

February 3, 2000

Mr. Oliver D. Kingsley
President, Nuclear Generation Group
Commonwealth Edison Company
ATTN: Regulatory Services
Executive Towers West III
1400 Opus Place, Suite 500
Downers Grove, IL 60515

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT 50-373/99016(DRS); 50-374/99016(DRS);
LICENSED OPERATOR REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION

Dear Mr. Kingsley:

On January 6, 2000, the NRC completed a routine on-site inspection of the Licensed Operator Requalification Training (LORT) program at your LaSalle Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2. At the conclusion of the inspection an exit meeting was conducted at the facility and the preliminary inspection findings were discussed with station management and staff. The enclosed report presents the results of that inspection. No cited violations of NRC requirements were identified.

This inspection focused on evaluations of operator performance during your annual administration of the LORT examinations. The implementation of your LORT program was evaluated through a selective inspection of procedures, representative records, observations of activities, and interviews with operations and training personnel. We conducted the inspection during different periods in September 1999 through January 2000 to accommodate your administration dates for different parts of the examination.

During the total one week inspection, your LORT staff satisfactorily prepared and administered the annual requalification examinations and objectively evaluated operator performance according to your training program's guidance which was consistent with regulatory guidelines. The overall crew and individual operator performance was generally satisfactory with the exception of one operating crew which demonstrated difficulties in crew communications and monitoring of plant status resulting in inappropriate emergency operating procedural actions during a simulator scenario evaluation. Your staff identified the deficiencies and took appropriate remedial actions. During the exit meeting, your staff indicated that they had identified periodic breakdowns in crew performance during training evaluations and are in the process of identifying measures to improve and reinforce consistency in operator performance during training and on shift.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

O. Kingsley

-2-

We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection.

Sincerely,

/RA/ D. R. McNeil (for)

David E. Hills, Chief
Operations Branch

Docket Nos. 50-373; 50-374
License Nos. NPF-11; NPF-18

Enclosures: 1. Inspection Report 50-373/99016(DRS);
50-374/99016(DRS)
2. Simulation Facility Report

cc w/encls: D. Helwig, Senior Vice President, Nuclear Services
C. Crane, Senior Vice President, Nuclear Operations
H. Stanley, Vice President, Nuclear Operations
R. Krich, Vice President, Regulatory Services
DCD - Licensing
J. Benjamin, Site Vice President
J. Meister, Station Manager
F. Spangenberg, Regulatory Assurance Supervisor
M. Aguilar, Assistant Attorney General
State Liaison Officer
Chairman, Illinois Commerce Commission

O. Kingsley

-2-

We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection.

Sincerely,

David E. Hills, Chief
Operations Branch

Docket Nos. 50-373; 50-374
License Nos. NPF-11; NPF-18

- Enclosures: 1. Inspection Report 50-373/99016(DRS);
50-374/99016(DRS)
2. Simulation Facility Report

- cc w/encls: D. Helwig, Senior Vice President, Nuclear Services
C. Crane, Senior Vice President, Nuclear Operations
H. Stanley, Vice President, Nuclear Operations
R. Krich, Vice President, Regulatory Services
DCD - Licensing
J. Benjamin, Site Vice President
J. Meister, Station Manager
F. Spangenberg, Regulatory Assurance Supervisor
M. Aguilar, Assistant Attorney General
State Liaison Officer
Chairman, Illinois Commerce Commission

DOCUMENT NAME: G:DRS\LAS99016.WPD

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	RIII	RIII	RIII		
NAME	DMcNeil for MBielby:jp	DMcNeil for DHills	DRoberts for MLEach		
DATE	02/01/00	02/01/00	02/03/00		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution:

AJM (E-Mail)

WES (E-Mail)

DMS6 (Project Mgr.) (E-Mail)

J. Caldwell, RIII w/encls

B. Clayton, RIII w/encls

SRI LaSalle w/encls

DRP w/encls

DRS w/encls

RIII PRR w/encls

PUBLIC IE-42 w/encls

Docket File w/encls

GREENS

IEO (E-Mail)

