

James A. FitzPatrick
Nuclear Power Plant
P.O. Box 41
Lycoming, New York 13093
315 342-3540



William Fernandez II
Resident Manager

May 16, 1991
JAFP-91-0307

Mr. Lee H. Bettenhausen
Operations Branch Chief, Division of Reactor Safety
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Dear Sir:

Attached please find the Authority's evaluation of the FitzPatrick licensed operator requalification program. The evaluation is based on the results of the requalification examination administered the week of April 26, 1991 and the criteria set forth in NUREG-1021, ES-601.

If you have any questions regarding this evaluation, please contact Fred Catalia of my training staff at (315) 349-6475.

Very truly yours,


WILLIAM FERNANDEZ II

cc: R. Beedle, Exec. V.P., Nuc. Gen.
J. Gray - WPO Licensing
R. Loey
J. Simpson
WPO Records Management
JAFNPP Document Control Center

WF:FJC:sz
Attachment

*Add: Region 1.
Original
11003
11*

9105310035 910516
FDR ADOCK 05000333
V FDR

NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY
JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LICENSED OPERATOR REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

1. EXAMINATION RESULTS

	RO PASS/FAIL	SRO PASS/FAIL	TOTAL PASS/FAIL
WRITTEN	4/2	4/2	8/4
SIMULATOR	5/1	5/1	10/2*
JPM	6/0	5/1	11/1
OVERALL	4/2	4/2	8/4

* 1 crew failure on one scenario in the simulator; 1 RO and 1 SRO on this crew received individual passing grades for this scenario.

2. PROGRAM EVALUATION RESULTS

Overall rating: UNSATISFACTORY

The facility performed an evaluation of the requalification program based upon the facility's examination results. The criteria for program evaluation as specified in ES-601 were used where appropriate. The sample size (12) met the minimum requirement of ES-601.

- a. Facility pass/fail decisions agreed with NRC decisions in all cases. This satisfies ES-601 criterion C.2.b(1)(a).
- b. Fewer than 75% of the operators passed the written examination. The actual percentage was 66.7%. This does not satisfy ES-601 criterion C.2.b(1)(b) and serves as the basis for the unsatisfactory program evaluation.
- c. No more than one third of the crews failed the simulator portion of the examination. This satisfies ES-601 criterion C.2.b(1)(c).
- d. Additionally, the facility feels that the program satisfied all of the secondary criteria listed in ES-601, section C.2.b(2).

NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY
JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LICENSED OPERATOR REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

3. SIMULATOR EVALUATION

The following strengths and weaknesses were noted during the simulator portion of the operating examination. The weaknesses will be addressed in future simulator training sessions.

a. STRENGTHS:

- (1) Teamwork and communications skills were, in general, very effective. One crew was less effective in this area than the other two.
- (2) Consistent use of, and adherence to, procedures was evident in all crews.
- (3) Administrative tasks such as Emergency Plan classifications and Technical Specification determinations were correctly completed by all SROs.
- (4) The ROs demonstrated good familiarity with system controls and instrumentation and proficiency in system operation.

b. WEAKNESSES:

- (1) No Generic weaknesses were noted in this portion of the examination.
- (2) One crew exhibited weaknesses in teamwork and communications skills in the areas of effective delegation of tasks and providing appropriate feedback on the status of tasks in progress.
- (3) One SRO on this crew implemented the power/level control strategy of the "Failure to Scram" procedure prematurely.
- (4) One RO on this crew did not complete the procedure for a stuck open relief valve and failed to inform the SRO of this when he was reassigned to another task.

4. JOB PERFORMANCE MEASURES EVALUATION

The following strengths and weaknesses were noted during the JPM portion of the operating examination.

a. STRENGTHS:

- (1) Operators were very familiar with the location and operation of all system controls and instrumentation.
- (2) Consistent use of, and adherence to, procedures was evident in all operators.

NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY
JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LICENSED OPERATOR REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

b. WEAKNESSES:

- (1) One Senior Reactor Operator failed the JPM portion of the examination. The individual received an unsatisfactory score on the performance of two JPMs. He was interviewed to determine the causes for the failure. Neither of the errors appears to be indicative of a genuine performance deficiency on the part of this operator.
- (2) Of all operators examined in 1991, this was the only instance in which an operator failed this portion of the examination. No generic performance deficiencies are indicated.

