VERMONT YANKEE
NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION

RD 5, Box 169, Ferry Road, Brattleboro, VT 05301

(802) 257-5271

March 8, 1991

TDL 91-004
BVY 91-027

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attention: Mrs. Tracy Walker, Lead Examiner
USNRC Region I

References: a) License No. DPR-28 (Docket No. 50-271)
b) NUREG 1021, Operator Licensing Examine Standards

Subject: Licensed Operator Requalification (LOR)

Dear Mrs. Walker:

A licensed operator requalification examination was jointly administered to twelve license holders at the Vermont Yankee Training Center and Station by the USNRC and the licensee during the week of February 25, 1991. Pursuant to Section ES-601 of reference b, the Vermont Yankee Training Department conducted an LOR training program evaluation. Vermont Yankee's evaluation results are enclosed.

If you have any questions regarding these results, please contact me. Thank you.

Very truly yours,

Randall W. Spinney
Training Manager

RWS/pjs/910306.1

Enclosure

cc: USNRC Region I Administrator
USNRC Project Manager - VYNPS
USNRC Resident Inspector - VYNPS

9103180002 910308
PDR ADOCK 05000271
V PDR

A003
1/1

VERMONT YANKEE NUCLEAR POWER CORPORATION
REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION BASED ON 1991 EXAMINATION

1. Individual Examination Results

	RO Pass/Fail	SRO Pass/Fail	TOTAL Pass/Fail
Written	4/0	8/0	12/0
JPM/Walkthrough	4/0	8/0	12/0
Simulator	4/0	6/2	10/2
Overall	4/0	6/2	10/2

2. Crew Examination Results

1 of 3 Crews Failed

3. Program Evaluation Results

The facility performed an evaluation of the requalification program based on the facility's examination results. The criteria for program evaluation as specified in ES-601 was used where appropriate. A complete comparison could not be made between facility and NRC results since NRC results were not available. The sample size (12) met the minimum requirement of ES-601. The facility results are:

- One of three crews failed the simulator portion of the examination.
- 100% of the operators passed the written examination.
- Two operators failed the simulator portion of the examination.
- 100% of the operators passed the JPM portion of the examination.
- All operators were trained and evaluated in all positions permitted by their individual licenses.
- Based on feedback from operators, facility observers, and the NRC team, it is felt that all the facility evaluators performed in a satisfactory manner.
- Common weaknesses on JPM's are as follows:
  - 50% of the operators administered JPM 20018 performed unsatisfactorily. (Terminate and Prevent Injection per OE 3102 2/3)
  - 66% of the operators administered JPM 21202, question one (1) performed unsatisfactorily. (Purpose of RPS Flywheel)
  - 100% of the operators administered JPM 22302 question two (2) performed unsatisfactorily. (Group III isolation signals)
- Common weaknesses on the written examinations are as follows:
  - 42% of the operators missed question number one on static simulator scenario 16. (Venting containment with isolation signal present)
  - 25% of the operators missed question number seven on static simulator scenario 17. (RWCU pump trip signals)

3. Program Evaluation Results (cont'd)

- 16% of the operators missed question numbers one, three, five, and nine of simulator scenario 17. (AOG recombiner shifting, ADS initiation logic, Load sequencing following an LNP, and steps required to place torus spray in service with a LOCA signal present.)

The Simulator portion of the operating examination revealed the following weaknesses. These identified weaknesses will be addressed.

- Overall Communications and Feedback among crew members was weak
- The Shift Supervisors' direction and use of manpower was weak (Command and Control)
- The CRO was given direction to maintain reactor level using feed/condensate during an LNP. The level went outside the band low prior to the CRO informing the Shift Supervisor that power was not available to the pumps
- The Shift Supervisor discussed using RWCU to reduce reactor water level with a gross fuel element failure present
- Two Senior Reactor Operators conservatively misinterpreted Technical Specification Operability Requirements resulting in a manual scram
- A crew was slow to diagnose an inadvertent RCIC injection
- A crew (several individuals) failed to completely back up a Group III Isolation
- Clarification of an EAL on Emergency Classification Procedure is required (General Emergency)
- An off-normal procedure (ON 3145) requires clarification (previously addressed and being currently implemented)
- A Shift Supervisor failed to correctly read a decision block on an Emergency Operating Procedure resulting in an unnecessary RPV-ED

4. Written Examination Results

The written examination completion times fell within the guidelines of ES-602.

	Classroom	SEG 16	SEG 17
ES-602			
Completion Time	90 minutes (minimum)	45 minutes (minimum)	45 minutes (minimum)
Review Time	30 minutes	15 minutes	15 minutes
	120 minutes (maximum)	60 minutes (maximum)	60 minutes (maximum)
Operator Average			
Completion Time	100 minutes	47 minutes	55 minutes

INDIVIDUALS WRITTEN EXAMINATION RESULTS

Operator	Section A points	Section B points	Overall Score %
Burns	19 of 20	19 of 20	95%
Cantrell	22 of 22	22 of 22	100%
DeVercelly	20 of 22	22 of 22	95.5%
Hibay	19 of 20	18 of 20	92.5%
King	21 of 22	22 of 22	97.7%
Lawrence	19 of 20	20 of 20	97.5%
LeClair	20 of 22	21 of 21	93.2%
Lindquist	18 of 22	22 of 22	90.9%
Livingston	19 of 20	20 of 20	97.5%
Pittman	20 of 22	22 of 22	95.5%
Porter	20 of 22	22 of 22	95.5%
Slauenwhite	20 of 22	21 of 22	93.2%

5. Walkthrough/JPM Examination Results

Operator	JPM	Questions	Score
Burns	5 of 5	8 of 10	95%
Cantrell	4 of 5	10 of 11	82.7%
DeVercelly	5 of 5	13 of 13	100%
Hibay	4 of 5	10 of 10	85%
King	4 of 5	11 of 12	82.9%
Lawrence	4 of 5	9 of 10	82.5%
LeClair	5 of 5	11 of 12	97.9%
Lindquist	5 of 5	11 of 12	97.9%
Livingston	5 of 5	8 of 10	95%
Pittman	5 of 5	12 of 12	100%
Porter	5 of 5	10 of 12	95.8%
Slauenwhite	5 of 5	11 of 12	97.9%

6. Recommendations for Improvement

JPM Evaluation

- The JPM's will be updated to ensure proper performance standards and cues

Simulator Evaluation Guide

- All scenarios will be reviewed to ensure consistent ISCT usage
- All scenarios will be reviewed to ensure proper complexity and depth to require multiple use of EOP's
- Scenarios will be developed that relate to industry events, LER's, and SOER's