



**UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 400
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011-4005**

March 7, 2003

Paul D. Hinnenkamp
Vice President - Operations
River Bend Station
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 220
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

SUBJECT: RIVER BEND STATION - NRC EXAMINATION REPORT 50-458/03-301

Dear Mr. Hinnenkamp:

On February 14, the NRC completed an examination at your River Bend Station. The enclosed report documents the examination findings, which were discussed on February 13, 2003, with Mr. Russ Godwin and other members of your staff.

The examination included the evaluation of four applicants for reactor operator licenses, four applicants for instant upgrade and four applicants for senior operator licenses. We determined that all applicants satisfied the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55, and the appropriate licenses have been issued.

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). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Sincerely,

/RA/

Anthony T. Gody, Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket: 50-458
License: NPF-47

Entergy Operations, Inc.

-2-

Enclosure:
NRC Examination Report
50-458/03-301

cc w/enclosure:
Executive Vice President and
Chief Operating Officer
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 31995
Jackson, Mississippi 39286-1995

Vice President
Operations Support
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 31995
Jackson, Mississippi 39286-1995

General Manager
Plant Operations
River Bend Station
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 220
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Director - Nuclear Safety
River Bend Station
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 220
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Wise, Carter, Child & Caraway
P.O. Box 651
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

Mark J. Wetterhahn, Esq.
Winston & Strawn
1401 L Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Manager - Licensing
River Bend Station
Entergy Operations, Inc.
P.O. Box 220
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Entergy Operations, Inc.

-3-

The Honorable Richard P. Ieyoub
Attorney General
Department of Justice
State of Louisiana
P.O. Box 94005
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9005

H. Anne Plettinger
3456 Villa Rose Drive
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806

President
West Feliciana Parish Police Jury
P.O. Box 1921
St. Francisville, Louisiana 70775

Michael E. Henry, State Liaison Officer
Department of Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 82135
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70884-2135

Brian Almon
Public Utility Commission
William B. Travis Building
P.O. Box 13326
1701 North Congress Avenue
Austin, Texas 78701-3326

Entergy Operations, Inc.

-4-

Electronic distribution by RIV:
Regional Administrator **(EWM)**
DRP Director **(ATH)**
DRS Director **(DDC)**
Senior Resident Inspector **(PJA)**
Branch Chief, DRP/B **(DNG)**
Senior Project Engineer, DRP/B **(RAK1)**
Staff Chief, DRP/TSS **(PHH)**
RITS Coordinator **(NBH)**
Scott Morris **(SAM1)**
RBS Site Secretary **(LGD)**

SOE:OB	SOE:OB	SOE:OB	SOE:OB	C:OB	C:PBB	C:OB
MEMurphy/lmb	TFStetka	TOMcKernon	GEWerner	ATGody	DNGraves	ATGody
/RA/	/RA/	/RA/	/RA/ E	/RA/	/RA/	/RA/
2/27/03	03/04/03	2/27/03	3/06/03	3/5/03	03/06/03	03/06/03

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

T=Telephone

E=E-mail

F=Fax

ENCLOSURE

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV

Docket: Docket: 50-458
License: License: NPF-47
Report No.: 50-313/02-302
Licensee: Entergy Operations, Inc.
Facility: River Bend Station
Location: 5485 U.S. Highway 61
St. Francisville, Louisiana
Dates: February 10-14, 2003
Examiners: M. Murphy, Senior Operations Engineer, Operations Branch
T. Stetka, Senior Operations Engineer, Operations Branch
T. McKernon, Senior Operations Engineer, Operations Branch
G. Werner, Senior Operations Engineer, Operations Branch
Approved By: Anthony T. Gody, Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ER 50-458/03-301; February 10-14, 2003; Entergy Operations, Inc.; River Bend Station; Initial Operator Licensing Examinations.

NRC examiners evaluated the competency of four applicants for reactor operator licenses, four applicants for instant upgrades, and four applicants for senior operator licenses at River Bend Station. The licensee developed the examinations using NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 8, Supplement 1. The written examination was administered by the facility to the applicants on February 7, 2003. The NRC examiners administered the operating tests on February 10-14, 2003.

Cornerstone: Human Performance

No findings of significance were identified (Section 40A4.1).

Report Details

4. OTHER ACTIVITIES (OA)

4OA4 Initial Operator License Examination

.1 Operator Knowledge and Performance

a. Examination Scope

On February 7, 2003, the licensee proctored the administration of the written examination to all twelve applicants. The licensee staff graded the written examinations, analyzed the results, and presented their analysis to the NRC on February 14, 2003.

