



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION II  
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

INQUIRY REPORT NO. 50-335/82-26

SUBJECT: Florida Power and Light Company  
St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1

Possible Compromise of Operator Licensing Examination - June 15, 1982

DATES OF INQUIRY: June 15-17, 1982

INVESTIGATORS:

*Robert H. Burch*

R. H. Burch, Regional Investigator  
Enforcement and Investigations Staff

*7/7/82*

Date Signed

*Robert H. Burch*

*for* B. Uryc, Jr., Regional Investigator  
Enforcement and Investigations Staff

*7/7/82*

Date Signed

REVIEWED BY:

*Carl E. Alderson*

Carl E. Alderson, Director  
Enforcement and Investigations Staff

*7/7/82*

Date Signed

SUMMARY OF INQUIRY

FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY

ST. LUCIE NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNIT 1

JUNE 15-17, 1982

A. SUMMARY

This inquiry was initiated at the direction of the Regional Administrator, Region II, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), on June 15, 1982, based upon information that a possible compromise of the Reactor Operator (RO) and Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) licensing examinations occurred on June 15, 1982, at the Florida Power and Light Company's (FP&L) St. Lucie Nuclear Power Plant Unit 1, St. Lucie, Florida.

On June 15, 1982, information was received alleging that a member of the St. Lucie training staff was observed talking to RO/SRO examinees prior to their taking the examination. The training staff member had reviewed the RO/SRO examinations prior to talking with the examinees. Although there was no information indicating the extent or particular topic of the conversation, the possibility of compromise could not be discounted.

This inquiry was conducted pursuant to Section 161.c of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

B. SCOPE OF INQUIRY

This inquiry was initiated to determine the facts and circumstances surrounding the reported observation that a member of the St. Lucie training staff was seen talking to examinees who were preparing to take RO/SRO examinations, and that the member of the training staff had reviewed the examinations prior to talking with the examinees. Specifically, the inquiry addressed the issue as to whether the incident constituted a willful and deliberate attempt to compromise the examinations and provide the examinees with information concerning the examination questions.

The inquiry was conducted by Region II investigators who interviewed the original source of information, five operator examinees, and members of the St. Lucie training staff. In addition, copies of the examinations were obtained from the representative of Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratory who prepared the examinations. A review of the examinations and Results of Interviews was conducted by members of the Region II staff to determine the possible impact of remarks made to the examinees prior to their taking the examination. Observations were also made of the St. Lucie physical facilities where the alleged impropriety took place.

C. FINDINGS

The inquiry revealed that a member of the St. Lucie training staff did in fact have contact with the examinees subsequent to reviewing the SRO examination. The individual made several general statements to the examinees concerning material covered in the examination. A technical assessment made by comparing the remarks by the individual to the examinees (as reported to the investigators by the individual and the examinees) and the material covered in the actual examinations indicate the individual's remarks to the examinees were of a general non-specific nature. As such,

the remarks would have primarily impacted on the examinees by generating discussion points for them following the individual's departure from the room. However, the period of time from when the individual left the examination room (leaving the examinees alone) to when the examination administrator entered the room to begin examinations was estimated at approximately 10 minutes. St. Lucie officials, in concert with an official of the NRC Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, decided to terminate the examination because of the incident.

There was no indication developed during the inquiry that any willful attempt was made to compromise the examinations or provide an advantage to the examinees. The incident appears to have occurred as a result of poor judgment on the part of the individual who talked with the examinees. There was no evidence to indicate any intent on the part of the individual who talked with the examinees to provide them with answers to specific examination questions.