DOCDESK (E-Mail)

M. A. Bies, RIII w/encls

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Docket Nos: 50-373; 50-374
License Nos: NPF-11; NPF-18

Report No: 50-373/99016(DRS); 50-374/99016(DRS)

Licensee: Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd)

Facility: LaSalle Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2

Location: 2605 N. 21st Road
Marseilles, IL 51341-9756

Dates: September 14-17, October 19-21, December 7, 1999 and
January 5-6, 2000

Inspectors: M. Bielby, Senior Operations Engineer, Lead
H. Peterson, Senior Operations Engineer
D. Muller, Operations Engineer
M. Kurth, Resident Inspector, Duane Arnold

Approved by: D. Hills, Chief, Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

LaSalle Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2
NRC Inspection Report 50-373/99016(DRS); 50-374/99016(DRS)

This inspection report contains the findings and conclusions from the licensed reactor operator (RO) and senior reactor operator (SRO) requalification training program inspection. The inspection included a review of training administrative procedures, and written and operating examination material; observation and evaluation of licensed operators and licensee evaluators during a requalification operating examination; an assessment of simulator fidelity; an evaluation of program controls to assure a systems approach to training; and a review of requalification training records. In addition, the inspectors observed a period of control room operations. The inspectors used the guidance in inspection procedures (IP) 71001 and 71707.

Operations

During observations of control room activities, the inspectors concluded that control room operators demonstrated professional behavior, maintained a businesslike decorum, and focused on performing plant evolutions safely and correctly (Section O1.1).

Operations Training

Overall operator performance observed by inspectors during the annual licensed operator requalification operating and written examination was satisfactory (Section O4.1).

The inspectors were concerned with a lapse in operating crew communications and monitoring of plant status during one simulator scenario evaluation which resulted in inappropriate emergency operating procedural actions. The licensee took appropriate remedial actions for this performance (Section O4.1).

The licensed operator requalification training program continued to focus on operator performance improvement and the inspectors noted improvement in the quality of examination material and operator performance evaluations (Section O5.1).

The licensee satisfactorily administered the annual requalification examinations and evaluated operator performance according to program guidance which was consistent with regulatory guidelines. The overall quality and content of the annual requalification examination material was satisfactory. Examination security and simulator fidelity was satisfactory throughout the examination period (Section O5.2 and Section O5.3).

The licensed operator requalification training program had adequate controls in place to provide an effective systematic approach for incorporating necessary changes to improve training based on various sources of feedback (Section O5.4).

The licensee's remediation training plan preparation, and administration and re-evaluation processes were sufficient to correct identified performance deficiencies and to assure that operators could safely resume licensed duties (Section O5.5).

All licensed operator medical records reviewed by inspectors indicated operators were current in their biennial medical examinations and medical license restrictions. The licensee's program effectively maintained operator licenses active in accordance with 10 CFR 55.53(e) and (f) (Section O5.6 and Section O5.7).

Report Details

I. Operations

O1 Conduct of Operations

O1.1 Control Room Observations

a. Inspection Scope (71707)

The inspectors observed routine control room activities during two continuous hours of near full power operation, performed panel walk-downs, attended two pre-job briefs, and questioned the control room operators on plant status.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors observed that control room personnel were professional and the environment was businesslike. Control room operators were knowledgeable of plant status, remained attentive to their panels, and promptly addressed control panel alarms. The inspectors observed that control room communications were generally three-way and consistent with management expectations. The control room staffing level for each unit included two reactor operators (ROs) and one senior reactor operator (SRO) which met the minimum requirements for two units at power.

The inspectors observed appropriate crew members participate in pre-job briefings for taking a main turbine bypass valve out of service and start-up of the low pressure core spray system for a surveillance. The shift supervisor facilitated crew discussions of procedural requirements and contingency actions, and emphasized the importance of ensuring the correct component was taken out of service.

c. Conclusions

During observations of control room activities, the inspectors concluded that control room operators demonstrated professional behavior, maintained a businesslike decorum, and focused on performing plant evolutions safely and correctly.

