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

EXAMINATION REPORT NO. 87-03 (OL)

FACILITY DOCKET NO. 50-286

FACILITY LICENSE NO. DPR-64

LICENSEE: Power Authority of New York
P.O. Box 215
Buchanan, New York 10511

FACILITY: Indian Point Unit 3

EXAMINATION DATES: February 24-26, 1987

CHIEF EXAMINER: Robert R. Temps — 4-8-87
Robert R. Temps, Reactor Engineer Examiner — Date

REVIEWED BY: R M Keller — 4/10/87
Robert M. Keller, Chief, Projects Section No. 1C

APPROVED BY: William F. Kane — 4/12/87
William F. Kane, Director, DRP — Date

SUMMARY: Oral, written and simulator examinations were administered to eight senior operator candidates. Seven senior operator candidates passed all portions of their examinations and will be issued licenses. One senior operator candidate failed all portions of the examination.

8705050029 870420
PDR ADOCK 05000286
V PDR

REPORT DETAILS

TYPE OF EXAM: Replacement __X__

EXAM RESULTS:

		SRO Pass/Fail		
Written Exam		7 / 1		
Oral Exam		7 / 1		
Simulator Exam		7 / 1		
Overall		7 / 1		

1. CHIEF EXAMINER AT SITE: R.R. Temps, NRC

2. OTHER EXAMINERS: N. Dudley, NRC
   E. Yachimiak, NRC
   G. Weale, Sonalysts (NRC Contractor Examiner)

3. No generic weaknesses were noted during conduct of the Operating and Simulator Examinations.

4. Generic weaknesses noted from grading of the written examinations:

   These comments are provided for your use in upgrading future requalification and initial operating training programs. No reply is necessary.

   A. Most candidates did not list peak overlap as one of the three effects which cause the Doppler Temperature Coefficient to become less negative as fuel temperature increases.

   B. Most candidates stated that the SG Atmospheric Dump Valves remain functional when instrument air pressure is less than 30 psig. Per Off Normal Operating Procedure IA-1, the valves fail shut.

   C. All candidates were unable to properly list the immediate action substeps for verification of main feedwater isolation.

D. All candidates were unable to properly list the three isolation steps, and the basis for each, as found in ECA 0.0 for the RCP seals.

E. Most candidates had trouble listing the five parameters and/or trends these parameters should exhibit to indicate that natural circulation flow is in effect.

F. All but one candidate were unable to state the three individuals (by title) who may authorize a volunteer rescuer to receive exposure during extreme conditions involving life saving circumstances.

5. Training and Reference Material:

A. Significant problems were noted as to the accuracy and completeness of the System Descriptions. Several chapters of the System Descriptions were incomplete (i.e. pages missing), some did not reflect plant modifications and others referenced old emergency procedures no longer in effect.

B. Some inconsistencies were noted between information found in the EOP lesson plans and the EOP's themselves.

6. Examination Meetings; Entrance, Exam Review and Exit:

A. Entrance Meeting

1) Personnel Present at Entrance Meeting:

NRC

Richard Barkley	Resident Inspector, IP-3
Noel Dudley	Lead Reactor Engineer Examiner
Robert Temps	Reactor Engineer Examiner
Gary Weale	Licensing Examiner (Sonalysts)
Ed Yachimiak	Reactor Engineer

Facility Personnel

Steve Bridges	Operations Training Supervisor
Michael Cass	Assistant to Resident Manager
William Josiger	Resident Manager
Bryan Ray	Training Coordinator
Richard Robenstein	Training Consultant
Richard Tansky	Training Superintendent

2) An entrance meeting was held on February 24, 1987 to inform facility personnel of the purpose of the examination trip and to discuss any facility questions regarding the examination process.

The facility licensee expressed concern on two subjects. The first dealt with the extent of simulator scenarios, specifically operation of the plant outside of its design basis, and the second dealt with whether or not the NRC has guidelines which cover the extent to which simulator scenarios are taken.

The NRC addressed the first concern by stating that the matter has already been addressed by the Commission in the proposed rule change to 10 CFR Part 55, dealing with degree requirements on shift.

