# U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGION I OPERATOR LICENSING EXAMINATION REPORT

EXAMINATION REPORT NO. 50-220/84-27 (OL)

FACILITY DOCKET NO. 50-220

FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-63

LICENSEE: Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation

300 Erie Boulevard West Syracuse, New York 13202

FACILITY: Nine Mile Point I

EXAMINATION DATES: December 11-12-13, 1984

riginal Signed By:

CHIEF EXAMINER: John Berra JAN 9 1985

Reactor Engineed (Examiner) Date

Principal Signed By:

R M Kindon

FEB 1 1 1985

REVIEWED BY: Chief, Project Section 1C Date

APPROVED BY: Bassub, Kister FEB 15 1985

Chief, Broject Branch No. 1 Date

SUMMARY: Written and oral/simulator examinations were administered to two Reactor Operator candidates, one Senior Reactor Operator candidate, and one Instructor Certification candidate. Oral/simulator examinations only, were administered to one Reactor Operator candidate and one Senior Reactor Operator candidate. One Reactor operator and one Instructor Certification candidate failed the written examination. All candidates passed the oral/simulator examinations. A meeting was held, with the future replacement license candidates for Unit I and the initial license candidates for Unit II to discuss general examination topics. The Chief Examiner was also present during the licensee's weekly Operational Management Review Committee meeting. Several topics were discussed during this meeting however, most topics were in regards to the NRC requalification audit which will be conducted in the near future. The minutes of this meeting, as prepared by the licensee, are attached as Attachment 3.

## REPORT DETAILS

| TYPE | OF  | EXAMS: | Initial | 3_ | Replacement | 3 | Requalification |  |
|------|-----|--------|---------|----|-------------|---|-----------------|--|
| EXAM | RES | ULTS:  |         |    |             |   |                 |  |

|                | RO<br>Pass/Fail | SRO  <br>  Pass/Fail | Inst. Cert<br>Pass/Fail | Fuel Handler<br>  Pass/Fail<br> |
|----------------|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Written Exam   | 1/1             | 1/0                  | 0/1                     | /                               |
| Oral Exam      | 3/0             | 2/0                  | 1/0                     | /                               |
| Simulator Exam | 3/0             | 2/0                  | 1/0                     | /                               |
| Overall        | 2/1             | 2/0                  | 0/1                     | 1                               |

1. CHIEF EXAMINER AT SITE: D. Lange, NRC

OTHER EXAMINERS: I. Levy, PNL W. Cliff, PNL F. Crescenzo, NRC

# 3. PERSONS EXAMINED

RO SRO INSTRUCTOR CERTIFICATION

E. M. Davis J. Lawrence R. E. Abbott J.A. Kronenbitter R. T. Seifried

J. S. Rossiter

Summary of generic strengths or deficiencies noted on oral exams:

During walkthrough oral exams, it was noted that all candidates were very familiar with plant components. Good teamwork during simulator exams was also noted. This was surprising since the simulator had been operational for only one month which would have precluded extensive training of candidates prior to the exam. All candidates were noted to be lacking knowledge of recent industry related experience (SIL's, NRC, I.E. bulletins, and LER's).

Summary of generic strengths or deficiencies noted from grading of written exams:

RO Exam -

- A generic strength was noted in the area of Reactor Theory and Principles of Nuclear Power Plant Operation; including the area of Instrumentation and Control.
- a generic weakness was noted in the area of Plant Design, Abnormal Procedures and emergency conditions.

SRO Exam -

- Generic strengths were noted in the area of Reactor Theory, Thermodynamics, Emergency Response and Technical Specifications.
- Generic weaknesses were noted in Plant Design and Instrument and Controls.
- 3. Comments on availability of, and candidate familiarization with plant reference material in the control room:

Candidates were generally familiar with plant reference material.

 Comments on availability of, and candidate familiarization with design, procedure, and T. S. changes, and with LERs and recent significant events.

Candidates were familiar with Tech Spec. changes but were generally weak on industry changes and the basis for modifications made as a result of I.E. bulletins or LER's.

Comments on interface effectiveness with plant training staff and plant operations staff during exam period. Plant Training staff personnel were cooperative and helpful in all respects during the examination period.

Plant Operating staff were very cooperative during Oral walkthroughs.

#### Personnel Present at Exit Interview: 6.

NRC Personnel

Dave Lange Frank Crescenzo

NRC Contractor Personnel

None

### Facility Personnel

Larry Lukens

J. C. Stanton

T. E. Lempges

T. L. Wood

G. C. VanWert

K. F. Zollitsch

T. Roman

J. C. Aldrich

M. A. Dooley

M. D. Jore

#### 8. Summary of NRC Comments made at exit interview:

All candidates were clear passes on the oral/simulator portion of the examination. Control Board component familiarization and teamwork during simulator exams were noted as generic strengths. Lack of knowledge in regards to recent industry experiences was noted as a generic weakness. A partial inspection of the requalification program was performed with no violations noted, however, it was suggested that all licensed personnel be kept better informed of changes to the NRC examiner's standards. In regards to administration of future examinations, it was requested that better restroom arrangements be made to preclude NRC monitoring of restroom activities during written exams. Additionally, it was suggested that future simulator candidates be instructed not to allow NRC or contractor examiners to interfere with their performance during simulator examinations. The discussions conducted during the operations Management Review Committee meeting were believed to be positive and the chief examiner suggested scheduling future examinations to coincide with these meetings.

10. CHANGES MADE TO WRITTEN EXAM DURING EXAMINATION REVIEW:

See attached Facility Comments and Examiner Resolutions.

### Attachments:

- 1. Written Examination(s) and Answer Key(s) (SRO/RO)
- 2. Facility Comments on Written Examinations made after Exam Review
- 3. Operational Management Review Committee Meeting minutes.