

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Certified By _____

FEB 21 1985

DISTRIBUTION:
Central Files
LQB Reading
DHFS Reading - 2
~~H. Booher~~
~~J. Persensky~~
D. Shum

50-334

MEMORANDUM FOR: Harold R. Booher, Chief
Licensee Qualifications Branch
Division of Human Factors Safety

THRU: J. J. Persensky, Section Leader
Personnel Qualifications Section
Licensee Qualifications Branch
Division of Human Factors Safety

FROM: D. H. Shum
Personnel Qualifications Section
Licensee Qualifications Branch
Division of Human Factors Safety

SUBJECT: OBSERVATION OF INPO ACCREDITATION TEAM VISIT AT BEAVER
VALLEY POWER STATION

On December 10-14, 1984, I observed members of the INPO Accreditation Team at Beaver Valley Power Station (BVPS) to evaluate the adequacy of the INPO Accreditation process as a means of meeting the intent of the Policy Statement on Training and Qualifications in the commercial nuclear power industry. The objective of my trip was to observe the INPO Accreditation Team's field activities during their evaluation of BVPS's training programs for nonlicensed operators and licensed operators, and licensed operator requalification training program.

Team Composition

The INPO Accreditation Team at BVPS which consisted of peer evaluators from INPO member utilities and personnel from INPO's Accreditation and Training Assistance Departments possessed a high degree of professionalism, experience and dedication. The team was organized into two subgroups to review the Training Program and Training Process with each team member responsible for a specific topical area. The team members and assignments are as follows:

Walter Popp Team Manager
Ralph Reed Team Manager in Training

Group 1

Mike Sakmar Lead Process Evaluator
Frank Cabanillas Process Evaluator for Licensed Operators
Larry Durham Process Evaluator for Staff
Mike Gettle Process Evaluator for Organization and
Administration

8502280663

XA

| | | | | | | | |
|---------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE | | | | | | | |
| SURNAME | | | | | | | |
| DATE | | | | | | | |

FEB 21 1985

Wayne Rodehorst
(Peer Evaluator)
Randy Lewis
(Peer Evaluator)

Process Evaluator for Nonlicensed Operators
Process Evaluator for Requalification Training

Group 2

John Hanson
Bob Stallman
Jim Morris
Mike Penovich
(Peer Evaluator)

Lead Program Evaluator
Program Evaluator for Licensed Operators
Program Evaluator for Requalification Training
Program Evaluator for Nonlicensed Operators

Method Used to Facilitate Evaluation of Training Programs

The purpose of the Accreditation Team visit was to gather facts related to verification of information contained in the BVPS's Self-Evaluation Report (SER) and to compare the above cited training programs to INPO's accreditation criteria as described in INPO 82-011, "The Accreditation of Training in the Nuclear Power Industry," dated May 1982. To facilitate evaluation, interviews were used to gather information and to obtain answers to questions for each topical area. The team members prepared for their interviews by reviewing the BVPS's procedures, files and other pertinent information for each functional area to be reviewed.

The variation in INPO interview technique was most in evidence during the question and answer period of the interview process. Some interviewers prepared a detailed list of specific questions for each individual to be interviewed prior to the interview. Some used a generic list of questions or information to prompt conversation in their assigned functional area during the interview. Others used no prepared list of questions or information, but relied on memory to cover material relevant to their functional areas.

Most of INPO interviewers closed the interview by asking the interviewee to identify strengths and weaknesses of the BVPS's training programs. Also, during the closing period, some interviewers asked the interviewee if they had any questions they wanted to ask of the Accreditation Team.

Regardless of interview technique, all team members were able to maintain a clear-focus on gathering information pertinent to their functional area of review. In some cases, questions on other functional areas were asked to gather information on behalf of another team member who had insufficient need to conduct a full interview with the individual.

Team Meetings

Short formal team meetings, attended by all team members, were held each morning prior to commencement of the team's daily activities. These meetings provided a forum for exchange of information between the members on their

| | | | | | | |
|--------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE | | | | | | |
| IRNAME | | | | | | |
| DATE | | | | | | |

FEB 21 1985

functional areas and for the team leader to provide additional guidance, administrative instructions, or feedback to the team from the previous day's meeting with the plant manager to all the members simultaneously. Following the short formal team meetings, principal member of the team would meet with the BVPS staff and inform them of the team's progress and any concerns identified during the previous day. The utility would provide additional information to individual team members based on these comments.

It was also usual for team members to hold small informal meetings during the day to exchange newly uncovered information on each others review area. These exchanges seemed to increase the efficiency of team activities.

Prior to leaving the BVPS training center each evening, another formal team meeting was held to allow each team member to report on their day's activities, share information, summarize concerns, identify follow-up items and discuss problems. The team leader used this information to then brief the plant manager of BVPS on the team's activities each day.

Exit Briefing

The exit briefing, attended by all team members and BVPS staff, was held the last day of the Accreditation Team visit. Each group leader presented a summary of findings which were classified into categories (such as strengths, weaknesses and noncompliance of INPO criteria) for their designated area of review.

At the end of the formal presentations by the group leaders, brief statements were made by the team manager in training and team manager. This brought the INPO Accreditation Team visit at BVPS to an end. The peer evaluators returned to their utilities and the INPO team members returned to their home office to begin development of the final report documenting their findings.

The following were some of INPO's concerns expressed at the Exit Briefing:

- ° 20% of job-analysis had not been conducted for nonlicensed operators.
- ° With regard to lesson plans for nonlicensed operators, objectives and task analysis should be emphasized.
- ° With regard to training instructors for nonlicensed personnel, no specific retraining was required to maintain the instructor's technical proficiency.
- ° BVPS did not have a formal or systematic procedure for receiving feedback from operators or students to establish lesson plans.
- ° On-the-job training should be based on job analysis.
- ° ~~SRQ job task analysis was not completed.~~

| | | | | | | |
|-----------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE ▶ | | | | | | |
| SURNAME ▶ | | | | | | |
| DATE ▶ | | | | | | |

FEB 21 1985

- ° With regard to the operator requalification training program, the oral examinations should have the objectives established. The simulator training program was one of the best INPO had ever seen.
- ° The instructor training program being developed should have a schedule layout.
- ° A new training manual was being developed, however, no firm date had been set when it would be implemented.

Conclusion

I was impressed with the INPO Accreditation Team visit. The accreditation process was good. It was a thorough and highly professional process which provided valuable input into the accreditation decision.

Each day, the team members reviewed documentation relevant to training, interviewed various plant personnel, reviewed the findings during group and/or team meetings, and followed up any concerns the next day. At the end of the process, INPO would have an extremely clear picture of the utility's training organization, training facilities, and training programs.

The staff of BVPS indicated that all INPO's concerns would be resolved in the new training manual which was in the final stage of development. Even though INPO had numerous concerns with respect to BVPS's training programs, these concerns were not related to any NRC requirements. Based on INPO's thorough and in-depth review of BVPS's training organization, training programs, etc., and providing that BVPS would resolve INPO's concerns, I conclude that BVPS should have a very effective training program for plant personnel.

Original Signed by

David H. Shum
Personnel Qualifications Section
Licensee Qualifications Branch
Division of Human Factors Safety

DW/DHS2/MEMO FOR BOOHER

| | | | | | | | |
|--------|----------|------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE | LOB/DHFS | LOB/DHFS | | | | | |
| JRNAME | DShum/br | JPersensky | | | | | |
| DATE | 2/21/85 | 2/21/85 | | | | | |