

50-359  
50-330

CONSUMERS POWER COMPANY  
MIDLAND ENERGY CENTER

Transmittal No: CSC-7397

Date: February 29, 1984

To: Stone & Webster  
P O Box 1963  
Midland, MI 48640


Attached Is: ☐ Partial Response To  
☒ Complete Response To  
☐ For Your Information  
☐ Other

PRINCIPAL STAFF			
✓ PR Doc	PRP		
D/RA	DE		
A/RA	DRMSP		
RC	DRMA		
PAO	SCS		
SGA	ML		
ENF	FTIB		

✓ orig + 3  
Doc

Description:

NIR-008: Attached is closed QAR RT-00021 which provides a complete response to NIR-008.

Signature: 

cc: JGKeppler, NRC Region III w/a  
JJHarrison, NRC Region III w/a  
RJCook, NRC Site w/a  
RAWells, MPQAD w/a  
BHPeck, MEC w/a  
NIREichel, MEC w/a  
DDJohnson, MEC w/a

MAR 7 1984

8403130210 840229  
PDR ADOCK 05000329  
S PDR

1201 11

QUALITY ACTION REQUEST

*QAR 15-2*  
~~THIS REPLACES ORIGINAL~~

6. QAR NO:	RT-00021	
7. DATE ISSUED:	12/29/83	8 REV: 0
9. PAGE	1	OF 3
10. ASME RELATED	<input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO	

1. REQUIREMENT:

FPG 2.000 identifies the requirements for, and the approvals required for training matrices. Various people generate and approve the matrices but the one common factor is that CP Co SMO gives final approval to all of them.

2. DEFICIENCY:

Stone and Webster NIR #008 identified five inadequacies in the system team training matrix in a sample of 50 which represented 318 job assignments.

11. POTENTIAL	50.55(e)
YES	<input type="checkbox"/>
NO	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

3. QAR ORIGINATED BY:	4. DISCIPLINE/DIVISION/SECTION	5. RESPONSE DUE DATE	12. REPORTED TO MPQA MANAGER:
DMTurnbull	QSD	1/6/84	DATE N/A

13. ACTION ITEM NO:	15. ITEM PRIORITY:	17. S/U CODE:	19. ACTION ORGANIZATION	20. QAR REVIEWED BY:
S04124	3	PGM00	CP Co Site Management Organization	<i>H F Ewert</i>
14. DISCIPLINE:	16. TREND CODE:	18. RESB CODE:	21. DATE:	
N/A	DNT	CPCO SM	12/29/83	

22. CAUSE:

See Bechtel Letter No. BCCC-8838 dated 12-29-83 - attached.

23. PROPOSED CORRECTIVE ACTION:

See Bechtel Letter No. BCCC-8838 dated 12-29-83 - attached. In addition CPCo SMO will conduct a thorough review of the new revisions to ensure consistency in the assigned training levels.

24. RESPONSIBLE ORGANIZATION/PERSON:

*DM*

25. PROPOSED COMPLETION DATE

Complete.

26. DISPOSITION CONCURRENCE:

*H F Ewert* 2/22/84  
QAR REVIEWER *GFEWERT* DATE

N/A *H F Ewert* 2/22/84  
PQAE (ASME ONLY) DATE

27. DISPOSITION ACTION TAKEN:

The BPCo review committee referenced in the last paragraph of letter BCCC-8838 completed their review and submitted the Bechtel training matrixes to CPCo SMO for approval on January 30, 1984. SMO conducted a thorough review for consistency in assigned levels of training and approved the training requirements on February 8, 1984.

28. METHOD OF DISPOSITION VERIFICATION

Verified that the CP Co engineer who approved Rev 3 of the Bechtel Training Matrices had made a point of verifying that all the changes asked for had been incorporated into Rev 3.

29. QAR CLOSED BY

*H F Ewert* 2/22/84  
MPQAD *GFEWERT* DATE

ACCEPTABLE ☒ UNACCEPTABLE ☐ SUPERCEDING QAR

N/A  
PFQCE (ASME ONLY) DATE

STONE AND WEBSTER ENGINEERING CORPORATION  
NONCONFORMANCE IDENTIFICATION REPORT

QCI 15.01  
Attachment 4.1  
Revision 2

PAGE 1 OF 2

DATE OF NONCONFORMANCE: NOVEMBER 8, 1983 NIR NUMBER 008

IDENTIFICATION/LOCATION OF ITEMS:

SYSTEM TEAM TRAINING MATRIX, REV.1, DATED JULY 20, 1983

DESCRIPTION OF NONCONFORMANCE:

During the review of the adequacy of the construction training matrices, a sample size of 50 training level assignments, representing a lot size of 318 assignments, five unsatisfactory conditions were observed in the training level assignments. The System Team Training Matrix of the Construction Training Program was utilized to perform the review.

See the attached for unsatisfactory conditions observed. The five unsatisfactory conditions reported represents a reject condition for this lot size of 318.