NRC policy is that it is necessary, at times, to use simulator scenarios which operate the plant outside of its design basis in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the operator candidates in dealing with the situation and their ability to use and transition through the EOP's.

Regarding the second concern, guidelines in the Examiner Standards (NUREG-1021, ES-302) are used in the development of simulator scenarios. These guidelines are undergoing continuous upgrading and review based on licensee comments, examination development programs and usage.

B. Written Examination Review

1. A review of the written examination was conducted following the exam. Four facility comments were discussed and all were resolved at the examination review. As a result, the following changes were made to the answer key:

   a. Part (a) of question 5.09 was deleted as it dealt with theoretical concepts beyond those required to be used by SRO's. Any value obtained in part (a) was allowed to be used in part (b) and full credit given for determining subcooled margin, provided the correct process was used. Point value of the question was reduced accordingly.

   b. The response to part (e) of question 6.01 was changed to "NO" as recent plant modifications removed any automatic actions associated with process radiation monitor R-17A/B. Also, part (c) was modified to delete reference to the auto start of the dilution fan. Point value of the question was reduced accordingly.

c. The answer to question 8.06 was modified to accept information contained in 10 CFR 50.74, parts X, Y and Z with full credit given provided the proper reference was made.

d. The answers to question 8.08 were expanded as follows; for part (a), E-plan classification III.3 was added and for part (c), classification I.A.5 was added.

2. The concern over completeness and accuracy of facility reference materials was discussed with the Training Department following the exam review and a copy of noted discrepancies was also supplied. As a result of the discussion, the facility has committed to implement measures so that reference materials sent to the NRC for future examinations will be complete, accurate and up-to-date.

C. Exit Meeting

1) Personnel Present at Exit Meeting:

NRC

Richard Parkley — Resident Inspector, IP-3
Noel Dudley — Lead Reactor Engineer Examiner
Robert Temps — Reactor Engineer Examiner
Ed Yachimiak — Reactor Engineer

Facility Personnel

Steve Bridges — Operations Training Supervisor
Michael Cass — Assistant to Resident Manager
Bryan Ray — Training Coordinator
Joseph Russell — Superintendent of Power
Richard Tansky — Training Superintendent

2) An exit meeting was held the evening of February 26, 1987. The matter of completeness and accuracy of facility reference materials was mentioned, along with the Training Department's commitment to improve the situation for future examinations.

The Chief Examiner reviewed the number and type of examinations conducted over the previous week. In response to a question by the facility licensee, the facility was informed that no generic weaknesses were noted during the simulator/oral portions of the examinations, and that if subsequent review of the examination packages indicated any significant generic weaknesses the Training Department would be informed.

...en Examination and Answer Key

c. The answer to question 8.06 was modified to accept information contained in 10 CFR 50.74, parts X, Y and Z with full credit given provided the proper reference was made.

d. The answers to question 8.08 were expanded as follows; for part (a), E-plan classification III.3 was added and for part (c), classification I.A.5 was added.

2. The concern over completeness and accuracy of facility reference materials was discussed with the Training Department following the exam review and a copy of noted discrepancies was also supplied. As a result of the discussion, the facility has committed to implement measures so that reference materials sent to the NRC for future examinations will be complete, accurate and up-to-date.

C. Exit Meeting

1) Personnel Present at Exit Meeting:

NRC

Richard Barkley	Resident Inspector, IP-3
Noel Dudley	Lead Reactor Engineer Examiner
Robert Temps	Reactor Engineer Examiner
Ed Yachimiak	Reactor Engineer

Facility Personnel

Steve Bridges	Operations Training Supervisor
Michael Cass	Assistant to Resident Manager
Bryan Ray	Training Coordinator
Joseph Russell	Superintendent of Power
Richard Tansky	Training Superintendent

2) An exit meeting was held the evening of February 26, 1987. The matter of completeness and accuracy of facility reference materials was mentioned, along with the Training Department's commitment to improve the situation for future examinations.

The Chief Examiner reviewed the number and type of examinations conducted over the previous week. In response to a question by the facility licensee, the facility was informed that no generic weaknesses were noted during the simulator/oral portions of the examinations, and that if subsequent review of the examination packages indicated any significant generic weaknesses the Training Department would be informed.

Attachment: Written Examination and Answer Key