U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGION I
OPERATOR LICENSING REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT NO. 50-244/91-24 (OL-RQ)

FACILITY DOCKET NO. 50-244

FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-18

LICENSEE: Rochester Gas and Electric Company
49 East Avenue
Rochester, New York 14649

FACILITY: R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Station

EXAMINATION DATES: October 13-15, 1991

CHIEF EXAMINER: Paul Bissett, Senior Operations Engineer — 12/5/91 Date

APPROVED BY: Peter Eselgroth, Chief, PWR Section
Operations Branch, Division of Reactor Safety — 12/6/91 Date

SUMMARY: Requalification examinations were administered to five senior reactor operators (SROs) and two reactor operators (ROs). The examinations were graded concurrently and independently by the NRC and the facility training staff. As graded by both the NRC and the facility training staff, one SRO failed both the simulator and written portions of the examination; and one SRO failed the written portion of the examination. The five remaining operators successfully passed all portions of the examination. Also, both the NRC and the facility evaluators judged both crews (one staff and one shift) as performing satisfactorily during the simulator examination. A programmatic review was not performed since the required number of examinees totaled less than twelve; therefore, the programmatic evaluation will be deferred until the next NRC administered requalification examination.

DETAILS

TYPE OF EXAMINATIONS: Requalification

EXAMINATION RESULTS:

NRC Grading	RO Pass/Fail	SRO Pass/Fail	TOTAL Pass/Fail
Written	2/0	3/2	5/2
Simulator	2/0	4/1	6/1
Walk-through	2/0	5/0	7/0
Overall	2/0	3/2	5/2

Facility Grading	RO Pass/Fail	SRO Pass/Fail	TOTAL Pass/Fail
Written	2/0	3/2	5/2
Simulator	2/0	4/1	6/1
Walk-through	2/0	5/0	7/0
Overall	2/0	3/2	5/2

1.0 Personnel Contacted During The Examination/Evaluation

Chief Examiner at Site:

P. Bissett, Senior Operations Engineer	(1,2,3)

Other NRC Personnel:

J. Munro, Operating Licensing Branch, NRR	(2,3)
T. Moslak, Senior Resident Inspector	(3)
T. Guilfoil, Sonalysts	(1,2)
F. Victor, Sonalysts	(1,2)

Rochester Gas and Electric Company

L. Briggs, Senior Reactor Operator	(1)
N. Brehse, Instructor, Licensed Training	(2)
R. Carroll, Ginna Training Manager	(3)
S. Dixon, Instructor, Licensed Training	(2)
J. Hart, Senior Licensed Instructor	(2)
K. Hart, Supervisor, Instructional & Office Services	(N/A)
B. Harper, Senior Instructor, Licensed Training	(2)
D. Hudnut, Supervisor, Simulator Training	(1,2,3)
M. Lilley, Manager, Nuclear Assurance	(3)
T. Marlow, Superintendent Ginna Production	(3)
K. Masker, Instructor, Licensed Training	(1,2)
R. Mecredy, General Manager, Nuclear Production	(3)
G. Meier, Manager, Production Division Training	(3)
J. Reagan, Senior Instructor, Licensed Training	(2)
T. Schuler, Operations Manager, Ginna Station	(2,3)
J. Widay, Plant Manager, Ginna Station	(3)
B. Zollner, Senior Instructor, Licensed Training	(2)

LEGEND:
(1) Participated in examination development
(2) Participated in examination administration
(3) Attended exit meeting on October 18, 1991 at the R.E. Ginna Training Center

2.0 Program Evaluation Results

In accordance with NUREG-1021, Operator Licensing Examiner Standards, ES-601, "Administration of NRC Requalification Program Evaluations," Revision 6, requires at least 12 examinees in order to obtain an adequate sample for program evaluation purposes. It further states that a program evaluation should be deferred until at least 12 operators from consecutive evaluations have been examined. Since the sample size for this cycle of examinations was seven operators (examinees), the program evaluation will be deferred until the next cycle of NRC administered requalification examinations.

3.0 Scenario Evaluation

The following weaknesses and strengths were noted during the scenario portion of the operating examinations.

