

| United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Official Hearing Exhibit | |
|---|---|
| In the Matter of: | Charlissa C. Smith (Denial of Senior Reactor Operator License) |
|  | ASLBP #: 13-925-01-SP-BD01 |
| | Docket #: 05523694 |
| | Exhibit #: BRD013-00-BD01 |
| | Admitted: 09/17/2013 |
| | Rejected: Other: |
| | Identified: 07/18/2013 Withdrawn: Stricken: |

Scenario 3, Event: 5

In the expected actions we say two things. First we say that the applicant was expected to recognize that the standby EHC pump did not automatically start after the running EHC pump tripped AND EHC pressure reached 1400 psig. We then say “Alternatively, the applicant was expected to recognize SHORTLY after the running EHC pump tripped that the standby pump would be required and its automatic start was imminent and thereby preemptively direct the standby EHC pump to be started prior to it automatic start setpoint (1400) being reached.”

Which action must the applicant perform to successfully complete the task or address the event of the scenario? In one sentence we say that the applicant should start the pump after the EHC pump tripped AND pressure reached 1400 psig. In the next sentence we say that the applicant should start the pump SHORTLY after the EHC pump trips

In response to the event we indicated that the “applicant started the standby EHC pump after the running pump tripped. Did we not identify this as an expected response once the running pump tripped? This appeared the corrected response. Applicants should be asked followup questions if they did something wrong or actions taken not identified in the event task description. Why the questions? It would appear to me that the applicant recognized that the standby pump tripped and directed actions to start the pump. We then asked a follow-up question and downgraded the applicant base on the answer provided. We went on to say that the applicant “incorrectly diagnosed that EHC pressure had dropped below 1400 psig, which is the standby EHC pump automatic start setpoint.” At no point in our write up did we say what EHC pressure was. What was pressure? Did you ask the applicant to show you what the pressure was when the pump was directed to be tripped? Was the applicant who tripped to pump asked the same question? Did you ask the applicant who tripped the pump, why they tripped the pump? Based on the applicant response, was that applicant downgraded? I am not sure where EHC pressure is read.

We went on to say that the applicant “demonstrated a weakness in her ability to obtain accurate EHC pressure data on which to base her diagnosis.” There is no indication that we asked her to identify where she got her reading from.....

It is my opinion that the applicant should not have been downgraded. Should not have been given a 1 based on two errors.

Scenario 3, Event 7

In the expected response, we stated that the applicant was “expected to direct that low steam line pressure SI/SLI be blocked when pressurizer pressure was less than 2000 psig as indicated by P-11 status lights” in accordance with procedure 19030-c,” Step 12. Note the procedure did not say as indicated by P-11 status lights. The procedure stated:

*1) **Check if low steamline pressure SI/SLI should be blocked:**

__a) Steam Dumps - AVAILABLE.

__b) PRZR pressure - LESS THAN 2000 PSIG.

In the applicant’s response we stated that the applicant directed the RO to block SI/SLI. We stated the block was not successful because pressure was not less than 2000 psig. We stated that pressure was approximately 2007 psig. The block was successfully completed a few minutes later. You also stated that the applicant thought pressurizer pressure was 1998 psig and this is why she directed that SI/SLI be blocked. If she thought pressure was 1998 psig, she was right in directing the action according to procedure because a setpoint was reached.

The applicant should not have been downgraded.....

Scenario 7, Event 6: RWST Sludge Mixing Line Pipe Break With Failure to Automatically Isolate

Who identified or was expected to identify the alarm and pulled the alarm response procedure? We say that the applicant was expected to know the location of the RWST sludge mixing isolation valves. Did the applicant not know where the valves were located?

You say that the applicant as the RO was not expected to leave the control board, therefore not expected to go and locate the valves.....If the BOP pulled the ARP, then the BOP should have read the actions identified in the ARP and performed the actions not the applicant. She is not expected to know the actions of the ARP from memory.

I looked at the Event Sheet and it said this was a CC for the BOP and the SS and a TS for the SS. The applicant should not have been downgraded in this area. Also look take a look at the writeup for the BOP. Write-up is not very good. It said that the crew took 19 minutes to take actions. What were they doing during the 19 minutes?

Scenario 7, Event 6: RWST Sludge Mixing Line Pipe Break With Failure to Automatically Isolate