June 27, 2002

Mr. Jack Skolds
President and CNO
Exelon Nuclear
Exelon Generation Company, LLC
4300 Winfield Rd.
5th Floor
Warrenville, IL 60555

SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK SENIOR REACTOR OPERATOR INITIAL EXAMINATION REPORT NO. 50-219/2002-301

Dear Mr. Skolds:

This report transmits the results of the senior reactor operator (SRO) licensing examination conducted by the NRC during the period of May 13 - 20, 2002. This examination addressed areas important to public health and safety and was developed and administered using the guidelines of the "Examination Standards for Power Reactors" (NUREG-1021, Revision 8, Supplement 1).

Based on the results of the examination, all eight applicants passed all portions of the examination. The eight applicants were all instant SROs. Examination results indicated that the applicants were well prepared for the examination. Mr. P. Bissett discussed performance insights observed during the examination with Mr. J. Hackenburg and others on May 17, 2002. On June 3, 2002, final examination results, including 5 of 8 individual license numbers, were given during a telephone call between Mr. P. Bissett and Mr. Hackenburg. Three of the licenses are being held pending the individuals' completion of the six-month onsite time requirement. The NRC also expressed their appreciation to the facility for their assistance during the development of the exam by the NRC. No findings of significance were identified.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). These records include the final examination and are available in ADAMS (SRO Written-Accession Number ML021610469; SRO Operating Section A-Accession Number ML021610490; SRO Operating Section B-Accession Number ML021610534; and SRO Operating Section C-Accession Number ML021610534). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/ADAMS.html (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Should you have any questions regarding this examination, please contact me at (610) 337-5183, or by E-mail at RJC@NRC.GOV.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Richard J. Conte, Chief
Operational Safety Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket No. 50-219
License No. DPR-16

Enclosure: Initial Examination Report No. 50-219/2002-301

cc w/encl:
Amergen Energy Company - Correspondence Control Desk
President and CNO, Exelon Nuclear
Vice President - Oyster Creek
Licensing and Regulatory Affairs- Vice President, Exelon Corporation
Director-Licensing
Regulatory Assurance Manager
R. Shadis, New England Coalition Staff
State of New Jersey
N. Cohen, Coordinator - Unplug Salem Campaign
E. Gbur, Coordinator - Jersey Shore Nuclear Watch
E. Zobian, Coordinator - Jersey Shore Anti Nuclear Alliance

Distribution w/encl: **(VIA E-MAIL)**
Region I Docket Room (with concurrences)
R. Summers, DRP - NRC Resident Inspector
H. Miller, RA
J. Wiggins, DRA
J. Rogge, DRP
S. Barr, DRP
W. Lanning, DRS
R. Crlenjak, DRS
R. Conte, DRS
P. Bissett, Chief Examiner, DRS
C. Buracker, DRS (Master Exam File)
H. Nieh, OEDO
S. Richards, NRR
P. Tam, PM, NRR
T. Colburn, Backup PM, NRR
T. Byron, INPO (byrontr@inpo.org)

DOCUMENT NAME: C:\ORPCheckout\FileNET\ML021780625.wpd
ADAMS PACKAGE: ML013520389
After declaring this document "An Official Agency Record" it **will** be released to the Public.
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	RI/DRS		RI/DRP		RI/DRS		RI/DRS			
NAME	CBuracker (PHB for)		PBissett		JRogge		RConte/RVC for			
DATE	6/13/02		6/13/02		6/27/02		6/27/02			

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION I

Docket No:	50-219
License No:	DPR-16
Report No:	2002-301
Licensee:	AmerGen Energy Company, LLC (AmerGen)
Facility:	Oyster Creek Generating Station
Location:	Forked River, New Jersey
Dates:	May 13 - 17, 2002 (Operating Test Administration) May 20, 2002 (Written Examination Administration) May 22 - 28, 2002 (Examination Grading)
Examiners:	P. Bissett, Senior Operations Engineer (Chief Examiner) P. Bonnett, Reactor Projects Engineer J. D'Antonio, Operations Engineer C. Sisco, Operations Engineer T. Kolb, Operations Engineer (RII Observer)
Approved by:	Richard J. Conte, Chief Operational Safety Branch Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

IR 05000219/2002-301; May 13 - 20, 2002; AmerGen Energy Company, Oyster Creek Generating Station; Initial Operator Licensing Examination Report. Eight of eight applicants (8 SRO instants) passed the examination.

The written examinations were administered by the facility and the operating tests were administered by four NRC region-based examiners.

