

ENCLOSURE 1

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OPERATOR LICENSING INITIAL EXAMINATION REPORT

REPORT NO.: 50-62/OL-91-01
FACILITY DOCKET NO.: 50-62
FACILITY LICENSE NO.: R-66
LICENSEE: University of Virginia
FACILITY: University of Virginia Reactor
EXAMINATION DATES: February 25 and 26, 1991
EXAMINER: David Silk, Region I, Chief Examiner

SUBMITTED BY:

David Silk
David Silk, Chief Examiner

3/25/91
Date

APPROVED BY:

Theodore L. Szymanski
Theodore L. Szymanski, Chief
Non-Power Reactor Section
Operator Licensing Branch
Division of Licensee Performance
and Quality Evaluation, NRR

3/25/91
Date

SUMMARY:

Written and operating examinations were administered to an SRO candidate. He passed all portions of the examination and was issued a license. The candidate's only detected weakness was pertaining to the UVAR tagging process.

While conducting this examination, the examiner identified additional documents that could have been used during examination development, but had not been provided to the NRC. The licensee has committed to submitting these documents for future examination.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Examiners:

David Silk, Region I, Chief Examiner

2. Results:

One instant Senior Reactor Operator took the examination. The candidate passed all parts of the examination.

3. Written Examination:

There were no generic weaknesses noted since only one candidate was evaluated.

4. Operating Examinations:

The only generic deficiency noted on the operating examination was that the candidate was unaware of the UVAR tagging process. The candidate had not been trained specifically in this area at UVAR. The candidate did, however, understand the importance and general process of equipment tagging.

5. Exit Meeting:

Personnel present at exit meeting:

David Silk, Region I, Senior Operation Engineer
P. Farrar, Reactor Administrator, University of Virginia

NRC comments at exit meeting:

The procedure for making up water to the pool during a leak did not contain specific guidance regarding valve lineups. The proper implementation of this evolution rests solely upon the knowledge and ability of the operator to identify and manipulate the correct valves.

The candidate admitted that he was not aware of the tagging procedure or program at UVAR. The candidate did understand the significance and implementation of work control in general but was not exposed to it specifically at UVAR.

Some automatically closing valves associated with the demineralization system were not documented in the reference material sent to the NRC for examination development. The NRC stated the importance of having current reference material.

While in the UVAR control room, the examiner found documents that should have been included with the material sent to the NRC for examination development. These documents include the UVAR Operations Notebook, Methods Notebook, Procedures and Methods for Experiments, and the Radiation Safety Guide. These contain information and procedures pertinent to reactor operations and will enhance future examination accuracy and validity.

Licensee comments at exit meeting:

The licensee agreed to upgrade the procedure (Abnormal Condition 11.A) to include specific guidance for making up water to the pool during a leak.

The licensee stated that the candidate had not been exposed to tagging at UVAR, but agreed that future operator candidates would be properly trained regarding its implementation.

The licensee agreed to update facility material to include system modifications.

The licensee agreed to include the above mentioned documents in material sent to the NRC for future examination development.