

Indian Point 3
Nuclear Power Plant
P.O. Box 215
Buchanan, New York 10511
914-736-8000



January 29, 1993
IP-TNG-93-044

Docket # 50-286
License # DPR-64

Mr. Robert Temps
License Examiner
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region I
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Dear Mr. Temps:

Attached is the examination report for the NRC Administered, licensed operator
requalification exam conducted at the Indian Point 3 facility during the week of
January 18, 1993.

If you have any questions regarding this report, please contact me at (914) 736-
8901.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'RER', followed by a horizontal line extending to the right.

R. E. Robenstein
Training Manager
Indian Point 3 Nuclear Power Plant

RER:RER:jhm
Attachments

Document Control Desk (original)
Mail Station PI-137
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

9303250035 930126
PDR ADOCK 05000286
V PDR

10008

LEAD
11

INDIAN POINT UNIT #3
NRC ADMINISTERED EXAM REPORT
18, JANUARY 1993

Report Summary

Exam Sequence : 19, January 1993 - Written Exam - The Part 'A' followed by the Part 'B'.

20, January 1993 - Operating Exam - Two (2) Simulator Evaluation Scenarios (SESS) and five (5) Job Performance Measures (JPMS).

21, January 1993 - Exit Meeting

Number Examined: Five (5) operators were examined: four (4) Senior Reactor Operators and one (1) Reactor Operator.

Exam Results : Written - All candidates satisfactory with an average of 96%.

Operating - Both crews were satisfactory. All Critical Tasks were successfully completed.

Individually, four (4) were satisfactory and one (1) was unsatisfactory based on individual competencies (provisions found in Attachment 5 will be used for remediation).

JPMS - All candidates were satisfactory with an average of 84%.

Simulator Exam Summary - All Crew Critical Tasks (CCTs) associated with both Simulator Evaluation Scenarios (SESS) were completed satisfactorily. The crews associated with both scenarios have passed.

All competencies were evaluated on an individual basis and it was determined that all but one (1) Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) passed. The individual who failed was the SRO for the second scenario.

INDIAN POINT UNIT #3
NRC ADMINISTERED EXAM REPORT
18, JANUARY 1993

Attachment Summary

The following Attachments provide the Indian Point 3 examination team's results of the examination process.

- Attachment 1: Simulator Crew Evaluations (SES-13)
- Attachment 2: Simulator Crew Evaluations (SES-03)
- Attachment 3: Written Examination results
- Attachment 4: JPM examination results
- Attachment 5: Provisions for Remediation

SIMULATOR EXAMINATION SUMMARY SHEET

Crew Members

SES-13 (Rev. 0)

Name	Position
SRO #1	SS
SRO #2	STA
SRO #3	SRO
RO	RO
SRO #4	RO Rover

Overall crew rating on the simulator examination:

 SAT or UNSAT

Comments: The crew was given a SGTR with a failure of the MTG to trip
requiring the MSIVs to be manually shut from the CCR.

UNDERSTANDING OF PLANT/SYSTEMS RESPONSE

Did the crew--

(a) locate and interpret control room indicators correctly and efficiently to ascertain and verify the status/operation of plant systems?

3

2

1

Each crew member located and interpreted instruments accurately and efficiently.

Some crew members committed minor errors in locating or interpreting instruments or displays. Some crew members required assistance.

The crew members made serious omissions, delays, or errors in interpreting safety related parameters.

(b) demonstrate an understanding of the manner in which the plant, systems, and components operate, including setpoints, interlocks, and automatic actions?

3

2

1

Crew members demonstrated thorough understanding of how systems and components operate.

The crew committed minor errors because of incomplete knowledge of the operation of the system or component's operation. Some crew members required assistance.

Inadequate knowledge of safety system or component operation resulted in serious mistakes or in plant degradation.

(c) demonstrate an understanding of how their actions (or inaction) affected systems and plant conditions?

3

2

1

All members understood the effect that actions or directives had on the plant and systems.

Actions or directives indicated minor inaccuracies in understanding by individuals, but the crew corrected the actions.

