


United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Official Hearing Exhibit	
In the Matter of:	Charlissa C. Smith (Denial of Senior Reactor Operator License)
	ASLBP #: 13-925-01-SP-BD01
	Docket #: 05523694
	Exhibit #: NRC-023-00-BD01
	Admitted: 7/17/2013
	Rejected: Other:
	Identified: 7/17/2013
	Withdrawn:
	Stricken:

NRC-023
Submitted: May 31, 2013

VOGTLE Exit Meeting
Friday, April 13, 2012

- (1). Good morning/afternoon, like to start the exit meeting for Vogtle units 1 and 2 initial licensed operator exam (your HL-17)
- (2). There is a sign-up sheet going around the room, please print your name and full title (also anyone on the phone).
- (3). It seems like it's been a long time since we had the entrance meeting; so once again the NRC team has been:
 - Michael Meeks, I've been acting as the chief examiner for qualification purposes;
 - Mark Bates, who is the chief examiner of record;
 - and Phil Capehart (who may be finishing up the last simulator JPM as we speak)
- (4). It would be wrong if I did not start off by thanking your staff for all the hard work to make this exam possible. They were very helpful in getting things like guest access to the LAN and lunches, and they were always ready to give answers to all our questions. Let me also mention by name:
 - Greg Wainwright
 - Thad Thompson
 - Ken Jenkins
 - Ernie Thornton

and many others who helped us out. With such a large class, we were working 10- and 12-hour days, which means your staff was working even longer hours—staying later to get ready for the next day and coming in earlier to prep. We are very happy with the way the op. test weeks were run.
- (5). Scope of our work: during the week of March 26th and then this week, week of April 9th, we administered the operating test portion of the initial licensed operator exam to
 - 8 RO applicants,
 - 8 instant SRO applicants,
 - and 1 upgrade SRO applicant.

In accordance with NUREG-1021, Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors, revision 9, supplement 1. As you may know, we had to take a one-week break in the schedule due to the Masters golf tournament. I am going to mention some details about the operating test, but since we have given all of it, it is no longer classified, and no one here needs to be signed in to the test (if you aren't already).

- (6). As is true for any exit meeting, anything that we discuss here today is subject to review and change by regional management; if so, we will re-exit via telecon. Having said that, formally state that There were no findings identified during this exam.
- (7). Because Phil and I were part of last year's exam, we can give you the benefit of our point of view looking at trends from last year to this year.
- (8). One of these, and a major positive comment for you, is that the overall operating test went much more smoothly and was of a much higher quality than last year. Your staff gave us a good quality product from day one, and we really did not have to make many major changes. So that's a lot better than last year. We were happy with the quality of the op. test, and your op. test submittal certainly met the required quality standards of NUREG 1021.
- (9). {DEBRIEF ONLY} Overall applicant performance is approximately the same as last year.
- ~~(10). Scheduling for such a big class may need to make changes in the future, may see some changes from NRC side (4 examiners? 3 week schedule? Alternate JPMs?)~~
- (11). We had a detailed debrief with your staff before this meeting where we covered comments of a minor nature that we will not discuss here; so if you would like those details please talk to members of your training staff. However, there are some comments on the operating test that we feel are worth talking about at this exit meeting:
- (12). First, there is a delta between how your applicants handled an ATWT and the common practice in most other Region II plants. Specifically, given an ATWT, three teams took from seven minutes to slightly over ten minutes to get the reactor tripped locally. Farley FR-S.1 has this step as part of immediate action step 1 of the procedure.
- (13). Second: procedure quality ... diesel procedure step that half of the applicants missed. E-3 procedural step that is confusing, to say the least, about arming COPS. Surveillance procedure for rod exercise that specifies to check IPC bank demand, does not specify how to do so, half the class used IPC individual rod demand and performed the test data wrong.
- (14). {DEBRIEF ONLY? At exit, talk about AOP and temperature channel failure?} Saturation issues with controllers; specifically pressurizer

master level control and charging control. Training and procedure issue. For temperature failure, procedure does not address impact on charging flow; all teams followed procedure and had problems immediately after defeating the faulty channel (delta T defeat switch), two team mis-diagnosed the plant response as an additional failure and one team believed a loss of charging condition had occurred and isolated letdown.

