

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

EXAMINATION REPORT NO. 50-166/84-03

FACILITY DOCKET NO. 84-03

FACILITY LICENSE NO. R-70

LICENSEE: University of Maryland
College Park, Maryland 20742

FACILITY: University of Maryland

DATES: August 22-23, 1984

CHIEF EXAMINER: Noel Dudley 10-23-84
Noel Dudley Date
Reactor Engineer Examiner

APPROVED BY: RM Wells 10/23/84
Chief, Project Section 1D Date

SUMMARY: Three of five candidates passed written and oral examinations and were awarded NRC licenses. Generic weaknesses regarding quarterly exposure limits, GM tube operations, and 1/M plots were identified during grading of the written examination. The facility was not properly prepared for a written examination.

REPORT DETAILS

TYPE OF EXAMS: Initial ____ Replacement X Requalification ____

EXAM RESULTS:

	RO Pass/Fail	SRO Pass/Fail	Inst. Cert Pass/Fail	Fuel Handler Pass/Fail
Written Exam	/	4/1	/	/
Oral Exam	/	3/1	/	/
Simulator Exam	/	/	/	/
Overall	/	3/2	/	/

1. CHIEF EXAMINER AT SITE: Noel Dudley
2. OTHER EXAMINERS: Gordon Robinson
3. PERSONS EXAMINED

SRO

T. Andreadis - Section L (Written Only)
 D. Brown
 R. Broughman
 T. Dougherty
 J. McCord

1. Summary of generic strengths or deficiencies noted on oral exams:

None

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

Candidates did not understand completely the quarterly exposure limits in 10 CFR 55. Candidates indicated a misunderstanding of GM tube operations. Candidates miscalculated reactivity additions required for criticality using $1/M$ plots. Candidates were weak on the immediate actions for a student sit in. Candidates did not know the basis for the reactivity addition rate limit.

3. Comments on availability and candidate familiarization with plant reference material:

None

4. Comments on availability and candidate familiarization with plant design, procedure, T. S. changes and LERs:

None

5. Comments on interface effectiveness with plant training staff and plant operations staff during exam period.

Written examination area was not prepared prior to the day of the examination. Reference material was in the bathroom and information was displayed on the blackboard.

6. Improvements noted in training programs as a result of prior operator licensing examinations/suggestions, etc:

None

7. Personnel Present at Exit Meeting:

NRC Contractor Personnel

G. Robinson

Facility Personnel

R. Belcher

8. Summary of NRC Comments made at exit interview:

Three candidates were identified as definite operating test passes.

9. Summary of facility comments and commitments made at exit interview:

None

10. CHANGES MADE TO WRITTEN EXAM

<u>Answer No.</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Reason</u>
J.1	Add "pull 2 rods, go critical on reg. rods, subtract calculated reactivity"	Proper answer supplied by facility.
K.3(a)	Replace "Reactor building continuous air monitor" with "Bridge monitor or water room monitor."	Provides monitors specific to facility.
L.1(e)	Add "or the other two are operable".	Provides completeness to answer.

Attachment:

Written Examination(s) and Answer Key(s) (SRO/RO)