The crew appeared to act without knowledge of or with disregard for the effects on plant safety.

Grade on understanding of the response of plant and systems: SAT or UNSAT

Comments: See page 43 comments

CONTROL BOARD OPERATIONS

Did the crew--

(a) locate controls efficiently and accurately?

3

2

1

Individual operators located controls and indicators without hesitation.

One or more operators hesitated or had difficulty in locating controls.

The crew failed to locate control(s), which jeopardized system(s) important to safety.

(b) manipulate controls in an accurate and timely manner?

3

2

1

The crew manipulated plant controls smoothly and maintained parameters within specified bounds.

The crew demonstrated minor shortcomings in manipulating controls, but recovered from errors without causing problems.

The crew made mistakes manipulating control(s) that caused safety system transients and related problems.

(c) take manual control of automatic functions, when appropriate?

3

2

1

All operators took control and smoothly operated automatic systems manually, without assistance, thereby averting adverse events.

Some operators delayed or required prompting before overriding or operating automatic functions, but avoided plant transients where possible.

The crew failed to manually control automatic systems important to safety, even when ample time and indications existed.

Grade on control board operations:

SAT or UNSAT

Comments: _____

CREW OPERATIONS
(Continued)

Did the crew members--

(d) use a team approach to problem solving and decision making by soliciting and incorporating relevant information from all crew member?

3

2

1

Crew members were involved in the problem solving process and the decision making process for effective team decision making.

At times, crew members failed to get involved in the decision making process when they should have, detracting from the team oriented approach.

The crew was not involved in making decision(s). The crew was divided over the scenario's progress and this behavior was counter-productive.

Grade on crew operations:

SAT or UNSAT

Comments: Crew did not isolate the SG in a timely manner. Crew did not link the MTG trip, MSIV isolation and the MTG output breaker indication.

Multiple horizontal lines for additional comments.

SIMULATOR EXAMINATION SUMMARY SHEET

Crew Members

SES-03 (Rev. 0)

Name	Position
SRO #2	SS
SRO #1	STA
SRO #4	SRO
RO	RO
SRO #3	RO Rover

Overall crew rating on the simulator examination: SAT or UNSAT

Comments: The crew was given a loss of heat sink with a loss of offsite power and a loss of one safeguards bus. The SRO failed this SES on competency. He lacked command and control of the event.

UNDERSTANDING OF PLANT/SYSTEMS RESPONSE

Did the crew--

(a) locate and interpret control room indicators correctly and efficiently to ascertain and verify the status/operation of plant systems?

3

Each crew member located and interpreted instruments accurately and efficiently.

2

Some crew members committed minor errors in locating or interpreting instruments or displays. Some crew members required assistance.

1

The crew members made serious omissions, delays, or errors in interpreting safety related parameters.

(b) demonstrate an understanding of the manner in which the plant, systems, and components operate, including setpoints, interlocks, and automatic actions?

3

Crew members demonstrated thorough understanding of how systems and components operate.

2

The crew committed minor errors because of incomplete knowledge of the operation of the system or component's operation. Some crew members required assistance.

1

Inadequate knowledge of safety system or component operation resulted in serious mistakes or in plant degradation.

(c) demonstrate an understanding of how their actions (or inaction) affected systems and plant conditions?

3

All members understood the effect that actions or directives had on the plant and systems.

2

Actions or directives indicated minor inaccuracies in understanding by individuals, but the crew corrected the actions.

1

The crew appeared to act without knowledge of or with disregard for the effects on plant safety.

Grade on understanding of the response of plant and systems: SAT or UNSAT

Comments: See page 43 comments

CREW OPERATIONS
(Continued)

Did the crew members--

(d) use a team approach to problem solving and decision making by soliciting and incorporating relevant information from all crew member?

3

2

1

Crew members were involved in the problem solving process and the decision making process for effective team decision making.

At times, crew members failed to get involved in the decision making process when they should have, detracting from the team oriented approach.

The crew was not involved in making decision(s). The crew was divided over the scenario's progress and this behavior was counter-productive.

