

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

EXAMINATION REPORT NO. 50-336/84-19

FACILITY DOCKET NO. 50-336

FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-65

LICENSEE: Northeast Nuclear Energy Company
P.O. Box 270
Hartford, Connecticut 06101

FACILITY: Millstone 2

DATES: July 16 - 19, 1984

CHIEF EXAMINER: N. F. Dudley
N. F. Dudley
Reactor Engineer Examiner

9-5-84
Date

APPROVED BY: R. M. Keller
R. M. Keller, Chief
Project Section 1D

9/6/84
Date

SUMMARY: One written reactor operator examination and one oral reactor operator examination were administered. A review of the requalification training program for licensed operators was conducted. The inspection of the Requalification Training Program involved 16 hours of onsite inspection by one operator licensing examiner.

RESULTS: All examinations were evaluated as satisfactory. No violations were identified.

8411160110 841002
PDR ADOCK 05000336
G PDR

REPORT DETAILS

TYPE OF EXAMS: Initial Replacement Requalification

EXAM RESULTS:

	RO Pass/Fail	SRO Pass/Fail	Inst. Cert Pass/Fail	Fuel Handler Pass/Fail
Written Exam	1 / 0	/	/	/
Oral Exam	1 / 0	/	/	/
Simulator Exam	/	/	/	/
Overall	2 / 0	/	/	/

1. CHIEF EXAMINER AT SITE: N. F. Dudley

2. OTHER EXAMINERS: D. Silk
G. Streier (EG&G)

3. PERSONS EXAMINED

Robert Poole
John Criscione

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

N/A

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

An open exchange of information was conducted with plant training staff.

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

N/A

7. Personnel Present at Exit Meeting:

NRC Personnel

N. Dudley
D. Silk

NRC Contractor Personnel

N/A

Facility Personnel

J. Kelly Jr, Unit Superintendent
K. Parkinson, Training Supervisor
J. Smith, Unit 2 Training Supervisor
R. Flanagan, Unit 2 Instructor

8. Summary of NRC Comments made at exit interview:

The oral examination was evaluated as a clear pass. The scope and findings of the licensed operator requalification program inspection were discussed.

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

Facility requested that two separate reports be written for examination and requalification program inspection.

10. CHANGES MADE TO WRITTEN EXAM

<u>Question No.</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>Reason</u>
5.04b (answer)	Changed	Setpoints not required since not requested by question.
5.05 (answer)	Changed	Substituted "degassifier" for "sparger" to match plant nomenclature.

5.09a. (answer)	No change	Question tests on the effect of RCS flow on reactivity. Even though the question deals with a situation not expected to occur during plant operations, the concept is considered valid.
6.01a. (answer)	No change	Suggested wording changes would not change the answer, therefore no modifications were made.
6.01b. (answer)	Changed	Changed "MSIV" to "MSI" to correctly identify an ESF actuation.
6.04 (answer)	Changed	Reformatted answer to correspond to question.
6.06[2+5] (answer)	Changed	Modified to incorporate Technical Specification basis as well as basis in lesson plan.
6.07	No Change	Documentation was not supplied to support recommended change.
7.01 (answer)	Addition	The clarification "(Higher flowrate)" was added after "operationally more palatable".
7.07b (answer)	No Change	"Forcing spray" and the answer are equivalent, therefore no modifications were made.

8.01 (answer)	No Change	"Required by procedure" is not adequate to explain reason for performing actions.
8.02b (answer)	Changed	Changed volume from 1090 cft to 1080 cft due to recent procedural change.
8.06a	Deleted	No graph was provided.
8.06a (answer)	Changed	Corrected answer to reflect question asked.

11. Licensed Operator Requalification Program-Unit 2

a. Scope:

A review of the requalification training program for licensed operators was conducted. The review involved verification of the program's conformance to the requirements of 10 CFR 55 and included an audit of six selected personnel training records, formal lesson plans, system descriptions, training schedules, requalification quizzes, the latest requalification annual examination, and renewal applications.

b. Findings

- Training lectures were scheduled many months in advance and incorporated weaknesses, identified by the annual requalification examination and plant related LER's or modifications.
- Instructors conducting integrated plant training are properly certified.
- Licensed operators attended scheduled training unless a formal waiver was given by the station manager, or material was covered on an independent self study basis and documented by a memo. The use of waivers and self study was minimal.
- Performance evaluations were provided routinely to operators when knowledge deficiencies were identified. The remedial actions required by the performance evaluations were appropriate for the identified deficiencies.
- The completion of remedial actions required by performance evaluations were documented.

- The annual examination was broad in scope and security was maintained by using a question bank and a random number generator to create individualized examinations.
- All required control manipulations were performed with the exception of loss of Instrument Air and loss of shutdown cooling. These two control manipulations can not be simulated on the CE simulator and were covered by walk throughs and lectures. Both control manipulations will be performed when a plant specific simulator is available next year.
- A long range project is in process to correct deficiencies in the training material.
- Renewal applications are being completed satisfactorily.
- The overall licensed operator requalification program is being conducted in accordance with regulatory requirements.
(50-336/83-13-03)