- Per the Examiner Standards, simulator scenarios are to last approximately fifty to sixty minutes in length. One scenario, 91-05, performed by two different crews, took 83 minutes for one crew and 99 minutes for the other. The licensee had estimated, following scenario validation, that scenario 91-05 should last approximately 55 minutes. The licensee should again revalidate this scenario and determine whether or not 55 minutes is an appropriate estimation. Also, a review of the estimated times for the other scenarios in the examination bank should be modified as they are run during requalification training to revalidate their actual times.

- Control room foremen (CRF) and shift supervisors (SS) should perform a cursory review of shift technical advisor's (STA) recommendations and/or information provided. It was noted that erroneous information was provided on two occasions; however, prior to the CRF or SS implementing the STA's recommendations, the STA corrected himself. Had the SS or CRF accepted the STA's recommendations as originally stated, one crew could have made a transition that was not required and the other crew's SS could have classified the event incorrectly.

- Evaluators should be more conscious of evaluative materials that they possess during the conduct of scenarios, i.e., the actual scenario sequence of events. They should pay particular attention as to how they hold them, where they lay them, etc., thus avoiding any possibility of examination compromise. NRC evaluators cautioned the licensee evaluators of their concern involving this matter. No compromise was observed.

- A facility management representative involved in plant operations should be present during the administration of the simulator scenario portion of the examination. This includes the performance

of both the staff and shift operating crews. The NRC chief examiner had to request that the Operations Manager return to the simulator observation booth when the staff crew began their portion of the simulator examination. An Operations representative's observation and viewpoint can often play an important part in determining whether or not a crew's performance was satisfactory. Operations and Training must work together in all aspects of the examination.

- Communications was viewed as an improvement in comparison to a previous requalification examination observed in 1989. As a result of poor communications observed during that examination in 1989, the licensee developed a communications standard. With a standard now in place, the training department can effectively evaluate crew communications and operating crews know what is expected of them. It was obvious to the NRC from the observed improved performance during the five scenarios that emphasis had been placed in this area.

4.0 Written Examination Evaluation

The following weaknesses were noted during the written portion of the examination:

- During the initial onsite review of the subsections of the written examination, Part A, it was determined by the NRC, that each section could be completed adequately within less than 30 minutes. Additional questions, therefore, were added to the Part A portion of the written examination in order to meet the time requirement of 45 minutes (excluding the 15 minutes allowed for review) for each of the two sections. The licensee questioned the appropriateness of adding additional questions and was concerned over the examinees ability to finish the examination within the allotted time. The NRC stated that a competent operator should have an adequate amount of time to complete the examination, especially when considering that 15 additional minutes are given for review. The NRC stated that, in the future, consideration should be given to: (1) allowing the operators to walkdown the simulator main control boards prior to the start of the examination; (2) identifying each examination question that does not specifically apply to the current status of the simulator main control boards, and (3) providing more available copies of reference material.

- Particular attention should be paid to those questions that appear to be direct lookups. If little cognitive thinking is required of the examinee, then the question should be either expanded upon or discarded. Only a few questions fell into this category.

5.0 Job Performance Measures (JPM) Evaluation

The following weaknesses were noted during the JPM portion of the examination.

- Several proposed JPMs were considered to be too simple a task and were therefore not considered as an adequate tool to evaluate an operator's competency. Although the tasks were of importance and had a high knowledge/abilities value, the JPM itself did little from an evaluative standpoint. These JPMs were replaced with more appropriate JPMs from the licensee's examination bank.

- The training department should periodically validate JPMs against applicable plant procedures. Three instances were found where either the JPM or the procedure was incorrect as written. The JPMs in which problems were experienced were JPM J004.005, "Dilute BAST Following a Loss of All A/C," and JPM J016.002, "Place Excess Letdown in Service." Plant procedure ER-AFW.1, "Alternate Water Supply to the AFW Pumps," was also found to be in error as written. Interim corrective changes were made to correct the discrepancies.

6.0 Review of Licensed Operator Medical Certification Records

The examiner performed a review of the medical certification records for eight of the 40 presently licensed operators at R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Station. The record review indicated that the licensee is performing medical examinations in accordance with the guidelines set forth in ANSI/ANS 3.4, "Medical Certification and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants."

7.0 Simulator Fidelity Report

In general, the simulator performed well during the dynamic simulator portion of the examination with one exception. During one scenario, the simulator plant indicators began displaying erroneous information and plant equipment was not responding as expected. The licensee terminated the scenario when this occurred. The NRC concurred with this decision. The examinees were then escorted from the simulator area. Following a brief evaluation of the simulator problem, the NRC determined that the same scenario could again be run since only one of several events had occurred up to the time in which the simulator began to malfunction. The cause of the malfunction is unknown.

