

NOTATION VOTE

RESPONSE SHEET


TO: Annette Vietti-Cook, Secretary  
FROM: COMMISSIONER MCGAFFIGAN  
SUBJECT: **SECY-99-244 - LOCATION OF THE NRC'S TECHNICAL TRAINING CENTER AND APPROPRIATE NUMBER OF SIMULATORS**

Approved  Disapproved  Abstain \_\_\_\_\_

Not Participating \_\_\_\_\_

COMMENTS:

See attached comments.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SIGNATURE

February 22, 2000  
\_\_\_\_\_  
DATE

Entered on "AS" Yes  No \_\_\_\_\_

Commissioner McGaffigan's Comments on SECY-99-244

I reviewed this paper carefully, together with various additional information provided by staff of the Technical Training Center (TTC) (for example, the material attached to Dr. Travers' October 28, 1999 memorandum). After completing that review, I favored a variant of Option 4, namely moving all four simulators from their current location at the TTC to headquarters, using the staff transition plan outlined in Option 4. I commend the TTC staff and the Chattanooga Chamber of Commerce for their vigorous defense of both retaining four simulators and keeping the training function in Chattanooga. I came to agree with them on the former issue, but not on the latter. Today, the Commission conducted a closed meeting to discuss the TTC decision and to review the Option 4 variant ("Option 5") cost figures. The data confirmed my view that costs alone do not significantly favor one course of action over another. Today's meeting made it clear that the Commission's approval of "Option 5" would also direct that particular attention be given to easing the difficulties facing the TTC staff in preparing for and making the move to headquarters.

I believe the centralizing of the agency's training facilities at headquarters will offer significant advantages. Integration of the training function with the program offices should allow for enhanced participation by senior managers and experts in training the staff. For example, in a course on a rule and its recent changes, students could easily benefit from putting their questions directly to the project managers and other individuals with key current and historical knowledge. While it might not be practicable for such individuals to make the trip to Tennessee, they might well participate for an hour or an afternoon at a local site. I feel students would greatly benefit from the participation of someone like Gary Holahan in a PRA course, or Rich Correia on the maintenance rule, or Eileen McKenna on the history of the changes to 10 CFR 50.59, or Bill Borchardt on the development of the enforcement policy. Similarly, there will be benefits in making the simulators and instructors more available to the program offices. For a variety of reasons, I believe that training courses will be in higher demand if they are conducted at headquarters. This is true for both internal NRC students and Agreement State students. The potential for synergism in the move of the TTC to headquarters is a significant factor in my decision.

The simulators should be located as close to the headquarters offices as possible to maximize the training value gained from the move. The staff should explore the possible development of land adjacent to the headquarters offices.

There is the possibility, as the TTC staff has argued, that NRC headquarters students training at headquarters will more likely be diverted from their training by program office needs. It will require management oversight to ensure that this does not happen. But this is not a new issue for headquarters management, because it must be handled during the large number of non-technical training courses already held at headquarters.