The NRC examination team administered the various portions of the operating examination to the applicants on February 10-14, 2003. All 12 applicants participated in two dynamic simulator scenarios, the 4 applicants for reactor operator and the 4 applicants for senior reactor operator (Instant) participated in a control room and facilities walkthrough test consisting of ten system tasks, and an administrative test consisting of five administrative tasks. The 4 applicants for upgrade to senior reactor operator participated in a control room and facilities walkthrough test consisting of five system tasks, and an administrative test consisting of five administrative tasks.

b. Findings

All 12 of the applicants passed all parts of the examinations. The applicants demonstrated good 3-way communications, alarm response, and peer checking. For the written examinations, the reactor operator applicants average score was 87 percent and ranged from 80.0 to 90.0 percent, the senior reactor operator applicants average score was 90.8 and ranged from 87.0 to 94 percent. The overall written examination average was 89.5 percent. The text of the examination questions may be accessed in the ADAMS system under the accession numbers noted in the attachment.

The licensee conducted a performance analysis for the written examinations, submitting them to the chief examiner on February 19, 2003. Two questions were missed by 50 percent or more of the applicants. The analysis identified no common knowledge deficiency. No remediation training was determined to be necessary following the examinations. The licensee also submitted a post examination comment on one question, and requested that two answers be accepted as correct. The licensee's rationale and the NRC resolution are contained in the attachment.

No findings of significance were identified.

.2 Initial Licensing Examination Development

The licensee developed the examinations in accordance with NUREG-1021, Revision 8, Supplement 1. Licensee facility training and operations staff involved in examination development were on a security agreement.

.2.1 Examination Outline and Examination Package

a. Examination Scope

The facility licensee submitted the operating examination outlines on October 11, 2003. Examiners reviewed the submittal against the requirements of NUREG-1021, Revision 8, Supplement 1. There were no comments. The facility licensee submitted the draft examination package on December 12, 2003. Examiners reviewed the draft submittals against the requirements of NUREG-1021, Revision 8, Supplement 1 and provided comments to the licensee on December 12, 2003. The chief examiner conducted an onsite validation of the examinations and provided further comments during the week of January 21, 2003. The licensee satisfactorily completed comment resolution on February 5, 2003.

b. Findings

Examiners approved the initial examination outline and advised the licensee to proceed with the operating examination development.

The chief examiner determined that the operating examinations initially submitted by the licensee were within the range of acceptability expected for a proposed examination and were satisfactory.

No findings of significance were identified.

.3 Simulation Facility Performance

a. Examination Scope

The examiners observed simulator performance with regard to plant fidelity during the examination validation and administration.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.4 Examination Security

a. Examination Scope

The examiners reviewed examination security both during the onsite preparation week and examination administration week for compliance with NUREG-1021 requirements. Plans for simulator security and applicant control were reviewed and discussed with licensee personnel.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

4OA5 Management Meeting

.1 Exit Meetings

The chief examiner presented the examination results to Mr. Russ Godwin, Training Manager, and other members of the licensee's management staff on February 13, 2003. The licensee acknowledged the findings presented.

The licensee did not identify as proprietary any information or materials examined during the examination.

ATTACHMENT

KEY POINTS OF CONTACT

Licensee

M. Cantrell, Operations Training Supervisor - Simulator
J. Clark, Assistant Operations Manager
R. Godwin, Training Manager
M. Wagner, Operations Training Supervisor - Classroom

ADAMS DOCUMENTS REFERENCED

Accession No. ML:030640621 Written examination for reactor and senior reactor operators

POST EXAMINATION COMMENT

Question #49

Comment: The question asks that for the situations provided, which one requires Emergency Depressurization. The facility recommends acceptance of an additional answer - 180°F and slowly rising, Containment Unit Coolers CANNOT be restored - since it states that containment temperature is slowly rising and approaching 185 degrees with the Containment Unit Coolers unavailable to turn containment temperature. The operator would then make the conservative decision to implement the required action of emergency depressurization based on the given conditions. Implementing the action emergency depressurization is justified based on the given conditions and the definition of "cannot be maintained below". The definition, contained in EPSTG*0002, Definitions/Usage of Key Words/Phrases, states ". . . depending upon plant conditions, the action may be taken as soon as it is determined that the limit will ultimately be exceeded. . ."

NRC Resolution: Recommendation accepted; the question has two correct answers (A and D). Procedure EOP-2 stipulates that "When Containment Temperature Cannot be Maintained Below 185°F - Emergency Depressurization is Required" and the licensee's training provides the accepted definition of "cannot be maintained below," which is promulgated in EPSTG*0002.