

PDR



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

April 2, 1984

TO ALL POWER REACTOR LICENSEES AND APPLICANTS FOR OPERATING LICENSES
SUBJECT: CHANGE TO NUREG-1021, "OPERATOR LICENSING EXAMINER STANDARDS"
(Generic Letter 84-05)

Generic Letter 83-44 notified licensees of the availability of NUREG-1021. Recently the Nuclear Regulatory Commission has revised NUREG-1021, ES-201, Section H to improve the security of the written operator and senior operator licensing examination administration procedure while maintaining a meaningful review by facility representatives. A copy of this change is enclosed for your information and for your use in keeping your copies of NUREG-1021 current.

Comments on NUREG-1021 are welcome and will be considered in future revisions. Comments should be directed to Mr. Don Beckham, Chief, Operator Licensing Branch, Division of Human Factors Safety.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisemut
Darrell G. Eisemut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure: *See packet*
Revision 1, ES-201, Section H

8404020019 840402
PDR ADOCK 05000003
P PDR

IDR-5-1
INFO LTR

FACILITY EXAM REVIEW PROCEDURE
AMENDMENT TO EXAMINER STANDARD ES-201

ES-201, Section H, "Facility Staff Review of Examination"

A review of the written examination by facility personnel may be appropriate to ensure that plant specific questions in the examination are correct and up-to-date. When the Examination Question Bank is operational and the questions have been culled and identified by content area, the examination review may be eliminated. Until that time, an examination review as described below will be conducted.

The facility review of the examination shall be conducted as follows:

No type of facility review of the written examination shall be allowed prior to or while the written examination is in progress. After all of the candidates have completed the examination and all examination materials and notes have been turned in to the examiner, the Chief Examiner should have knowledgeable member(s) of the facility staff (training coordinator, operations supervisor, etc.) review the written examination and the answer key to identify any inappropriate questions and to ensure that the questions will elicit the answers in the key. Discussions may be necessary for clarification.

Normally the examiner who prepared the examination should be present throughout the review to explain questions, sources of answers and to ensure that the facility reviewers' questions about the examination are answered to the extent possible. The examiner should be capable of providing clarification on examination questions. Therefore, if the person writing the examination is not available, the other examiners must be certain that they are familiar with the intent of the questions. A maximum of one facility staff member per section per examination may be present during the review. The review is limited to a maximum of 2 hours (elapsed time). The Chief Examiner may extend this limit only if approved by the appropriate Regional Section Chief or his designee. All questions and comments made by the facility (other than questions asked to facilitate the review) shall be noted by the examiner. Although resolution of comments should be reached, if possible, the major emphasis of the review should be to identify all facility concerns rather than to reach agreement on resolution.

After the review, all copies of the examinations and answer keys will be collected by the examiner(s) and no other comments will be accepted by the examiners(s). Any additional comments should be provided in writing to the appropriate Regional Branch Chief, not later than five (5) working days following the end of the site visit.

Guidance on conducting the debriefing session (exit interview) with the facility staff before leaving the site is contained in Standard ES-104, Section B.

Prior to grading the examinations, the examiner who conducted the review shall resolve all facility comments, shall correct the examination questions and answer key, if appropriate, and shall document all facility comments, whether or not he considered them appropriate, and his resolution of the comments. This documentation, the revised master examination and answer key, and examination results shall be sent to the facility.

The examiner shall include on the master copy of the examination the names of the persons who reviewed the examination and answer key. The examiner shall complete appropriate sections of Table ES-201-6.

Upon completion of examination grading, the Regional Office shall send an examination report to the utility. The report shall document the examination review meeting with the licensee. Copies of this report will be sent to PDR's. Copies of examination summary sheets, which are currently provided to utilities pursuant to ES-104, could be enclosed with this letter, but shall be withheld from public disclosure for privacy reasons. A sample examination report is included as Attachment 4 to this standard.

Guidance on conducting the debriefing session (exit interview) with the facility staff before leaving the site is contained in Standard ES-104, Section B.

Prior to grading the examinations, the examiner who conducted the review shall resolve all facility comments, shall correct the examination questions and answer key, if appropriate, and shall document all facility comments, whether or not he considered them appropriate, and his resolution of the comments. This documentation, the revised master examination and answer key, and examination results shall be sent to the facility.

The examiner shall include on the master copy of the examination the names of the persons who reviewed the examination and answer key. The examiner shall complete appropriate sections of Table ES-201-6.

Upon completion of examination grading, the Regional Office shall send an examination report to the utility. The report shall document the examination review meeting with the licensee. Copies of this report will be sent to PDR's. Copies of examination summary sheets, which are currently provided to utilities pursuant to ES-104, could be enclosed with this letter, but shall be withheld from public disclosure for privacy reasons. A sample examination report is included as Attachment 4 to this standard.