O4 Operator Knowledge and Performance

O4.1 Annual Evaluation Performance Review (Operator Requalification)

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

To better facilitate resource scheduling with respect to a plant outage, the facility licensee administered the various parts of the annual licensed operator requalification training (LORT) examinations during three different time periods. The inspectors observed dynamic scenario performance of one shift operating crew and one administrative crew during the last week (Scenario Week 5) of the first part of the LORT annual examination. The inspectors observed the licensee administer job performance

measures (JPMs) to each licensed operator of one shift operating crew during the last week (JPM Week 6) of the second part of the LORT annual examination. One inspector performed an onsite and in-office review of the three written exams.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors observed the licensee administer two dynamic scenarios to one shift operating crew consisting of three SROs and three ROs, and two dynamic scenarios to one administrative crew consisting of five SROs and one RO. Throughout the scenarios, the inspectors noted that the Shift Manager (SM) and Unit Supervisor (US) on each crew maintained their position of oversight. The SMs provided good backup to the respective USs in most instances. The USs generally ensured follow-up to directed actions, and provided informative briefings and crew updates at appropriate times. The Unit 1 and Unit 2 Assistant Nuclear Shift Operators and Unit 1 Nuclear Shift Operator generally demonstrated good self and peer checking during routine activities. As a whole, the crews generally used three-way communications, provided clear announcements of entry into abnormal, alarm response, and emergency operating procedures, and announced entry conditions and procedure transitions.

However, the inspectors and licensee evaluators observed failure to perform two critical scenario tasks during the operating crew scenario. These deficiencies resulted in the licensee evaluating an individual and crew performance as unsatisfactory. The scenario involved a drywell (DW) loss of coolant accident (LOCA) with loss of electrical power to an essential bus that resulted in a loss of main feedwater. In addition, a malfunction of the high pressure core spray (HPCS) system prevented it from injecting to the reactor pressure vessel (RPV), and the reactor core isolation cooling (RCIC) controller would only operate in the manual mode. In accordance with emergency operating procedures (EOPs), the US directed a reactor scram subsequent to the resulting loss of reactor water level (RWL) transient, and eventually directed initiation of the automatic depressurization system.

- One scenario critical task involved recognition of the failure of RCIC automatic flow control and required the operator to take manual control to inject to the RPV. Although an operator identified that RCIC failed to automatically initiate, the individual did not take manual control of RCIC and align it to inject to the RPV when the US directed RPV injection with all available sources.
- In accordance with an EOP caution, a second critical task required emergency core cooling system flow not be diverted from the RPV while RWL was less than top of active fuel (TAF). During the scenario, the crew aligned residual heat removal (RHR) for injection to the RPV with RWL below TAF. Coincidentally, primary containment criteria required RHR flow to spray the drywell. Although RWL was below TAF, the crew diverted RHR to the DW spray mode instead of splitting the system for both RPV injection and DW spray. The incorrect action to realign RHR was primarily attributed to poor crew communication of RWL and failure to adequately monitor overall plant status.

The inspectors observed that the licensee evaluated the crew and one individual

performance as unsatisfactory based on the failure to correctly perform the scenario critical tasks. The inspectors also observed that the licensee convened a Performance Review Committee (PRC), which included the Operations Manager, Operations Training Superintendent, and Licensed Operator Requalification Training Group Leader, to review individual crew member evaluations, past training history, and determine an appropriate course of remediation. The inspectors verified that the individual operators were removed from shift with an appropriate entry made in the SM log.

The inspectors observed the performance of seven licensed operators during a portion of licensee-administered JPMs. For JPMs which the inspectors did not observe, the inspectors reviewed the licensee's grading. The inspectors observed that each licensed operator performed two simulator JPMs and three in-plant JPMs. During the JPM portion of the requalification examination, the inspectors noted individual operator performance deficiencies in the areas of procedural adherence and log keeping. One operator incorrectly determined protective action recommendations during an emergency plan JPM. Another operator did not meet station expectations for procedure place keeping during a RCIC surveillance JPM. Another operator failed to install all the required electrical jumpers while performing a JPM to defeat main steamline isolation. In addition, two operators did not discuss the proper logging of information during an emergency plan JPM. The inspectors considered these instances of individual performance deficiencies to be individual weaknesses, not program weaknesses. The inspectors determined that although operators demonstrated unsatisfactory performance on individual JPMs, there was no overall unsatisfactory operator performance that required remediation during the inspection period. The inspectors concurred with the licensee's overall evaluation of operator performance.

