June 16, 2005

Mr. T. Palmisano
Site Vice President
Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant
Nuclear Management Company, LLC
2807 West County Road 75
Monticello, MN 55362-9637

SUBJECT: MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT
NRC INITIAL LICENSE EXAMINATION REPORT NO. 05000263/2005301(DRS)

Dear Mr. Palmisano:

On May 12, 2005, Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) examiners completed initial operator licensing examinations at your Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant. The enclosed report documents the results of the examination which were discussed on May 12, 2005, with Mr. R. Jacobs and other members of your staff.

The NRC examiners administered an initial license examination operating test during the weeks of May 2 and May 9, 2005. A written examination was administered by Monticello Plant training department personnel on May 12, 2005. Four Reactor Operator and six Senior Reactor Operator applicants were administered license examinations. The results of the examinations were finalized on June 10, 2005. All applicants passed all sections of their respective examinations and were issued applicable operator licenses.

In accordance with 10 CFR Part 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosures will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records 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).

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

Sincerely,

/RA/

Hironori Peterson, Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket No. 50-263
License No. DPR-22

Enclosures:
1. Operator Licensing Examination Report 05000263/2005301(DRS)
2. Simulation Facility Report
3. Post Written Examination Comments and Resolutions
4. Written Examinations and Answer Keys (RO & SRO)

cc w/encl 1 & 2:
J. Cowan, Executive Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Manager, Regulatory Affairs
J. Rogoff, Vice President, Counsel, and Secretary
Nuclear Asset Manager, Xcel Energy, Inc.
Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Health
R. Nelson, President
Minnesota Environmental Control Citizens Association (MECCA)
Commissioner, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
D. Gruber, Auditor/Treasurer,
Wright County Government Center
Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Commerce
Manager - Environmental Protection Division
Minnesota Attorney General's Office

cc w/encl 1, 2, 3 & 4:
S. Halbert, Training Manager

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

Sincerely,

/RA/

Hironori Peterson, Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket No. 50-263
License No. DPR-22

Enclosures:
1. Operator Licensing Examination Report 05000263/2005301(DRS)
2. Simulation Facility Report
3. Post Written Examination Comments and Resolutions
4. Written Examinations and Answer Keys (RO & SRO)

cc w/encl 1 & 2:
J. Cowan, Executive Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Manager, Regulatory Affairs
J. Rogoff, Vice President, Counsel, and Secretary
Nuclear Asset Manager, Xcel Energy, Inc.
Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Health
R. Nelson, President
Minnesota Environmental Control Citizens Association (MECCA)
Commissioner, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency
D. Gruber, Auditor/Treasurer,
Wright County Government Center
Commissioner, Minnesota Department of Commerce
Manager - Environmental Protection Division
Minnesota Attorney General's Office

cc w/encl 1, 2, 3 & 4: S. Halbert, Training Manager

DOCUMENT NAME: G:DRS\ML051680162.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		RIII	
NAME	DMcNeil:tr		BBurgess		HPeterson			
DATE	06/14/05		06/14/05		06/16/05			

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ADAMS Distribution:
WDR
LMP
RidsNrrDipmIipb
GEG
KGO
SPR
CAA1
C. Pederson, DRS (hard copy - IR's only)
DRPIII
DRSIII
PLB1
JRK1
ROPreports@nrc.gov
MAB1
DCT

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Docket No:	50-263
License No:	DPR-22
Report No:	05000263/2005301(DRS)
Licensee:	Nuclear Management Company, LLC
Facility:	Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant
Location:	2807 West Highway 75 Monticello, MN 55362
Dates:	May 03 through May 12, 2005
Examiners:	D. McNeil, Reactor Engineer D. Reeser, License Examiner R. Walton, Reactor Engineer
Approved by:	H. Peterson, Chief Operations Branch Division of Reactor Safety

Enclosure 1

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ER 05000263/2005301(DRS); 05/03/2005 - 05/12/2005; Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant; Initial License Examination Report.

The announced operator licensing initial examination was conducted by regional Nuclear Regulatory Commission examiners in accordance with the guidance of NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 9.

Examination Summary:

Six Senior Reactor Operator applicants and four Reactor Operator applicants were administered initial operator license examinations. All applicants passed all sections of their respective examinations and were issued applicable operator licenses. (Section 4OA5.1)

REPORT DETAILS

4. OTHER ACTIVITIES (OA)

4OA5 Other

.1 Initial Licensing Examinations

a. Examination Scope

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) examiners conducted an announced operator licensing initial examination during the weeks of May 02 and May 09, 2005. The plant's training staff used the guidance established in NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 9, to prepare the examination outline and to develop the written examination and operating test. The NRC examiners administered the operating test between May 3, 2005, and May 11, 2005. Monticello Plant training department staff members administered the written examination on May 12, 2005. Four Reactor Operator and six Senior Reactor Operator applicants were examined.

b. Findings

Written Examination

The licensee developed the written examination. During the initial review of the examination, the examiners determined that the examination, as submitted by the licensee, was within the range of acceptability expected for a proposed examination. During examination validation the week of April 11, 2005, examination changes agreed upon between the NRC and the licensee were incorporated according to the guidance contained in NUREG-1021.