A. Inspector Identified Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

B. License Identified Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

Report Details

1. REACTOR SAFETY

Mitigating Systems - Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) Initial License Examinations

a. Scope of Review

The Oyster Creek examination team developed the written and operating initial examinations and together with the NRC personnel, verified or ensured, as applicable, the following:

- The examination was prepared and developed in accordance with the guidelines of Revision 8, Supplement 1 of NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors" and it met the overall quality goals (range of acceptability) of these standards. The review was conducted both in the Region I office and at the Oyster Creek plant and training facility. Final resolution of comments and incorporation of test revisions was conducted during and following the onsite preparation week.

- Simulation facility operation was proper.

- Facility licensee completed a test item analysis on the written examination for feedback into the systems approach to training program.

- Examination security requirements were met.

The NRC examiners administered the operating portion of the examination to all eight applicants from May 13-17, 2002. The written examination was administered by the Oyster Creek training staff on May 20, 2002.

b. Findings

Grading and Results

All eight applicants (8 instant SROs) passed all portions of the initial licensing examination.

There were four post-written examination comments that were submitted by the licensee (Attachment 2).

Examination Preparation and Quality

The examination was within the acceptable range.

Examination Administration and Performance

No generic performance errors by the applicants were noted during the administration of the examination.

4. OTHER ACTIVITIES

4OA6 Meetings, including Exit

On June 3, 2002, the NRC provided conclusions and examination results to the Oyster Creek Operations Training Manager, Mr. J. Hackenburg, via telephone. License numbers for five of the eight applicants were also provided during this time. The three other licenses are being held pending completion of each individual's six-month onsite time requirement. Licenses will be provided to each applicant once the NRC is notified in writing that this time requirement has been completed.

The NRC also expressed appreciation for the cooperation and assistance that was provided during the preparation and administration of the examination by the licensee's training staff.

ATTACHMENT 1

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

KEY POINTS OF CONTACT

J. Hackenburg	Manager - Operations Training
P. Nielson	Exelon NRC Exam Coordinator
G. Young	Supervisor - Operations Training

LIST OF ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

None.

ATTACHMENT 2

LICENSEE COMMENTS

ATTACHMENT 3

NRC RESOLUTION OF LICENSEE COMMENTS

Question #33

Comment: Answer “D” is to direct a manual scram before the automatic scram setpoint is exceeded. Station Procedure 106, Conduct of Operations, specifies in step 5.1.1 that the SRO has the duty and authority to shut down the reactor under any of a series of conditions including, “when operating parameters are trending such that an automatic scram is imminent or inevitable.” Since no information is given in the question regarding the rate of increase other than indications that level is rising and will continue to rise, answer ”D” is also correct.

NRC Resolution: Recommendation accepted; the question has two correct answers (C and D). Agree with facility comment based upon actions stated in Station Procedure 106, step 5.1.1.

Question #64

Comment: At Oyster Creek, it is a common occurrence to receive APRM upscale rod blocks during routine power ascensions. The stem of the question does not provide any information related to the rod patten and sequence of control rod and recirc system adjustments. The APRMs have “PUSH-RESET” alarms that must be routinely reset during the power ascension to prevent receiving rod blocks. This action is directed in Step 6.55 of Station Procedure 201, Plant Startup. Station Procedure 403.2 Operation of the LPRM-APRM System During Startup and Power Operation, precaution 4.2 states, “Failure to acknowledge the APRM ALARM LEVEL - PUSH RESET indicator each time it illuminates will result in a rod block if power is allowed to increase.” Procedural guidance and operational experience have demonstrated that answer “C” is also a correct answer.

NRC Resolution: Recommendation accepted; the question has two correct answers (C and D). Agree with facility comment based upon actions stated in Station Procedure 201, step 6.55.

Question #70

Comment: Answer “D” is similar to answer “C”, except that it does not address Reactor Engineering assistance, but rather whether a Reactor Engineer is required to be stationed. In Station Procedure 201, in the Precautions and Limitations section, step 4.12 requires a Reactor Engineer to be present in the control room during all core reactivity changes. Answer “D” is also correct.

NRC Resolution: Recommendation accepted; the question has two correct answers (C and D). Agree with facility comment based upon requirement in Precautions and Limitations, step 4.12 of Station Procedure 201.

NRC RESOLUTION OF LICENSEE COMMENTS

Question #91

Comment: A stem focus issue exists in that the stem does not indicate the results of the Screening Review that was conducted. If the candidate believes that the Screening Reviews were completed in the stem and that an additional review is required, this indicates that the reviews must have required a full 50.59 evaluation. Under these conditions, answer “C” is correct because a PORC review is required in accordance with step 8.2.6 of Procedure 108.8, Temporary Modification Control.

NRC Resolution: Recommendation accepted; the question has two correct answers (A and C). Agree with facility comment that the stem of the question does not state the results of the Screening Review.