The inspectors reviewed the graded written examinations of two operating crews during the inspection period. The inspectors determined that all licensed operators satisfactorily passed the written examination.

c. Conclusions

Overall operator performance observed by inspectors during the annual licensed operator requalification operating and written examination was satisfactory. The inspectors were concerned with a lapse in operating crew communications and monitoring of plant status during one simulator scenario evaluation which resulted in inappropriate emergency operating procedural actions. The licensee took appropriate remedial actions for this performance.

O5 Operator Training and Qualification

O5.1 Operating History

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

The inspectors reviewed the following documents to assess the LORT program's effectiveness regarding operator performance:

- April 1997 Initial License Operator Examination Report 50-373/374/97303

- September 1997 High Intensity Training Inspection Report 50-373/374/97014
- October 1997 Licensed Operator Requalification Training Program Inspection Report 50-373/374/97017
- June 1998 Restart Training Inspection Report 50-373/374/98016
- Select resident inspector observations and reports during 1999
- Select licensee event reports during 1999
- March 26 and September 30, 1999 Plant Performance Reviews

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors reviewed the history of licensee actions to improve operator performance. Late in 1996, the licensee entered an extended outage, in part, to address operating crew performance and licensed operator training effectiveness concerns identified by a licensee initiated independent self-assessment (ISA). The licensee initially developed a Startup Readiness Training (SRT) program to address the ISA issues. However, based on substandard operator performance and poor licensee examination material preparation and control during the April 1997 initial operator license examination, the licensee halted the SRT program and conducted evaluations of all licensed operators. As a result of identifying additional operator performance deficiencies, the licensee modified the SRT into a new program, entitled High Intensity Training (HIT). NRC inspectors observed HIT during the September 1997 training inspection and identified an improved and rigorous operator training program although some examination material was considered marginal and instances of poor operator performance were observed. During the October 1997 requalification training inspection, the inspectors continued to identify training deficiencies in examination material preparation and administration. Operator performance during scenarios was improved although communications and lack of attention to EOP parameters were identified as deficiencies by NRC inspectors. During the June 1998 special training inspection, the inspectors observed the licensee's SRT program and concluded that the HIT program had effectively addressed training and operator performance issues identified by their previous ISA and SRT programs. The plant restarted in August 1998. The February 1999 Plant Performance Review (PPR) identified that since that time, overall operator performance had improved, although some inconsistency remained.

During this LORT inspection, overall individual operator performance had generally improved from the last LORT inspection, although some lapses in consistent operating crew performance were still observed by the inspectors. The inspectors noted significant improvement in the licensee prepared examination material. Furthermore, the licensee's evaluators were more objective regarding operator performance during dynamic scenario evaluations.

c. Conclusions

The licensed operator requalification training program continued to focus on operator performance improvement and the inspectors noted improvement in the quality of examination material and operator performance evaluations.

O5.2 Requalification Examination Material

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

The inspectors reviewed the licensee's annual requalification written and operating examination material using IP 71001, Appendix A checklists to assess the quality and content. The following documents were reviewed:

- All five weeks of the 1999 annual requalification examination dynamic scenarios
- All six weeks of the 1999 annual requalification examination JPMs
- First two of three weeks of the 1999 biennial written examination
- The 1998 annual requalification operating examination material
- The previous 1997 biennial written examination material
- Selected 1999 training cycle scenario evaluations and written quizzes
- Nuclear Training Administrative Forms and Templates (NTAFT) JLOR03, Job Performance Measure Development Job Aid, Revision 2
- NTAFT JLOR04, Licensed Operator Requalification Training Examination Development Job Aid, Revision 2
- NTAFT JLOR05, Licensed Operator Requalification Training Examination Administrative Job Aid, Revision 2
- Common Work Practice Instructions (CWPI)-NSP-TQ-1-6, Licensed Operator Requalification Training Program, Revision 1
- NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards", Interim Revision 8

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors reviewed the written and operating examination material administered during the 1999 annual requalification examination and compared it to previously administered examinations and quizzes.