- (15). {DEBRIEF ONLY} All teams had problems with RWST sludge valves and ARP response; procedure for service air specifies QPCP panel, ARP does not. Also procedural usage—some other plants ARPs state to verify automatic actions occur, yours do not.
- (16). {DEBRIEF ONLY} In plant JPM j step for “VERIFY ACCW pumps running” – applicants read ‘verify’ as ‘check.’
- (17). {DEBRIEF ONLY} JPM for starting RCPs-TEST annunciators to ensure they are operable (half the class)
- (18). {DEBRIEF ONLY} ECCS cold leg recirculation – approximately half of the applicants could not properly perform RNO steps and other procedural steps to get to ECA-1.1, some applicants did not determine that transition to ECA-1.1 was required.
- (19). {DEBRIEF ONLY} RCP shutdown operations from local panel—potential procedural enhancement to specify more precisely how to shut-down RCP (lift oil pump, non-1E switch, 1E switch; 1E switch on shutdown panel is on top and is the natural switch to reach for first). Is the sequence critical in the plant? Critical in JPM for starting/shutting down RCP in control room, not listed as critical for JPM in plant? Is it critical? Potential post-exam comment to change JPM.
- (20). {DEBRIEF ONLY} Simulator communications at times were sloppy and incomplete, SS positions did not correct informal comms (or ROs).
- ~~(21). {DEBRIEF ONLY} E plan admin JPM. Checklist appears to be in error as to how it is written. NMP EP 110 Checklist 1 Classification determination. Procedural flowpath from step 1 to 2 to 3 when cold.~~
- (22). {DEBRIEF ONLY} Control room JPM ‘h’ some applicants attempted to open dampers for the non-running control room ventilation train, contrary to the procedure.
- (23). {DEBRIEF ONLY} We have some questions on the op test still to be resolved (diesel generator loading); could be answered as a post-exam comment. Another question is during E-3 depressurization, what are consequences to the plant for stopping depressurization at 3 degrees

subcooling? Also, please provide CRs concerning any procedural issues identified during the exam or other CRs generated as a result of the exam. We may also provide additional comments to you via telecom in addition to these at the debrief.

- (24). {DEBRIEF ONLY} EOP performance: generally good; watch out for ECA-3.1 comment.
- (25). Written exam: we went the extra mile to ensure a good, quality written exam. We had the written exam sample plan to you very early in the process, and granted extra time to validate the initial submittal. However, initial submittal had 28 UNSAT questions on the RO test and 10 UNSAT questions on the SRO test. Both of these exceed the threshold in the NUREG 1021. So, both portions of the written exam could potentially be classified as not meeting the quality standards of the NUREG in the final report.
- (26). However, based on hard work by Greg, Thad, Ernie, Ken, Mike Henry in the Region, Mark and I were very happy with the working relationship and with the level of effort to get the written exam where it needs to be. Once we have the finalized version of the written exam next week, we will meet with Malcolm and make a recommendation to him for the final classification of the written exam.
- (27). If we can get finalized paperwork on the written exam by early next week, I expect we will be able to get the written exam approved so that we can meet intention of administering the written exam on Friday, April 20.
- (28). Timeline going forward: expect to see post-exam comments approximately 5 working days after the written exam is given. Remember that post-exam comments are from the facility, not from individual applicants.
- (29). Our goal is to complete all licensing actions within 30 days from receipt of your post-exam comments. (e.g. April 20 written exam, post exam comments April 27, results approx May 27).
- (30). Results of this exam will be documented in a 'stand alone' DRS report (not part of the resident's quarterly report) docket number/2012-301.
- (31). During the debrief, we verified that we did not receive any proprietary materials.
- (32). Any Questions?

- (33).
- (34). Thank you! That's the end of the exit meeting.
- (35). Second: