



Nebraska Public Power District

Always there when you need us

NLS2008037
March 27, 2008

Stephen M. Garchow,
Chief Examiner, Region IV
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
611 Ryan Plaza Dr. Suite 400
Arlington, TX 76011-4005

Subject: Post-Examination Review Documentation
Cooper Nuclear Station, Docket No. 50-298, DPR-46

Reference: NUREG 1021, Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors,
Revision 9.

The purpose of this correspondence is to transmit post-examination review documentation resulting from the Reactor Operator and Senior Reactor Operator initial licensing examinations which were administered at Cooper Nuclear Station (CNS) the week of March 17, 2008.

Pursuant to the Reference above, a post-examination analysis was performed. The graded written examinations (i.e., each applicant's original answer and examination cover sheets) plus a clean copy of each applicant's answer sheet (ES-403, "Grading Initial Site-Specific Written Examinations") were carried by you on your departure from CNS. The remaining examination documentation required by Section ES-501, C. 1 of the Reference is enclosed and includes the following.

- Master examination(s) and answer key(s), annotated to indicate any changes made while administering and grading the examination(s).
- Questions asked by and answers given to the applicants during the written examination.
- Substantive comments made by the applicants following the written examination, with an explanation concerning why the comment was accepted or rejected. Two documented comments and CNS Nuclear Training Procedure 5.2 are provided.
- Written examination seating chart.
- Completed Form ES-403-1, "Written Examination Grading Quality Checklist".

COOPER NUCLEAR STATION

P.O. Box 98 / Brownville, NE 68321-0098

Telephone: (402) 825-3811 / **Fax:** (402) 825-5211

www.nppd.com

- Results of written examination performance analysis, with recommended substantive changes.
- Original Form(s) ES-201-3, "Examination Security Agreement," with a pre- and post-examination signature by every individual who had detailed knowledge of any part of the operating tests or written examination before they were administered.
- Excerpted pages B-6-40 through B-6-49 from CNS Emergency Operating Procedures Bases Document, PSTG/SATG, AMP-TBD00, Technical Basis – Appendix B.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact me at (402) 825-2904 or David Werner, Operations Training Superintendent, at (402) 825-5751.

Sincerely,



David W. Van Der Kamp
Licensing Manager

/em

Enclosure

cc: Nuclear Training Manager w/o encl

Operations Training Superintendent w/o encl

CNS Records w/o encl

Correspondence Number: **NLS2008037**

The following table identifies those actions committed to by Nebraska Public Power District (NPPD) in this document. Any other actions discussed in the submittal represent intended or planned actions by NPPD. They are described for information only and are not regulatory commitments. Please notify the Licensing Manager at Cooper Nuclear Station of any questions regarding this document or any associated regulatory commitments.

COMMITMENT	COMMITMENT NUMBER	COMMITTED DATE OR OUTAGE
None		

Cooper Nuclear Station
2008 Initial License Training
Exam Analysis

Overall the Cooper Nuclear Station NRC Exam was taken on 3-14-08 by one Reactor Operator, one Instant Senior Reactor Operator and four upgrade Senior Reactor Operators.

The following is the results of the examination analysis for each question that was missed at a rate of 50% or higher:

- RO 2 This question dealt with electrical interlocks for one of the feeder breakers to the emergency bus 1F. This question scored a 50% success rate, with choice “a” being the correct answer. This question is valid, correct as written and contains no psychometric flaws.
- RO 9 This question dealt with pneumatics to the main steam line isolation valves when nitrogen is returned to service and air is lost. While taking the exam the students had a question about the meaning of the phrase “What MSIV pneumatic function(s) is/are lost,” and asked “Are we to assume that the system is leak tight and are we to assume that the accumulators are not there?” My response back to them was that all the information is there and to reread the question. This question scored a 50% success rate, with choice “b” being the correct answer. This question is valid, correct as written and contains no psychometric flaws.
- RO 15 This question dealt with the procedural requirement to secure Torus Sprays before pressure lowers to 0 psig. While taking the exam the students has a question about whether this was procedural or system requirements. They were all told “Procedural”. This question scored a 50% success rate, with choice “c” being the correct answer. This question is valid, correct as written and contains no psychometric flaws.
- RO 25 This question dealt with the Secondary Containment Tech Spec 3.6.1.4 and whether or not it was met when moving spent fuel in the fuel pool. **This question is incorrect as written.** The explanation for the question referenced the bases definition for recently irradiated fuel. With the reactor shutdown for five days the fuel that is being moved in the fuel pool cannot meet the definition of recently irradiated and therefore the correct answer should be “a” No TS entry is required. Change Key to make correct answer “a”.
- RO 58 This question dealt with where some RHR components can be operated. This question contains a typo in choice “c” instead of “ADS Room” it should read “ASD Room”, this was pointed out by one of the students. This correction should be made before this question is added to the exam bank. This question scored a 50% success rate, with choice “b” being the correct answer. This question is

valid, correct as written and contains the typo listed above and no other psychometric flaws.

- RO 63 This question dealt with the response of the off-gas system as reactor power is raised. This question scored a 33% success rate, with choice “b” being the correct answer. This question is valid, correct as written and contains no psychometric flaws.
- SRO 15 This question dealt with the entry into emergency procedures during a loss of off-site power. **This question is incorrect as written**; the correct answer is choice “d” not “b” as the key indicates. The key’s answer was based on an operations policy that is not documented anywhere, not by procedure. The Operation Procedure Policy 2.0.1.2 states in section 6.3 Entry and Exit Conditions step 6.3.2.2 “When abnormal or emergency plant conditions are consistent with Procedure Entry Conditions: a. Entry conditions are formatted as a list. Generally, if any entry condition is met, the procedure should be entered unless the entry condition specifies entry based on a logic term (e.g., “and”, “or”, “if”, “if not, and “when”).” The key should be changed to choice “d” as the correct answer.
- SRO 21 This question dealt with the SRO’s responsibility as the refueling supervisor and which activity is required to be supervised by them. This question scored a 20% success rate, with choice “c” being the correct answer. This question is valid, correct as written and contains no psychometric flaws.