Operating Examination

In general, the inspectors determined the scenarios and JPMs met the standards for quality specified by the IP 71001 checklist and the licensee's program requirements. The operating examination material contained the necessary quantitative and qualitative attributes to provide a satisfactory evaluation of operator skills based on identified critical tasks and crew and individual competencies. The annual dynamic scenario examination consisted of four scenarios administered to each plant operating crew. Each plant operating crew was subdivided into two simulator crews to ensure that each licensed operator participated in at least two scenarios. The annual JPM examination consisted of three in-plant and two simulator control room JPMs. The licensee administered each operator a set of five JPMs which contained four common, and one SRO or RO JPM as appropriate. The licensee administered the biennial written examination to each operator.

The inspectors considered the scenario examination material satisfactory. The inspectors determined that, overall, the dynamic scenarios were of good quality and reasonable complexity. The licensee had identified appropriate steps as critical and incorporated Probabilistic Risk Assessment (PRA) elements. In addition, the inspectors observed that the major transients and malfunctions after EOP entry provided a good evaluation tool of operator performance. However, the inspectors identified some minor

inconsistencies in formatting because some scenarios still contained lists of “Qualitative Attributes”.

The inspectors considered the JPM examination material satisfactory. The inspectors observed that the JPMs were reasonably challenging, diverse, and had appropriate steps identified as critical. One inappropriate cue for a reactor water cleanup (RWCU) JPM was self revealing during the examination administration. The cue incorrectly stated the differential pressure value for the pump suction filter. After the initial miscue, the licensee instructors corrected the value for the subsequent RWCU JPMs. The inspectors noted that the evaluation potential could be improved by expanding the task to incorporate PRA insights.

The inspectors reviewed the size of the licensee’s examination bank and determined that the number of JPMs and dynamic scenarios exceeded the respective goals of 125 and 30 as specified in ES-601, Attachment 2. The inspectors observed that the week to week 1999 annual operating examination, and the 1999 to 1998 annual examination material overlap was satisfactory. The licensee did not repeat any JPMs or dynamic scenarios during the 1999 annual examination, or with the previous year’s annual operating examination. In addition, no operating examination scenarios overlapped with the training cycle evaluation scenarios. The inspectors determined that the licensee’s examination bank, and methodology to control duplication of examination material, contributed significantly to producing an operating examination that was unpredictable and discriminating.

Written Examination

The inspectors reviewed the content and discriminatory value of the written examination questions and identified that, overall, they met the standards for quality specified by the IP 71001 checklist and the licensee’s program requirements. In addition, the size of the question bank met the goal of 350 specified in ES 601, Attachment 2. The inspectors determined that the questions provided a satisfactory evaluation of operator knowledge and abilities. The written examination was an open reference examination consisting of 35 multiple choice questions. The licensee had incorporated aspects of PRA insights and lessons learned into the questions. However, the inspectors identified a few direct look-up questions that were considered to have a low discriminatory value.

The inspectors noted that the week-to-week overlap of the annual written examination material was satisfactory. The week-to-week repeat of annual examination questions were within the licensee’s procedural guidance of less than 20 percent. However, the inspectors identified that the licensee did not verify overlap from the current to the previous annual examination, or to the training cycle quizzes. During the inspection, the licensee performed a rough estimate of repeated questions used from the previous biennial written examination and identified a maximum of 31 percent repeated questions. The inspectors were concerned that a lack of methodology to control duplication of examination material from the current to previous written examination, and training cycle quizzes had the potential to make the examinations more predictable and therefore less discriminating with regard to operator performance.

c. Conclusions

The overall quality and content of the annual requalification examination material was satisfactory.