Grade on crew operations:

SAT or UNSAT

Comments: Although the crew completed necessary action, the recovery was disjointed since the SRO did not take command and control and allowed the crew to do what it seemed it wanted to do without direction.

Multiple horizontal lines for additional comments.

INDIAN POINT UNIT #3
NRC ADMINISTERED EXAM REPORT
18, JANUARY 1993

Written Examination Evaluation Summary

A review of the written section (Parts 'A' and 'B') for the 1993 NRC Administered Exam has identified no significant individual weaknesses. It is important to note that no significant generic weakness has been found in any LRQ topic or task either. There are, however, minor problems with 4 Part 'B' and 2 Part 'A' questions that were missed by at least one operator.

An analysis of the 4 Part 'B' questions identified the following:

- LIC-EOP-10.1.2.- 1/5 operators missed this ATWS-related question. This was an interpretation problem by the operator and the question is being reviewed for format error.
- LIC-EDS-6.1.6.- 1/5 operators missed this SI-loading question. This topic is scheduled in the 1993 LRQ training cycle.
- LIC-IXC-13.1.6.16 1/5 operators missed this SI-loading question. This topic is scheduled in the 1993 LRQ training cycle.
- NRC-IXC-05 (NIS) 2/5 operators missed this Instrument Bus question. This topic has been scheduled into the LRQ training cycle for 1993.

INDIAN POINT UNIT #3
NRC ADMINISTERED EXAM REPORT
18, JANUARY 1993

Written Examination Evaluation Summary

An analysis of the 2 Part 'A' questions identified the following:

Static Question A-05-05 1/5 operators missed this transfer to cold-leg recirc question. This topic is scheduled in the 1993 LRQ training cycle.

Static Question A-05-07 1/5 operators missed this Containment Spray pump operation question. This topic is scheduled in the 1993 LRQ training cycle.

The attached tables may be used to examine a test question or exam category. These tables are as follows:

Table I Individual section and overall exam averages for the written exam.

Tables IIa/b Respective question analysis of the SRO/RO Part 'B' exam results.

Table III Part 'A' question analysis results.

INDIAN POINT UNIT #3
NRC ADMINISTERED EXAM REPORT
18, JANUARY 1993

JPM Results

A weakness has been identified in our "Alternate-Path" formatted JPMS. 3 of the 5 candidates incorrectly performed the "Alternate-Path" JPM. An analysis of this indicates a possible weakness in operator's abilities to perform all Immediate Operator Actions as the EOPs without the aid of the procedure. This will, therefore, be implemented into the LRQ cycle for 1993. Along with training of the Immediate Operator Actions, all "Alternate-Path" JPMS will be covered during the "Diagnostics/Teamwork" portions of the 1993 LRQ training.

The one other JPM that was missed was a result of misreading the procedure. The operator was counseled on the use of procedures and the importance of procedural compliance. This was an isolated event and has not been demonstrated to be a generic weakness.

POS	JPMs PASSED	GRADE
SRO #1	4/5	80%
SRO #2	4/5	80%
SRO #3	4/5	80%
SRO #4	5/5	100%
RO	4/5	80%

INDIAN POINT UNIT #3
NRC ADMINISTERED EXAM REPORT
18, JANUARY 1993

Provisions for Remediation

The SRO who failed the Simulator Evaluation Scenario (SES) based on his individual competencies has been removed from watchstanding duties until satisfactory completion of his remediation.

His remediation will consist of the following:

1. Nine (9) weeks of Emergency Operating Procedure (EOP) training from 08, February through 18, June 1993. The training will consist of four (4) hours classroom and four (4) hours simulator training each day.
2. One (1) week Management Training with instruction in Leadership and Assertiveness. The goal is to have him act as team leader and be more assertive in his command and control role as the shift SRO.
3. Provide consultation to assist him in the realization of his shortcomings and assist in his reintroduction to his crew.

This remediation will be considered satisfactory when:

1. The candidate has achieved a pass evaluation in the EOP final exam

AND

2. The candidate has achieved satisfactory evaluations on all competencies when given two (2) Simulator Evaluation Scenarios.