The licensee graded the examination on May 12, 2005, and on May 13, 2005, conducted a review of each question to determine accuracy and validity of the examination questions. The licensee submitted six post-examination comments on the written examination. Resolution for the comments can be found in Enclosure 3, "Post Written Examination Comments and Resolutions." None of the post-examination comments resulted in changes to the written examination applicant scores.

Operating Test

The NRC examiners determined that the operating test, as originally submitted by the licensee, was within the range of acceptability expected for a proposed examination. Examination changes made during the validation of the operating test were agreed upon between the NRC and the licensee, and were made in accordance with the guidelines provided in NUREG-1021.

Examination Results

All applicants passed all sections of their respective examinations and were issued applicable operator licenses.

.2 Examination Security

a. Inspection Scope

The NRC examiners reviewed and observed the licensee's implementation of examination security requirements during the examination preparation and administration.

b. Findings

The licensee's implementation of examination security requirements during examination preparation and administration were acceptable and met the guidelines provided in NUREG 1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors." During development of the examination, it was determined that one person's security badge was erroneously coded to allow that person access to the examination development room when the individual was not on the security agreement. Upon discovery, it was determined that the individual had not entered the examination development room, and was unaware the badge would allow access to the examination development room. Access to the room by the card was terminated. Because the unauthorized individual did not enter the room and did not view any examination material, no examination material was required to be replaced and no violation of 10 CFR 55.49 occurred.

4OA6 Meetings

.1 Exit Meeting

The chief examiner presented the examination team's preliminary observations and findings on May 12, 2005, to Mr. R. Jacobs and other members of the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant Operations and Training Department staff. No proprietary information was identified during the examination.

ATTACHMENT: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

KEY POINTS OF CONTACT

Licensee

J. Conway, Site Director
R. Bulduc, Supervisor, Operations Continuing Training
M. Carey, General Supervisor Operations Training
J. Earl, Supervisor Initial Operations Training
S. Halbert, Training Manager
R. Jacobs, Plant Manager
J. Kindred, Operations ILT Supervisor
B. MacKissock, Operations Manager
K. Markling, Control Room Supervisor
J. Ruth, Examination Developer
J. Shriver, Principle Engineering Analyst - Simulator
J. Sorensen, Vice President NMC Training

Nuclear Regulatory Commission

S. Ray, Acting Senior Resident Inspector, Monticello Plant

ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED AND DISCUSSED

Opened and Closed

None

Discussed

None

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

None

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED

ADAMS	Agency-Wide Document Access and Management System
DRS	Division of Reactor Safety
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Enclosure 2

SIMULATION FACILITY REPORT

Facility Licensee: Monticello Plant

Facility Docket No.: 50-263

Operating Tests Administered: May 03 - 12, 2005

The following documents observations made by the NRC examination team during the initial operator license 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:

ITEM	DESCRIPTION
PCV-7497A	PIC-7497A operation appeared to be erratic while being operated during a Job Performance Measure. Simulator change number 2005DR013 was issued to track this condition.
RWM	While performing a control rod block surveillance, the rod worth minimizer error message was different than the message called for in the surveillance. Simulator change number 2005DR062 was issued to track this condition.
Rod Control	Several applicants noted problems with the simulator “double notching” when they were manipulating control rods. Apparently, this is not consistent with the operating plant because of seal leakage, etc. Simulator change number 2005DR061 was issued to track this condition.

Enclosure 3

Post Written Examination Comments and Resolutions

Question #11 Applicant Comment:

The question asks for conditions that would result in an automatic Group 5 isolation. One of the distractors (C) states "ONE of the FOUR groups of high area temperature switches greater than the setpoint." The applicant provided a comment that this answer should be accepted as correct because if all four switches in the group were above the setpoint an automatic Group 5 isolation would occur.

Facility response: The question grading for the exam should not change. The statement should be read as only one of the switches is greater than the setpoint. Eight of the nine applicants did not get confused with the distractor wording. Recommend an editorial change prior to placement in the INPO exam bank to distractor C to eliminate any confusion in the future. Distractor C should be changed to read "ONE switch in ONE of the FOUR groups of high area temperature switches greater than the setpoint."

NRC resolution: After reviewing the question, the NRC agreed that the grading for the question should not change. A note in the reference section for this question will indicate the proposed change when the examination is sent to INPO.

Question #12 Applicant Comment:

The question gives conditions of the plant during a transient involving a group 1 isolation. The question then asks for which EOP's would be entered for the conditions given. The applicant provided a comment that the stem stated that a group isolation occurred, and both HPCI and RCIC were running which would all add significant heat to the torus and thus an entry to C.5-1200 PRIMARY CONTAINMENT CONTROL may be necessary on torus temperature. The applicant recommends providing a time frame in the stem or providing a torus temperature.

