



OFFICE OF THE  
COMMISSIONER

UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555

May 14, 1985

MEMORANDUM FOR: William J. Dircks  
Executive Director for Operations

FROM: Lando W. Zech, Jr. *Lando W. Zech Jr.*

SUBJECT: SECY-85-150 - FINAL POLICY STATEMENT ON ENGINEERING  
EXPERTISE ON SHIFT

Prior to voting on the final policy statement on engineering expertise on shift, I would like to obtain additional information from the staff, as well as from NUMARC and INPO if possible, concerning the substitution of experience and completion of INPO-accredited SRO/STA courses for the alternate educational requirements in Option 1 of Versions A and B. In my view, the Commission should be encouraging industry to adopt a long-range plan which would provide that licensed operators either obtain engineering degrees or are hired with engineering degrees. I believe the mental discipline and perspectives gained through formal education are important. Accreditation, on the other hand, is also important to ensure that training programs are uniformly adequate. It is the difference between educational qualifications and training improvements that concerns me with regard to the policy statements. It is my view that the Commission should support both enhanced education and improved training programs.

Subparagraph b (2) of Option 1 in both Versions A and B indicates that instead of alternate educational requirements, a utility could substitute four years of experience as a licensed operator and successful completion of the INPO-accredited STA and SRO training programs. I have the following questions with respect to the above policy:

1. Does the expertise referred to mean four years of experience as an SRO or four years of experience as a licensed operator (RO and SRO)?
2. INPO STA and SRO program guidelines are stated to be acceptable to satisfy the requirements of a training program. It is my understanding that guidelines are suggested elements for a program and are not requirements. With regards to the educational suggestions in the program guidelines, which, if any of the guidelines are considered the minimum requirements? For instance, are there minimum formal education prerequisites?
3. I would like to know the specific differences between what is recommended in the INPO SRO and STA guidelines. What additional

8507110580 850701  
PDR COMMS NRCC  
CORRESPONDENCE PDR

RDO --- 000633

Rec'd Off. EDO

Date...

Time...

specific guidelines above those suggested for an SRO apply to the STA?

4. It is my impression that a utility could not consider an STA qualified by invoking paragraph b (2) of Option 1 until the STA program has been accredited and the individual has successfully completed it. I would like to be sure that this impression is correct. In addition, which utilities currently have accredited STA programs and when do you suspect a utility could invoke this option to qualify an STA?
5. I assume subparagraph b (2) meant to refer to PWR or BWR operator and supervisor programs. If this is not correct, I would appreciate an explanation.

cc: Chairman Palladino  
Commissioner Roberts  
Commissioner Asselstine  
Commissioner Bernthal  
OPE  
SECY