

point beach
50-266
50-301

JUL 25 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: J. McMillen, Chief, Operator Licensing Section
FROM: T. Burdick, Reactor Engineer, Operator Licensing Section
SUBJECT: POINT BEACH REQUAL EXAM

During the week of June 12, 1983, I was assigned to conduct a requal exam and program audit at the Point Beach facility.

The audit consisted of review and regrading of randomly selected written examinations. It is my opinion that the written exam administered by the facility was inadequate for several reasons.

First, both RO's and SRO's take the same exam, therefore, SRO's are not being challenged at an SRO level. The entire exam was very fundamental in substance. There were no thought provoking analytical questions whatsoever. Most questions required simple answers such as setpoints and start or stop signals, etc., not very demanding for experienced operators.

Secondly, the exam was weighted very heavily in an extremely narrow scope of interest. For example, Section 4 had 7 1/2 points dedicated to the reactor startup procedure out of a 20 point total. Twenty-five percent of Section 5 concerned controlled area access.

Based upon these facts, it is apparent that the annual exam administered at Point Beach was deficient due to a lack of sufficient difficulty and scope. This exam could not adequately determine the licensed operators' knowledge of those areas covered in the 2 year requal cycle.

Point Beach uses 70% per section and 80% overall for failure determination. According to the Training Supervisor, no one has failed an exam at Point Beach in several years. With the minimum level of difficulty and narrow scope it is no wonder the failure rate is zero. Overall results were 88% average.

Three oral exams were conducted with two Shift Supervisors and the General Superintendent. Questions concerning current requal material were emphasized. All three individuals were satisfactory in those areas, however, problems were found to exist in the following areas:

- 1. Two of the three individuals were unaware of the range on their self-reading pocket dosimeters.

N00510

OFFICE	R111	8412200475	830725
SURNAME	Burdick /cl	PDR ADOCK	05000266
DATE	7/25/83	PDR	

JUL 25 1963

- 2. Two individuals disagreed on policy for operations control of valve lineups subsequent to tagouts involving primary sample system. (Radioactive release occurred at PBNP due to this.)
- 3. One individual could not identify the difference between an undervoltage coil and a trip coil in the reactor trip breakers.
- 4. One individual showed weakness in areas concerning nuclear instrumentation and radiation instruments relative to their use and operation.

Their overall performance was satisfactory. However, had the exam been comprehensive, the results may have been quite different.

T. Burdick, Reactor Engineer
Operator Licensing Section

OFFICE ▶
SURNAME ▶
DATE ▶