

Mary Ann

Docket No. 50-373
Docket No. 50-374

DEC - 2 1992

Commonwealth Edison Company
ATTN: Mr. Cordell Reed
Senior Vice President
Licensing Department - Suite 300
Opus West III
1400 Opus Place
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Dear Mr. Reed:

SUBJECT: INITIAL AND REQUALIFICATION EXAMINATION REPORT

During the week of October 26, 1992, Mr. D. McNeil and others of this office administered initial license examinations to employees of your organization who operate and direct fuel movement at your LaSalle County Station. A requalification examination and a requalification re-take examination were also administered to two employees who operate your LaSalle County Station. At the conclusion of the examination, any generic findings that evolved as a result of the examinations were discussed with those members of your staff identified in the enclosed report. All individuals passed all sections of their respective examination.

Due to the small sampling size, no evaluation was made of your requalification program. The LaSalle County Station requalification program remains satisfactory based on the results of the previous requalification examination.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the Commission's regulations, a copy of this letter and the enclosures will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room.

Should you have any questions concerning this examination, please contact us.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY GEOFFREY C. WRIGHT

Geoffrey C. Wright, Chief
Operations Branch

See Attached Enclosures
and Distribution

RIII
McNeil
McNeil/cg
12/2/92

RIII
Alan for MJJ
Jordan
12/2/92

Yes
RIII
bc
for Hague
12/2/92

RIII
Wright
Wright
12/2/92

Enclosures:

1. Examination Report
No. 50-373/OL-92-02
2. Examinations and
Answer Keys (SRO/RO)
3. Simulation Facility Report
4. Requalification Program Evaluation Report

cc w/enclosures:

D. Galle, Vice President - BWR
Operations
T. Kovach, Nuclear
Licensing Manager
J. Schmeltz, Acting Station
Manager
DCD/DCB (RIDS)
OC/LFDCB
Resident Inspectors LaSalle
Dresden, Quad Cities
Richard Hubbard
J. W. McCaffrey, Chief, Public
Utilities Division
Patricia O'Brien, Governor's
Office of Consumer Services
Licensing Project Manager, NRR
Robert Newmann, Office of Public
Counsel, State of Illinois Center

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Report No. 50-373/OL-92-02

Docket Nos. 50-373; 50-374

Licenses No. NPF-11; NPF-18

Licensee: Commonwealth Edison Company
Licensing Department - Suite 300
Opus West III
1400 Opus Place
Downers Grove, IL 60515

Facility Name: LaSalle County Station

Examination Administered At: LaSalle County Station,
Marseilles, IL

Examination Conducted: 10/15/92 --- Regualification Retake Exam
10/23/92 --- Regualification for a
Limited Senior Reactor
Operator and an initial
exam for a Limited Senior
Reactor Operator Exam
Week of 10/26/92 --- Initial Exam

Examiners: R. L. Doornbos, Region III
M. N. Leach, Region III
H. Peterson, Region III
C. M. Zelig, Region III

Chief Examiner:

D. R. McNeil

12/1/92
Date

Approved By:

M. J. Jordan, Chief
Operator Licensing Section 1

12/1/92
Date

Examination Summary

Examination Administered on October 15 - 30, 1992 (Report No. 50-373/OL 92/02(DRS)): Reactor Operator (RO) examinations were administered to three candidates. Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) examinations were administered to four SRO-Instant candidates and three SRO-Upgrade candidates. A Senior Reactor Operator Limited to Fuel Handling examination was given to one candidate. A regualification re-take examination (Job Performance Measures (JPMs) portion) was given to one operator and a regualification examination was given to one SRO Limited to Fuel Handling.

Results: All individuals examined passed their respective examination.

The following is a summary of the strengths and weaknesses noted during the performance of this examination.

Strengths:

- o Crew communications during dynamic simulator scenarios.
(For details see Section 3c.)

Weaknesses:

- o Lack of familiarity with location of in-plant components during JPM walkthroughs. (For details see Section 3b.)