5. WRITTEN EXAMINATION RESULTS

The following strengths and weaknesses were noted during the written portion of the examination.

a. STRENGTHS:

- (1) Strengths were generally demonstrated in the use of procedures, particularly the emergency operating procedures.
- (2) The SROs demonstrated proficiency in the use of technical specifications and knowledge of administrative reporting requirements.

b. WEAKNESSES:

- (1) The facility failed to properly time validate the written examination materials. As a result, the examination was too long for the allowed time frame. It is felt that this directly contributed to the excessive failure rate on the written examinations.
- (2) The following is a summary of the weaknesses noted for some operators from the grading of the written examinations. The affected operators will receive remedial training and the areas of deficiency will be addressed during subsequent classroom and simulator training sessions when a generic problem is indicated.

STATIC SCENARIO QUESTIONS

21504001A05C01 - 9 of 12 (75%) incorrect - This question dealt with the expected response of Recirculation System Flow Comparators to a partial loss of power. Plant response would be a rod withdrawal block, but verification of the final condition would require the use of facility prints, if not known from memory.

NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY
JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LICENSED OPERATOR REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

5. b. (2) 20004250A05C10 - 4 of 12 (33%) incorrect - This question involved the expected final condition of the drywell N₂ supply path following a partial loss of power. Plant response to this condition would be supported by analog computer data and/or computer and annunciator alarms, especially if drywell N₂ pressure decreased. The question was expected to be answered using a combination of facility electrical and mechanical schematics.

26401004EDGC03 - 4 of 6 (67%) incorrect - This question dealt with expected response of a specific low pressure ECCS pump (PWR C) if a LOCA signal occurred and one EDG (C) failed to start. The plant has procedures and Operator Aids for verification of proper ECCS response. This question relied on operator memory of power supplies and pump response or the use of facility prints to make a determination.

21701005RCICC07 - 3 of 6 (50%) incorrect - This question dealt with the expected response of the RCIC system to a high drywell pressure signal while being operated in the full flow test mode. This signal does not initiate RCIC but causes a common valve in the HPCI system to close. Requires recognition of the interrelation and the use of prints to determine HPCI valve response. If this occurred during operation, the RCIC system response would be evident to the operator.

20101010CRDC13 - 4 of 6 (67%) incorrect - This question dealt with the operators ability to select the correct description of a design feature of the Alternate Rod Insertion System. It would not translate into an inability to operate the system when required.

LIMITS AND CONTROLS QUESTIONS

20004210B01C - 3 of 12 (25%) incorrect - This question required the selection of the proper course of action to be taken in an abnormal operating procedure under a given set of plant conditions with a loss of one of the station 125 VDC power systems. This does not appear to be a generic weakness, but does need to be reviewed with individuals who answered the question incorrectly.

22301006B04C - 3 of 12 (25%) incorrect - This question dealt with predicting system responses to a loss of "B" RPS. If this condition actually occurs, a detailed isolation checklist is used in the control room to verify proper system response to the isolation signal.

20004215B02C - 6 of 12 (50%) incorrect - This question dealt with the expected response of two pumps upon restoration of power after a power loss with no operator action. If this situation were to occur in the control room the response of the pumps would be apparent through multiple indications. This appears to be a problem in the use of prints related to 600V component switchgear.

NEW YORK POWER AUTHORITY
JAMES A. FITZPATRICK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT
LICENSED OPERATOR REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

5. b. (2) 20004227B01 - 9 of 12 (75%) incorrect - This question required the operator to determine which of four actions would not mitigate a level transient during a loss of UPS. A review of this question revealed a technical problem in the given plant conditions, such that a level transient should not have occurred. Based on this, the question is invalid. This question was deleted during the facility's review and grading of the examinations.

20005215B06C - 3 of 6 (50%) incorrect - This question required the ROs to determine the correct course of action to take using an override in an EOP. The ROs are not as familiar with using these overrides, since this is usually directed by the SROs.

29903009B01C - 3 of 12 (25%) incorrect - This question required the operator to identify the information required from someone reporting a fire. Upon reviewing this question and the reference procedure, it was determined that the answer selected by all those who missed the question was also acceptable. The alternative answer was accepted during the facility's review and grading of the examination.

33301037B01S - 6 of 6 (100%) incorrect - This question required the senior reactor operator to identify a correct statement concerning the basis of the TSV closure scram. The key answer was a contraposition of a technical specification statement which may not be true in all cases and was found confusing by the operators. This question was deleted during the facility's review and grading of the examinations.

33301037B36S - 3 of 6 (50%) incorrect - This question required the determination of the LCO associated with the failure of a fuel zone level transmitter.