O5.3 Requalification Examination Administration Practices

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

The inspectors observed and evaluated the following aspects of the LORT annual operating examinations to assess the licensee's policies and practices regarding the annual LORT examination administration, simulator fidelity, and examination security:

- Dynamic scenario performance of one operating shift crew, one administrative crew, and individuals during Scenario Week 5 (last week)
- JPM performance of one operating shift crew during JPM Week 6 (last week)
- Licensee's documentation of operator performance
- Simulator performance
- Licensee's examination security practices
- CWPI-NSP-TQ-2-1, Examination Security And Administration, Revision 2

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors observed the licensee evaluate the performance of one shift operating crew and one administrative crew during a total of four dynamic simulator scenarios with all crew members participating in at least two scenarios. During the scenarios, both the licensee evaluators and inspectors identified similar crew and individual performance deficiencies. The inspectors' overall assessments of crew and individual operator performance agreed with the licensee's. The inspectors observed that the number of evaluators was adequate and included at least one member from operations and training management. Furthermore, the inspectors observed that, overall, the licensee's evaluators were objective regarding operator performance and based grading on meeting the licensee's expected performance standards. At the conclusion of the LORT annual dynamic scenario examination, the licensee determined that one operating crew, one administrative crew, and four individuals had demonstrated unsatisfactory performance.

The inspectors observed the licensee evaluate the individual operator performance of one shift operating crew during a set of five JPMs. The inspectors noted no undue prompting by the evaluators during the performance of the JPM walkthrough examination. Although some JPMs were unsatisfactorily performed, the licensee evaluated all individuals as satisfactory overall. The inspectors agreed with the licensee's overall operator JPM performance evaluations. At the conclusion of the LORT annual JPM examination, the licensee determined that all but one operator had demonstrated satisfactory performance.

The inspectors did not identify any examination security problems during the annual examination administration. The inspectors observed a heightened sensitivity displayed by operation and training staffs for examination material and operator control during the annual examination administration.

The inspectors did not identify any new simulator or fidelity issues during the operating portion of the annual LOR examination (Enclosure 2, "Simulation Facility Report"). The inspectors observed that, in general, the licensee tracked and addressed simulator deficiency requests within a reasonable time period. The simulator down time was coordinated to ensure that licensed operator training was not significantly affected. In addition, the licensee had re-configured the large simulator mainframe computer with a personal computer and was prepared to move the simulator to their new onsite training facility, both of which should enhance the licensee's utilization of the simulator for training.

c. Conclusions

The licensee satisfactorily administered the annual requalification examinations and evaluated operator performance according to program guidance which was consistent with regulatory guidelines. Examination security and simulator fidelity was satisfactory throughout the examination period.

O5.4 Requalification Training Program Feedback System

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

The inspectors performed the following to assess the licensee's training program feedback system effectiveness:

- Interviewed licensee personnel (operators, instructors, and training management)
- Reviewed a sampling of 1999 student and management evaluations of requalification training modules
- Reviewed a sampling of open training requests
- Reviewed "Requalification Examinations Self-Assessment Report", FA-3Q-99-2 (8/17-20/99)
- CWPI-NSP-TQ-2-2, Training Program Self-Assessment, Revision 1
- CWPI-NSP-TQ-2-4, Training Management System, Revision 1

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors determined the licensee's feedback process was effectively implemented. The inspectors observed that the licensee had adequate controls in place to revise the LORT program based on audits and self-assessments, industry and plant events, emergent needs, and operator and management feedback. The inspectors also observed that issues related to improvement of requalification training were being

identified, documented, prioritized and addressed in a timely manner. The inspectors identified that the self-assessment report performed by the Nuclear Generation Group was sufficiently critical to improve the LORT program.

c. Conclusions

The licensed operator requalification training program had adequate controls in place to provide an effective systematic approach for incorporating necessary changes to improve training based on various sources of feedback.

O5.5 Remedial Training Program

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

The inspectors reviewed the following LOR annual examination documents to assess the licensee's remedial training program effectiveness:

- Licensee's unsatisfactory dynamic scenario performance evaluations for two individuals and one operating crew
- Licensee's remediation training and re-evaluation plan for three individuals and one operating crew
- CWPI-NSP-TQ-1-6, "Licensed Operator Requalification Training Program", Revision 1
- NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors", Revision 8

b. Observations and Findings

The licensee identified unsatisfactory performance for one operating crew, one administrative crew, and four individuals during the dynamic scenario portion of the annual operating examination. The inspectors reviewed the licensee's process for remediation. The inspectors noted that the individuals were promptly removed from standing watch, names entered in the SM log, operation's and training management notified, and a PRC convened that included the Operations Manager, Operations Training Superintendent, and Licensed Operator Requalification Training Group Leader. Training personnel prepared a tailored remediation package that focused on the area of weakness demonstrated during the examination. The inspectors reviewed the remediation training plans and noted that they included instructor facilitated reviews of applicable procedures, unsatisfactory performance evaluation and associated scenario, and simulator exercises related to deficient performance areas. The operator also participated in a training management review of remedial training. After completion of re-training, the operator was re-evaluated in a scenario that required successful demonstration of deficiencies identified in the original evaluation scenario.

c. Conclusions

The licensee's remediation training plan preparation, and administration and re-evaluation processes were sufficient to correct identified performance deficiencies and to assure that operators could safely resume licensed duties.

O5.6 Conformance With Operator License Conditions

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

The inspectors reviewed the biennial medical history for seven individuals maintaining RO and SRO licenses in accordance with 10 CFR 55.21.

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors identified that all of the licensed operators were current with their biennial medical examination and medical license restrictions. Of the seven sampled medical records, none had exceeded the 24 months time requirement. Medical reports matched the required medical restrictions on the individual's license.

c. Conclusions

All licensed operator medical records reviewed by inspectors indicated operators were current in their biennial medical examinations and medical license restrictions.

O5.7 Conformance With Operator License Conditions: Maintenance of Active Operator Licenses

a. Inspection Scope (71001)

The inspectors interviewed operations and training department personnel and reviewed the following documents to assess the facility and operator licensees' compliance with 10 CFR Part 55.53 license condition requirements:

- CWPI-NSP-TQ-1-6, "Licensed Operator Requalification Training Program", Revision 1
- NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors", Revision 8
- Technical Specifications Administrative Section
- Control room proficiency watch list for licensed operators

b. Observations and Findings

The inspectors reviewed and determined that the licensee's program for maintaining RO and SRO licenses active, and for reactivating licenses, was in accordance with 10 CFR 55.53(e) and (f). The inspectors identified that the program accounted for licensed individuals assigned to control room duties as well as individuals assigned to work support activities. The inspectors did not identify any examples of individuals who had not maintained their SRO or RO licenses active in accordance with 10 CFR 55.53(e)

and (f). The inspectors also verified that control room manning agreed with the Technical Specification required control room licensed positions.

c. Conclusions

The licensee's program effectively maintained operator licenses active in accordance with 10 CFR 55.53(e) and (f).

V. Management Meetings

X1 Exit Meeting Summary

The inspectors presented the preliminary inspection results to members of licensee management and staff at the conclusion of the site inspection on January 6, 2000. The licensee acknowledged the findings presented and did not identify any of the information reviewed as proprietary.

During the exit meeting, the inspectors communicated that the overall crew and individual operator performance was generally satisfactory with the exception of one operating crew which demonstrated difficulties in crew communications and monitoring of plant status resulting in inappropriate emergency operating procedural actions during a simulator scenario evaluation. The licensee's staff had identified the deficiencies and took appropriate remedial actions. During the exit meeting, the licensee's staff indicated that they had identified periodic breakdowns in crew performance during training evaluations and are in the process of identifying measures to improve and reinforce consistency in operator performance during training and on shift.

PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Licensee

J. Bearden, Nuclear Oversight
J. Benjamin, Site Vice President
A. Duncan, Regulatory Assurance
M. Entwistle, Operations Training
J. Estes, Radiation Protection Supervisor
T. Gienich, Work Control
R. Gilbert, Operations Manager
G. Kaegi, Training Manager
E. McVey, Reactor Engineering Supervisor
J. Meister, Station Manager
D. O'Rourke, Operations Training
J. Rickman, Operations
E. Shankle, Assistant Maintenance Manager
F. Spangenberg, Regulatory Assurance Manager
J. Thean, Chemistry
J. Yesinowslu, Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety

NRC

E. Duncan, Senior Resident Inspector, LaSalle

INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED

IP 71001: Licensed Operator Requalification Program Evaluation
IP 71707: Plant Operations

ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

Opened

None

Closed

None

Discussed

None

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWPI	Common Work Practice Instructions
DRP	Division of Reactor Projects
DRS	Division of Reactor Safety
DW	Drywell
EOP	Emergency Operating Procedure
HIT	High Intensity Training
HPCS	High Pressure Core Spray
IP	Inspection Procedure
ISA	Independent Self-Assessment
JPM	Job Performance Measure
LOCA	Loss of Coolant Accident
LORT	Licensed Operator Requalification Training
NRC	Nuclear Regulator Commission
NTAFT	Nuclear Training Administrative Forms and Templates
PPR	Plant Performance Review
PRA	Probabilistic Risk-Assessment
PRC	Performance Review Committee
RCIC	Reactor Core Isolation Cooling
RHR	Residual Heat Removal
RO	Reactor Operator
RPV	Reactor Pressure Vessel
RWCU	Reactor Water Cleanup
RWL	Reactor Water Level
SM	Shift Manager
SRO	Senior Reactor Operator
SRT	Startup Readiness Training
TAF	Top of Active Fuel
US	Unit Supervisor

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The following is a list of facility licensee documents reviewed during the inspection, including documents prepared by others for the facility licensee. Inclusion on this list does not imply that NRC inspectors reviewed the documents in their entirety, but, rather that selected sections or portions of the documents were evaluated as part of the overall inspection effort. NRC acceptance of the documents or any portion thereof is not implied.

Procedures:

- CWPI-NSP-TQ-1-6, Licensed Operator Requalification Training Program, Revision 1
- CWPI-NSP-TQ-2-1, Examination Security And Administration, Revision 2
- CWPI-NSP-TQ-2-2, Training Program Self-Assessment, Revision 1
- CWPI-NSP-TQ-2-4, Training Management System, Revision 1
- NTAFT JLOR03, Job Performance Measure Development Job Aid, Revision 2
- NTAFT JLOR04, Licensed Operator Requalification Training Examination Development Job Aid, Revision 2
- NTAFT JLOR05, Licensed Operator Requalification Training Examination Administrative Job Aid, Revision 2

Current Cycle Material:

- Technical Specifications Administrative Section
- Control room proficiency watch list for licensed operators
- All five weeks of the 1999 annual requalification examination dynamic scenarios
- All six weeks of the 1999 annual requalification examination JPMs
- All three weeks of the 1999 biennial written examination
- The 1998 annual requalification operating examination material
- The previous 1997 biennial written examination material
- Selected 1999 training cycle scenario evaluations and written quizzes
- Reviewed a sampling of 1999 student and management evaluations of requalification training modules
- Reviewed a sampling of open training requests
- Reviewed "Requalification Examinations Self-Assessment Report", FA-3Q-99-2 (8/17-20/99)
- Licensee's unsatisfactory dynamic scenario performance evaluations for two individuals and one operating crew
- Licensee's remediation training and re-evaluation plan for three individuals and one operating crew

SIMULATION FACILITY REPORT

Facility Licensee: LaSalle Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1 and 2

Facility Licensee Dockets No: 50-373; 50-374

Operating Tests Administered: September 14-17, 1999; October 19-21, 1999

This form is to be used only to report observations. These observations do not constitute audit or inspection findings and are not, without further verification and review, indicative of noncompliance with 10 CFR 55.45(b). These observations do not affect NRC certification or approval of the simulation facility other than to provide information that may be used in future evaluations. No facility licensee action is required in response to these observations.

While conducting the simulator portion of the operating tests, the following items were observed (if none, so state):

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
None	None