REPORT DETAILS

1. Examiners

D. R. McNeil, Region III - Chief Examiner
R. L. Doornbos, Region III
M. N. Leach, Region III
H. Peterson, Region III
C. M. Zelig, Region III

2. Persons Contacted

Facility

* J. Schmultz, Production Superintendent
* W. R. Huntington, Technical Superintendent
* H. J. Hentschel, Assistant Superintendent of Operating
*+T. J. Shaffer, Training Supervisor
* J. K. Walkington, Services Director
* J. E. Lockwood, Radiological Protection Supervisor
* S. Harmon, Operations Training Group Leader
+R. L. Calvin, Training Department
+T. Johnson, Training Department
+G. Graff, Training Department
+R. Guthrie, Training Department
+J. Williams, Training Department
+G. Dubois, Training Department
+M. Dowd, Training Department
+C. Essington, Training Department
+R. Simers, Training Department
+M. D. Schaible, Training Department

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)

*+M. J. Jordan, RIII, Chief, OLB Section 1
*+D. R. McNeil, RIII, Chief Examiner
*+R. L. Doornbos, RIII Examiner
M. N. Leach, RIII Examiner
*+H. Peterson, RIII Examiner
*+C. Zelig, RIII Examiner
* D. Hills, SRI, LaSalle County Station
*+W. Gleaves, RIII Intern

*Denotes those present at the exit meeting on
October 29, 1992.

+Denotes those present at the training exit meeting on
October 29, 1992.

3. License Training Program Observations

The initial license training program appears to be functioning well as evidenced by the 100% pass rate. Candidates appeared well prepared for the examination. Training department personnel were responsive to the needs of license candidates and in assisting the NRC in developing this examination.

The requalification program was not evaluated due to the small sample size. The training department personnel responsible for preparing and conducting this examination were excellent at giving cues even when the operators made errors.

The following information from both the initial examinations and the requalification examinations is provided for evaluation by the licensee via their SAT based training program. No response is required.

a. Written Examination

Strength:

- o The pre-exam review was thorough. There were no post examination comments.

Weaknesses:

- o There was an identified weakness in knowledge of administrative daily exposure limits. Two of three RO candidates chose incorrect (non-conservative) values for Radiation Work Permit (RWP) daily exposure limits at LaSalle.

b. Job Performance Measures (JPMs)

Strengths:

- o All candidates successfully performed all JPMs on the examination.

Weaknesses:

- o While performing JPMs in the plant it was noted that some SRO-Instant (SROI) candidates were not familiar with some component locations. For example, three of four SROI candidates had

difficulty locating E12-F063C and E12-F388C (CY and LPCI cross-connect valves) when they were directed to lineup CY to LPCI "C" as an alternate injection system. One SROI candidate stated he had not spent much time in the plant.

- o Several SRO candidates were slow in making Protective Action Recommendations during a simulated GSEP event. One SRO candidate stated that this area of training had not been emphasized.

c. Dynamic Simulator Scenarios

Strengths:

- o All candidates displayed excellent communications skills during the dynamic scenarios. SRO candidates kept their crews informed of plant status and their intended recovery actions. All candidates used the "closed-loop" method of communications, repeating back orders and acknowledging verbal responses. It is noteworthy that proper three-way communications never broke down, even during the most intensive parts of the dynamic scenarios.

Weaknesses:

- o There were no major weaknesses noted in this area.

4. General

a. Training

- o Training department personnel were professional and conscientious in execution of their duties and responsibilities. Their assistance in dry-running the dynamic scenarios and their suggestions for improvements contributed to the overall exam quality. One item that needed clarification was the difference between the simulator performance during the dry-run scenarios and the actual examination scenarios. The simulator operators had inserted a batch file into the computer program during the scenario dry-run which caused decay heat to be extremely high. When the examination was conducted, this batch file was not inserted, leading to differing results. The simulator should not be changed between the dry-run and actual examination.

