# U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-155/0L-90-02

Docket No. 50-155

Licensee: Consumers Power Company 1945 West Parnall Road Jackson, MI 49201

Facility Name: Big Rock Point

Examination Administered; Big Rock Point Charlevoix, Michigan

Chief Examiner:

Approved By:

J. Jordan, Chief Μ. Operator Licensing Section 1

au

12/5/90

Date

Examination administered during week of November 5, 1990 Report No. 50-155/OL-90-02)) Written and operating requalification examinations were

administered to two Senior Reactor Operators (SROs) and four Reactor Operators (ROs). Two Operating Crews were evaluated during the simulator portion of the operating examination. Results: All individuals and crews passed the examination. The facility results matched those of the NRC.

Independent grading by facility and individual/crew performance results satisfied the criteria of NUREG 1021, Rev 5. The program evaluation will be deferred until a minimum of twelve perators have been examined.

9012110329 901204 PDR ADOCK 05000155 PDD

### REPORT DETAILS

### 1. Examiners

E. Rau, Chief Examiner, NRC Region III C. Tyner, INEL

### 2. Persons Contacted

- L. Monshor, QA Superintendent
- L. Darrah, Shift Supervisor
- Q. Donnelly, Nuclear Safety Administrator
- \*D. LaCroix, Training Administrator W. Bieckman, Plant Manager
- W. Trubilowicz, OPs Superintendent
- B. Alexander, Technical Engineer

All individuals listed above were present at the management exit meeting conducted on November 9, 1990. In addition, those individuals marked by an asterisk were present for a training department pre-exit briefing.

#### 3 . Operator Performance

- The following strengths and weaknesses were identified a . for the crews and individuals that passed the NRC Regualification Examination.
  - (1) Strengths

None noted

- (2) Weaknesses
  - (a) During administration of the Liquid Poison Alternate Injection JPM operators were unable to locate all equipment necessary to perform the task.
  - During scenarios SRO's failed to use EOP (b) placekeeping techniques to determine status of EOP steps. This could result in steps not being performed or being performed out of sequence.

### Training Department 4 .

- Generally, the quality of the facility examination a. material was adequate. The following deficiencies were noted during the examination process.
  - (1) JPM guestions were open-ended leading to inconsistent question scoring.

b. The traini department was very receptive to correcting all material related deficiencies identified by the NRC as a result of the examination process.

# 5. Simulator Fidel:

a. Simulator Fidelity will be discussed in Attachment 1 to this report.

## 6. Exit Meeting

A pre-exit briefing, with the utility training staff, and a formal management exit meeting was conducted on November 9, 1990. The individuals who attended the meetings are listed in Section 2 of this report.

During the exit all items contained in this report, were discussed in detail. The facility was also informed that examination results were preliminary, pending regional management review.

Enclosure 2

# REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Facility: Clinton Power Station

Chief Examiner: E. D. Rau

Dates of Evaluation: November 5, 1990

Areas Evaluated: Written, Oral, and Simulator

Examination Results:

i,

	RO <u>Pass/Fail</u>	SRO <u>Pass/Fail</u>	Total Pass/Fail	Evaluation (S, M, or U)
Written Examin	ation 4/0	2/0	6/0	N/E
Operating Exam Oral Simulator	ination 4/0 4/0	2/0 2/0	6/0 6/0	N/E N/E
Evaluation of	Facility Wri	ltten Examin	nation Grading:	N/E

Crew Examination Results:	Crew 1 <u>Fass/Fai</u>	Crew 2 <u>Pass/Fail</u>	Evaluation (S, M, or U)
	Pass	Pass	N/E

# Overall Program Evaluation

Deferred due to small sample size

Rau Examiner 12/5/90 Forwarded: Jordan MA Section Chief 12/5/90 Approved: Burdick Branch Chief 12/5/90

# SIMULATION FACILITY FIDELITY REPORT

Facility Licensee: Big Rock Point

Facility Licensee Docket No. 50-155

Operating Tests Administered On: Week November 5, 1990

Big Rock Point's Simulator is currently in the start-up phase and is not operational. A modified examination approach was used in which instructors provided feedback to the operators. This exam technique was more effective in evaluating operator performance than could be realized from using the Dresden Simulator. However, the scope of EOP usage was limited by the lack of fidelity.