

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Official Hearing Exhibit	
Charlissa C. Smith (Denial of Senior Reactor Operator License)	
	ASLBP #: 13-925-01-SP-BD01
	Docket #: 05523694
	Exhibit #: NRC-039-00-BD01
	Admitted: 7/17/2013
	Rejected:
Other:	
	Identified: 7/17/2013
	Withdrawn:
	Stricken:

NRC-039
Submitted: May 31, 2013

RATING FACTOR 4: COMMUNICATIONS

1. Examiner comment on 303 form p. 23 of 32, related to Scenario 6, Event 4

- At 08:35.57, Carla directed [REDACTED] to take manual control of FIC-121.
- At 08:40:16, Carla notified Clearance and Tagging (C&T) of the failure and requested permission to go back to automatic. C&T granted that permission.
- At 08:46:32 Carla started a crew brief to discuss the event. During this brief, she incorrectly stated that FIC-121 was in automatic, when it was actually in manual.

This was an error that was made by Carla and corrected by [REDACTED]

The error was categorized in rating factor 4.a, communications – clarity, because the applicant did not communicate in a clear and easily understood manner, which was supported by the reactor operator correcting the communication.

2. Examiner comment on 303 form p. 24 of 32, related to Scenario 6, Event 4

After initiation of the event, controlling pressurizer level channel LT-459 failed low, Carla directed the performance of immediate operator actions. The unit operator informed Carla that no immediate operator actions existed.

During post-scenario questioning, the examiner asked the applicant what she was intending the operator to do when she directed him to perform immediate operator actions. The applicant stated that she simply misspoke.

This error was categorized in rating factor 4.a, communications – clarity, because Carla did not communicate in a clear and easily understood manner. The applicant’s response to the previously documented post-exam question was used to place this error in rating factor 4.a.

3. Examiner comment on 303 form p. 25 of 32, related to Scenario 7, Event 7

During performance of E-0 at Step 4 RNO, which checks to see if SI was required, J. Turner directed Carla to check if SI was required. Carla was initially standing in front of the steam generator panel, checked steam generator pressures, and reported that pressurizer pressure was 1020 psig and

stable. The E-0 procedural requirement directs a Safety Injection if pressurizer pressure was less than or equal to 1870 psig. [REDACTED] did not correct the miscommunication and did not take any incorrect action, but had the information been accurate, a safety injection would have been required.

This error was categorized in rating factor 4.a, communications – clarity, because Carla did not communicate in a clear and easily understood manner.

4. Examiner comment on 303 form p. 26 of 32, related to Scenario 3, Event 1

As stated in the ES-303 documentation, Carla directed a surrogate unit operator to place FIC-540 back to automatic prior to getting shift manager permission. The reactor operator whispered to Carla that she needed to get shift manager permission. She instructed the unit operator to wait to place the controller to automatic, received the required shift manager permission, and then directed the unit operator again to place the controller in automatic.

This error was placed in rating factor 4.b, communications – crew & other informed, because she did not keep those outside the control room informed of plant status as required by facility procedures.

5. Examiner comment on 303 form p. 27 of 32, related to Scenario 3, Event 4

As stated in the ES-303 documentation, Carla directed the unit operator to place the pressurizer master pressure controller back to automatic without first getting shift manager permission as required by procedure. In this event, the error was not corrected and the actions were taken without ever obtaining shift manager permission.

This error was placed in rating factor 4.b, communications – crew & other informed, because she did not keep those outside the control room informed of plant status as required by facility procedures.

6. Examiner comment on 303 form p. 28 of 32, related to Scenario 6, Event 1

As stated in the ES-303 documentation, following the trip of ACCW pump #1, [REDACTED] reviewed lit annunciators and stated to Carla that alarms were consistent with the ACCW pump malfunction. When this communication was made only a few feet separated the applicants and the communication was

clear and spoken at a level that was easily heard by anyone in the control room.

The error was placed in rating factor 4.c, communications – receive information, because the applicant did not ensure receipt of clear, easily understood communications from the crew.

→ SS did not correct

maintain AFW flow to 65% NR