Facility response: The question grading for the exam should not change. The statement in the stem of "to this point" indicates the question is asking about a time frame directly following the conditions stated. All nine applicants chose the correct answer. Recommend making an editorial change to clarify the stem prior to placement in the INPO exam bank. The stem should state, "Assuming no operator action occurred to this point, which EOP's should the crew enter at the time the conditions listed above occurred?"

NRC resolution: After reviewing the question, the NRC agreed that the grading for the question should not change. A note in the reference section for this

question will indicate the proposed change when the examination is sent to INPO.

Question #19 Applicant Comment:

The question gives conditions of a transient involving a 2R transformer lockout. The question then asks "Based on the above, the operator should insert a manual scram due to . . .". Three of the answer choices involve equipment trips. The choices involving equipment trips are A) Both Feed Pump breakers trip, B) Both Recirc Pumps trip, and D) Both Circ Water pump breakers trip. The applicant recommends removing the word "breaker" from answer choices A and D to eliminate any confusion.

Facility response: The question grading for the exam should not change. All nine applicants chose the correct answer. For the conditions stated, it is appropriate to ask the conditions of equipment breakers. Recommend making an editorial change prior to placement in the INPO exam bank. Change distractor B to "Both Recirc Pump breakers trip" to provide consistency in answer choices.

NRC resolution: After reviewing the question, the NRC agreed that the grading for the question should not change. A note in the reference section for this question will indicate the proposed change when the examination is sent to INPO.

Question #48 Applicant Comment:

The question gives conditions of the SBGT system. The question then asks the expected automatic response for SBGT Train "B". The correct answer was A) B SBGT started when "the Low Flow annunciator came in." The applicant recommends an editorial change to clarify the time between the start setpoint of 2800 CFM and the alarm setpoint of 3000 CFM.

Facility response: The question grading for the exam should not change. Five of the nine applicants chose the correct answer. The four candidates who chose an incorrect answer all chose B, "the 30 sec low flow time delay relay timed out". This answer is clearly incorrect as this relay is only in affect during initial start and the question stem stated that the low flow alarm came in after 5 minutes. From the order of conditions given in the stem, it does not state a time lag between the annunciator coming in and the low flow indication. Given these conditions, answer A is correct. Recommend making an editorial change prior to placement in the INPO exam bank. Change the conditions listed in the stem to clarify that the indication of 2500 CFM occurs at the time the low flow annunciator is received. This can be accomplished by combining the third and fourth bulleted items in the stem.

NRC resolution: After reviewing the question, the NRC agreed that the grading for the question should not change. A note in the reference section for this

question will indicate the proposed change when the examination is sent to INPO.

Question #64 Applicant Comment:

The question gives conditions following a Reactor scram and resetting of the scram. The question then asks where the source of the Reactor Building radiation condition is. The correct answer was A) Reactor Building Drain Tank. The applicant states the correct answer should be "C", Reactor Building Floor Drain Sump, since the Reactor Building Floor and Equipment drain tanks would overflow into the Reactor Building Floor Drain Sump if it was overfilled. He also states that a "Reactor building Drain Tank" does not exist.

Facility Response: The question grading for the exam should not change. Eight of the nine applicants chose the correct answer. Though answer "A" is incomplete, it is clearly the correct answer as the Scram discharge volume drains to the Reactor Building Floor and Equipment drain tanks. Given no other conditions in the stem that would indicate a tank overflow, answer "C" would be incorrect. Recommend making an editorial change prior to placement in the INPO exam bank. The change would be to change answer A to "Reactor Building Equipment Drain Tank."

NRC resolution: After reviewing the question, the NRC agreed that the grading for the question should not change. A note in the reference section for this question will indicate the proposed change when the examination is sent to INPO.

Question #84 Applicant Comment:

The question gives conditions during a RPV cooldown. The question then asks what direction the CRS should give next. The correct answer was B) stop the cooldown for a minimum of 15 minutes. The applicant states that the actual minimum time is 6 minutes based on figure 2, Reactor Depressurization Rate.

Facility response: The question grading for the exam should not change. Five of the six SRO applicants chose the correct answer. Though answer "B" contains the word minimum, it is still the correct answer because it would not be incorrect to wait an additional period of time to provide margin to the cooldown limit of figure 2. Recommend making an editorial change prior to placement in the INPO exam bank. The change would be to change answer B to removed the word minimum.

NRC resolution: After reviewing the question, the NRC agreed that the grading for the question should not change. A note in the reference section for this question will indicate the proposed change when the examination is sent to INPO.

Enclosure 4

WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS AND ANSWER KEYS (RO/SRO)

RO/SRO Initial Examination ADAMS Accession No. ML051600455.