U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION II

Docket Nos.:	50-250, 251
License Nos.:	DPR-31, 41
Report Nos.:	50-250,251/98-300
Licensee:	Florida Power and light Corporation
Facility:	Turkey Point Nuclear Units 3 and 4
Location:	Florida City, Florida
Dates:	February 27, 1998
Examiners:	Ronald F. Aiello, Chief License Examiner
Approved by:	Thomas A. Peebles, Chief Operator Licensing and Human Performance Branch Division of Reactor Safety

9803180093 980309
PDR ADOCK 05000250
V PDR

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Turkey Point Nuclear Plant Units 3 and 4
NRC Examination Report No. 50-250, 251/98-300

On February 27, 1998, The NRC conducted an announced operator licensing Job Performance Measures (JPM) re-take examination in accordance with the guidance of Examiner Standards, NUREG-1021, Interim Revision 8. This examination implemented the operator licensing requirements of 10 CFR §55.45.

Operations

- One Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) candidate received a JPM re-take examination. The NRC administered this examination on February 27, 1998.

- Candidate Pass/Fail

	SRO	RO	Total	Percent
Pass	1	0.00	1	100%
Fail	0	0.00	0	0%

- The examiner concluded that candidate's performance on the JPM examination was satisfactory. (Section 05.3).

Report Details

Summary of Plant Status

During the period of the examination, both units were in Mode 1.

I. Operations

05 Operator Training and Qualifications

05.1 General Comments

The facility (under the guidance of the NRC) developed an operator licensing initial JPM re-take examination to be administered by the NRC under the requirements of an NRC security agreement, in accordance with the guidelines of the Examiner Standards (ES), NUREG-1021, Interim Revision 8. One SRO upgrade re-take applicant received and passed the JPM operating examination.

05.2 Pre-Examination Activities

a. Scope

The NRC reviewed the licensee's examination submittal using the criteria specified for examination development contained in NUREG 1021 Interim Revision 8.

b. Observations and Findings

The licensee developed the SRO JPM re-take examination. All materials were submitted to the NRC on time. The Chief Examiner reviewed, modified, and approved the examination prior to administration. The NRC conducted in-office and onsite preparation prior to examination administration. The examination met the criteria set forth in NUREG 1021 Interim Revision 8.

(1) Operating (JPM) Examination Development

The JPM examination was submitted on time and in a greatly improved format when compared to the previous submittals. There were no direct look-up JPM follow-up questions. Most of the questions were either comprehensive or analytical.

c. Conclusion

The NRC concluded that the quality of the examination had improved since the last examination. Greater emphasis was placed on ensuring that the examination was technically accurate and discriminating.

05.3 Examination Results and Related Findings, Observations, and Conclusions

a. Scope

The chief examiner reviewed the results of the JPM examination.

b. Observations and Findings.

The overall performance of the candidate on the JPM exam was satisfactory.

c. Conclusion

The chief examiner identified no discrepancies.

V. Management Meetings

X1. Exit Meeting Summary

On February 27, 1998, the chief examiner discussed the examination results with the Operations Training Supervisor. Dissenting comments were not received from the licensee. No proprietary information was identified.

PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Licensee

* T. Abbatiello, Quality Manager
* P. Finegan, Operations Training Supervisor
* O. Hanek, Licensing Engineer
* G. Hollinger, PTN Licensing Manager
* R. Hovey, Vice President, PTN
  D. Jernigan , Plant General Manager
  T. Jones, Operations Supervisor
* M. Lacal, Training Manager
  R. West, Operations Manager

NRC

* T. Johnson, Senior Resident Inspector.
* J. York, Reactor Inspector, Region II

ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

Opened

None

Closed

URI 50-250,251/97-13-02, Medical License Condition. The inspectors identified one course critique which contained a negative comment that was not adequately resolved by the licensee. In one critique, an individual identified a licensed operator that had recurring bouts of vertigo during class. The inspectors reviewed the operator's medical records. The records indicated that the operator was placed on medication for this condition in June 1995. The critique was written in June 1997. The licensee responded to the critique by stating that the said condition was already known and documented. However, the inspectors were concerned with the effectiveness of the prescribed medication and its impact on the operator's ability to stand no-solo.

The inspectors reviewed the operator's license for a medical license condition. The inspectors found no condition as (perceived) required by ANSI 3.4, paragraphs 5.2.2 and 5.3. The facility Medical Review Officer (MRO) questioned whether this condition constitutes a license restriction. The operator's medical file was forwarded to the NRC's MRO for review. The NRC's MRO concurred with the facility's MRO in that vertigo was NOT considered a disqualifying condition per ANSI 3.4. However, due to the nature of the operator's condition, the facility has agreed to place a precautionary restriction on the operators Part 55 license. This item is considered closed.

Discussed

None