North Carolina Power Authority
ATTN: Mr. H. G. Jones
Manager of Power
550A Chesnut Street
Anyplace, NC 37401

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: EXAMINATION REPORT

On December 12-16, 1983, NRC administered examinations to employees of your company who had applied for licenses to operate your Edison Nuclear Power Station. At the conclusion of the examinations, the examination questions and preliminary findings were discussed with those members of your staff identified in the enclosed report.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.7.90(a), a copy of this letter and the enclosure will be placed in NRC's Public Document Room unless you notify this office by telephone within ten days of the date of this letter and submit written application to withhold information contained therein within thirty days of the date of this letter. Such application must be consistent with the requirements of 2.790(b)(1).

Should you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact us.

Sincerely,

David M. Smith, Chief
Project Branch 1
Division of Project and
Resident Programs

Enclosures:

1. Examination Report
2. Examination(s) and Answer Key(s) (SRO/RO)

cc: Plant Superintendent
Plant Training Manager
Examiner

SAMPLE
EXAMINATION REPORT

Facility Licensee: North Carolina Power Authority
500A Chesnut Street
Anyplace, NC 37401

Facility Docket No.: 50-123

Facility License No.: CPPR-195

Examinations administered at Edison Nuclear Power Station near
Spring City, North Carolina

Chief Examiner: _____
Sam Y. Smith , Date Signed _____

Approved by: _____
Frank R. Adams, Section Chief Date Signed _____

Summary

Examinations on December 12-16, 1983

Written, oral, and simulator examinations were administered to four SROs, three ROs, and two instructor candidates. A written examination was administered to one additional RO candidate. Two SROs, two ROs and one instructor passed these examinations. All others failed.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Examined

SRO Candidates

W. T. Bounds
L. B. Spivey
D. E. Huskins
J. T. Heck

RO Candidates

S. T. Allen
R. F. Kahle
O. P. Gibson
A. F. Sloan

Instructor Candidates

I. M. Smart
P. A. Mills

2. Examiners

*S. Y. Smith, NRC
J. M. Johnson, EG&G
R. F. Radio, EG&G

*Chief Examiner

3. Examination Review Meeting

At the conclusion of the written examinations, the examiners met with R. P. Johnson, C. L. Boggs and M. E. Peoples of the Training Department to review the written examinations and answer key. As a result of this review, Questions 2.10 and 6.4 of the RO and SRO examinations respectively were deleted. It was determined that although these questions were obtained from facility supplied information, a recent vendor analysis negated the requirement for this system asked for in the questions. The design change was documented in DCM-83-16.

The facility questioned the applicability of Question 3.3 of the RO examination, but provided no supporting references. The question was considered appropriate by the staff and retained because the knowledge and skills covered by this question are important to the performance of his job as described in the Job Task analysis.

4. Exit Meeting

At the conclusion of the site visit the examiners met with representatives of the plant staff to discuss the results of the examinations. Those individuals who clearly passed the oral and/or simulator examination were identified in this meeting. The examiners made the following observations concerning your training program:

- a. Areas of generic weaknesses were found in the use of procedures, radiation protection, and theory, both nuclear and thermodynamic. The facility committed to place more emphasis in these areas in future training programs (Open Item 84-).
- b. Areas in which the examiners believe that the candidates exhibited good training and knowledge were control room familiarization, instrumentation, and facility administrative procedures.

- a. Areas of generic weaknesses were found in the use of procedures, radiation protection, and theory, both nuclear and thermodynamic. The facility committed to place more emphasis in these areas in future training programs (Open Item 84-).
- b. Areas in which the examiners believe that the candidates exhibited good training and knowledge were control room familiarization, instrumentation, and facility administrative procedures.

QUESTION DELETED FROM WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS

Question 2.10 a. Describe the accident which the Boron Injection Tank (BIT) is designed to mitigate. (1.0)

b. Describe the design features of the BIT, i.e., how does it accomplish its function during an accident situation. (1.0)

Answer 2.10 a. The ECCS including the BIT provides shutdown capability by means of boron injection. The most critical accident for shutdown capability in the main steam line break.

b. The BIT contains a nominal 12 wt.% boric acid and is connected to the discharge of the centrifugal charging pumps. Upon receipt of an SI signal, the charging pumps provide the pressure to inject the boric solution into the RCS when the isolation valves open.

REF: I&E Training Center, Systems Manual, Chapter 4.2.
Also Edison NPS, STM 13-6.

Reason for deletion: Westinghouse Analysis, W-001, provided justification why the BIT was no longer required. The Tank is still in place, however, it's contents have been replaced with boron at RCS concentration. Automatic responses to SI signals have been removed (ref: DCM-83-16).