8.0 Summary of Comments Made at Exit Meeting on October 18, 1991

The NRC expressed appreciation for the level of effort expended by the training department representatives in accommodating the NRC examination team. This level of effort, which included providing an adequate working area, appropriate reference materials, locked storage capabilities, plant access badging, etc., helped in expediting the review process and the

conduct of the exam. Appreciation was also expressed for the cooperation and level of effort expended by all those involved in the process, especially the facility team members who administered the examination.

The NRC discussed the topics addressed in Paragraphs 2 through 5 above. The NRC also stated that a requalification training program evaluation would be deferred until the next annual cycle since less than twelve licensed operators were examined during this cycle. The next program evaluation would, however, include the results of the seven individuals and two crews evaluated during this examination.

Attachment 1

ROCHESTER GAS AND ELECTRIC CORPORATION • 89 EAST AVENUE, ROCHESTER N.Y. 14649-0001

ROBERT C. MECREDY
Vice President
Ginna Nuclear Production

TELEPHONE
AREA CODE 716 546-2700

October 29, 1991

Mr. Lee Bettenhausen
Operations Branch Chief
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region 1
475 Allendale Rd.
King of Prussia, PA 19446

Dear Mr. Bettenhausen:

As required by the Operator Licensing Examiner Standards (NUREG-1021, Section ES-601, Rev 6), enclosed you will find Rochester Gas & Electric's 1991 Requalification Examination results.

Included in this package you will find the Pre and Post-Examination security agreements, the individual summary sheet and an overall summary sheet. Also included are the overall results of the 1991 Requalification Exam administerd by the Ginna Training staff.

At this time I would like to commend the members of the exam team who worked hard to ensure that the exam was a fair and thorough assessment of our licensed personnel. Even though the exam week was cut short due to a holiday and travel time, the exam was conducted in a most professional and efficeient manner.

If there are any questions regarding this summary, please feel free to call Frank Maciuska at 716-724-8200, ext.6651.

Very truly yours,

Robert C. Mecredy

Robert C. Mecredy

XC: G. Meier

1991 GINNA NRC
REQUALIFICATION EXAM
SUMMARY

The 1991 NRC administered requalification exam was conducted at Ginna Station during the week of October 14th. Four on shift licensed operators and three staff licenses participated in the exam. A program evaluation was not conducted on the Ginna training program due to the small license sample size.

At the conclusion of the examination process both the Ginna training staff and the NRC agreed that two (one shift and one staff) Senior Reactor Operators (SROs) had failed the written examination and one of those had also failed the dynamic simulator exam. Both SROs were immediately removed form licensed duties until the completion of a remediation program and second examination approved by the Ginna Station License Review Board.

The remediation program is based on item analysis conducted on all three portions of the written examination. Common areas missed are included as well as individual weaknesses for both candidates. Classroom, self study, On the Job Training and quizzes are all included as preparation for the second comprehensive exam.

Interviews with all who participated in the exam process indicate that they felt that the exam instruments were longer than normal. A comparison between the NRC exam and the Ginna exam revealed that the exams were indeed longer. The static exams contained three or four more questions while the Part B exam contained five more questions. The examiner standards do not indicate a required number of points for either portion of the exam, as a result the number of points is left to the experience of the Chief Examiner.

Although the NRC written exams were validated prior to being administered, the stress level for the validation and the actual NRC exam were quite different. Test anxiety is the most reasonable basis for the feeling that time was limited.

A comparison of the results from the last three Ginna and NRC annual exams indicates that the average grade drops five points. Other than the small difference in the number of questions and the presence of the NRC, the exams are the same. In an effort to reduce some of the test anxiety, Ginna has increased the number of questions on the cycle exams.

The small sample population made it difficult to interpret a full item analysis of the written exam for program weaknesses. There was one item, however, which indicated a difficulty index of .14. The static exam question which dealt with a Safety Injection (SI) signal subsequent to an initial SI signal reset was missed by six

of the seven operators. Information on this item was sent out to all operators via the Immediate Notification process to ensure that this concept is clearly stated. This information, as well as all items with a difficulty index of less than .75 will be included in the next requal cycle.