TH Barber  
INITIATOR  
DATE 11/9/83

PROGRAM MGR [Signature]  
DATE October 10, 1983

CORRECTIVE ACTION BY:

IDENTIFY ORGANIZATION TAKING CORRECTIVE ACTION

VERIFICATION SAT UNSAT  
INITIATOR \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_

NEW NIR#  
DATE

CONCURRENCE  
PROGRAM MGR \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_

REMARKS

1. • FPG 9.700, "System Team Charter"

FPG 9.700 appears on the "System Team Training Matrix" as a Level "0" (no training required) for the system team field engineer, mechanical. Paragraph 5.2.7 of this procedure identifies the job responsibilities and reporting relationships for the system team field engineers. As such, a level of training of "0" (no training) is not satisfactory.

2. FPO 1.201, "Bechtel Assigned Post Turnover (PTO) Work".

FPO 1.201 appears on the "System Team Training Matrix" as a Level "0" (no training required) for the system team field engineer, mechanical. In discussion with the Team #5 supervisor, it was noted that the Team members do get involved in Post Turnover Work. Because of this involvement by the Team members, a level of training of "0" (no training) is not satisfactory.

3. FIG 1.400 "Preparation, Review and Routing of Field Engineer's Reports."

FIG 1.400 includes responsibilities for several disciplines, ie; mechanical, civil, welding, and instrumentation as well as including responsibilities for the electrical discipline. The following conditions were noted as being unsatisfactory;

(a) The "System Team Training Matrix" under the column entitled "Responsible Discipline" shows this procedure to be an electrical discipline procedure.

(b) The "System Team Training Matrix" requires the field engineers of the mechanical and the instrumentation disciplines to receive a level "2" training whereas the field engineers of the electrical and welding disciplines receive a level "3" training. There is an inconsistency of training levels being assigned.

4. Specification M-214, "Piping System Erection Fit-up Control Requirements."

M-214 appears on the "System Team Training Matrix" as a level "0", (no training required) for the system team field engineer, welding. Specification pages 3, 5; 7B and 8 address welding. Also, weld fit-ups are addressed throughout this specification. As such, a level of training of "0" (no training) is not satisfactory.

5. Drawing E-039 - "Seismic Wireway Supports."

E-039 appears on the "System Team Training Matrix," as a level "0" (no training required) for the system team field engineer, welding. This drawing contains weld sizes and weld symbols for typical wireway supports. As such, a level of training of "0" (no training) is not satisfactory.

It is recommended that the disposition to this NIR include a commitment to verify the adequacy of all training matrices.



# Bechtel Power Corporation

1/10/84

Site Mgr.  
Midland Project

Post Office Box 2167  
Midland, Michigan 48640



December 29, 1983

Consumers Power Company  
P.O. Box 1963  
Midland, MI 48640

Attention: D. L. Quamme  
Site Manager

Job 7220 Midland Project  
NIR-008, OBSERVATION #34  
UNSATISFACTORY CONDITIONS  
ON TRAINING MATRIX  
BCCC-8838

DLQ	
JFF	
JMB	
VMB	
TAB	
RFK	
ADK	
SLM	
SNP	
NJS	
SEE-NIR	
FILE NO.	
JFI	

Dear Mr. Quamme:

The review of a sampling of the training matrix by Stone & Webster uncovered five possible unsatisfactory conditions. The conditions are inconsistencies between the levels and areas of Orientation and Indoc-trination (O&I) Training that the systems teams receive.

The assignment of the level and area of O&I training is based on judge-ment as to what the requirements are for bringing a qualified employee up to speed to accomplish the CCP. This judgement was made by various groups who established the levels for their respective areas, using some general guidelines. With this approach, there is a chance for inconsistencies due to difference of opinion and judgement.

One item cited by Stone & Webster was the lack of O&I training for a welding engineer on the electrical support drawings (E-039). Even though these drawings have welding symbols and sizes on them, the group establishing the levels of training made the determination that these drawings, as well as many other drawings, do not have to be included in the O&I training for welding engineers.

Another item involved an inconsistency between some members of a team receiving a level 2 (read only) and others having level 3 (read and review with supervisor) on the same procedure (Preparation, review and routing of Field Engineer's Report). This is an inconsistency though not serious, and the matrix is presently being reviewed to eliminate this type.

The other three unsatisfactory conditions involved leaving off some members of a team from an O&I training requirement of level 2 (read only) on two general procedures and failing to require O&I training for the welding engineer on piping specification M-214 (Piping system erection fit-up control requirements).

D. L. Quamme

BCCC-8838

Page Two

In regard to the piping specification, it has almost no involvement with welding or welding fit-up and is a pure judgement call as to whether welding engineers should be required to have O&I training on the specification. Of the other two procedures, one obviously should have been included as a systems team requirement (FPG-9.700, System Team Charter) and the other is a matter of judgement as to who requires O&I training on the "Bechtel Assigned (PTO) Work" procedure.

In summary of the five items noted by Stone & Webster, two are clear inconsistencies and the other three fall into an area of subjective opinion.

To eliminate our inconsistencies in levels and areas of O&I training, we have a committee reviewing the entire matrix with the goal of issuing the next revision by mid January 1984.

Very truly yours,

*G. A. Hierzer*

G. A. Hierzer  
Site Manager

GAH/EK/jkc

Written Response Requested: No