- o The facility's detailed written examination review resulted in many good comments; most were incorporated into the exam before it was administered.
- b. Operations, Security, Rad Protection, Other
- o Operations, Security, and Rad Protection personnel were professional and courteous. Operations personnel assisted in the review of the written examination. Their effort in this area was significant.
 - o The power block appeared clean and well lighted, especially for an outage.
 - o During the operating test, a candidate attempting to determine reactor vessel level from outside the control room was directed by LOA-AP-08 "Loss of All AC Power" to the local instrument racks in the reactor building, 761' level. The candidate stated that the local instruments at that location had been removed recently, but the procedure he was using (TSC copy) had not been updated. A followup inspection by the examiner determined the candidate was correct and the procedure was in error.
 - o A CECO employee was observed jumping over a radcon barrier from a clean area into an RCA. Although this is not a radiological control problem, it is a personnel safety concern and demonstrates a lack of professionalism. This was an isolated incident.

5. Simulator Observations

Simulator discrepancies were identified. These discrepancies are noted in Enclosure 3.

6. Exit Meeting

An exit meeting was held at the LaSalle County Station, in the new service building, on October 29, 1992. Those attending the meetings are listed in Section 2 of this report. The following items were discussed during the exit meeting:

- o Strengths and weaknesses noted in this report.
- o The general observations relating to the plant noted in section 4.

ENCLOSURE 3

SIMULATION FACILITY REPORT

Facility: LaSalle County Station

Docket No. 50-373

Operating Tests Administered On: October 26 - 30, 1992

The following documents observations made by the NRC examination team during the October, 1992 initial examination. These observations do not constitute audit or inspection findings and are not, without further verification and review, indicative of non-compliance with 10 CFR 55.45(b). These observations do not affect NRC certification or approval of the simulation facility other than to provide information which may be used in future evaluations. No licensee action is required in response to these observations.

During the conduct of the simulator portion of the operating tests, the following items were observed:

<u>ITEM</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
CRD P/Bs	The control rod insert/withdrawal pushbuttons must be depressed an excessive amount of time compared to the actual plant. This is a known simulator problem.
CRTs	Control room CRT indications were erratic during the dynamic scenarios, especially when temperature displays were selected. This is a known simulator problem.
SBGT Flow	As flow rates in the Standby Gas Treatment System changed, they changed in a stepped (non-smooth) fashion. This is a known simulator problem.
Decay heat	During the dry-run of the simulator scenarios, a batch file was inserted, increasing the amount of decay heat. This batch file was not inserted during the actual examination scenarios. The end results of the scenarios were then different than those expected by the NRC. Review of the dynamics of the increased decay heat may be necessary to obtain proper simulator response.

ENCLOSURE 4

REQUALIFICATION PROGRAM EVALUATION REPORT

Facility: LaSalle County Nuclear Power Station

Examiners: D. McNeil, Chief Examiner, RIII
R. Doornbos, Examiner, RIII
M. Leach, Examiner, RIII

Dates of Evaluation: October 15, & 23, 1992

Areas Evaluated: X Written X Oral

Examination Results:

	LSRO	^{RO} SRO	Total	Evaluation
	<u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>(S or U)</u>
Written Exam:	<u>1/0</u>	<u> </u>	<u>1/0</u>	<u>S</u>
Operating Exam				
Oral	<u>1/0</u>	<u>1/0</u>	<u>2/0</u>	<u>S</u>
Simulator	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>N/A</u>
Evaluation of facility written examination grading				<u>S</u>

Crew Examination Results:

	Crew 1	Crew 2	Crew 3
	<u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Pass/Fail</u>	<u>Pass/Fail</u>
Operating Examination	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>

Overall Program Evaluation

Satisfactory N/A Unsatisfactory N/A

RIII
DM
McNeil
Examiner
12/1/92

RIII
Jordan for MSL
Jordan
Section Chief
12/1/92

RIII
Wright
Wright
Branch Chief
12/2/92