



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I
475 ALLENDALE ROAD
KING OF PRUSSIA, PA 19406-1415

August 31, 2010

Mr. John T. Carlin
Site Vice President
R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, NY 14519

SUBJECT: R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT - NRC EXAMINATION REPORT
05000244/2010301

Dear Mr. Carlin:

On June 25, 2010, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) completed an examination at Ginna. The enclosed report documents the examination findings, which were discussed on August 5, 2010, with Mr. Robert Adams of your staff.

The examination included the evaluation of three applicants for reactor operator licenses, five applicants for instant senior operator licenses, and four applicants for upgrade senior operator licenses. The written and operating examinations were developed using NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 9, Supplement 1. The license examiners determined that nine applicants satisfied the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55, and the appropriate licenses have been issued.

No findings of significance were identified during this examination.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 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,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Samuel L. Hansell, Jr.", is written over a horizontal line.

Samuel L. Hansell, Jr., Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket No. 50-244
License No. DPR-18

Enclosure: NRC Examination Report 05000244/2010301

cc w/encl: Distribution via ListServ

August 31, 2010

Mr. John T. Carlin
Site Vice President
R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, NY 14519

SUBJECT: R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT - NRC EXAMINATION REPORT
05000244/2010301

Dear Mr. Carlin:

On June 25, 2010, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) completed an examination at Ginna. The enclosed report documents the examination findings, which were discussed on August 5, 2010, with Mr. Robert Adams of your staff.

The examination included the evaluation of three applicants for reactor operator licenses, five applicants for instant senior operator licenses, and four applicants for upgrade senior operator licenses. The written and operating examinations were developed using NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 9, Supplement 1. The license examiners determined that nine applicants satisfied the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55, and the appropriate licenses have been issued.

No findings of significance were identified during this examination.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 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/

Samuel L. Hansell, Jr., Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket No. 50-244
License No. DPR-18

Enclosure: NRC Examination Report 05000244/2010301

cc w/encl: Distribution via ListServ

Distribution w/encl:
M. Dapas, Acting RA
D. Lew, Acting DRA
J. Clifford, DRP
D. Collins, DRP
D. Roberts, DRS
P. Wilson, DRS

L. Trocine, RI OEDO
G. Dentel, DRP
N. Perry, DRP
J. Hawkins, DRP
G. Hunegs, DRP, SRI
L. Casey, DRP, RI
M. Rose, DRP, OA

D. Bearde, DRS
RidsNrrPMREGinna Resource
RidsNrrDorLpl1-1 Resource
ROPreportsResource@nrc.gov
DRS Master Exam File

SUNSI Review Complete: TF (Reviewer's Initials)

DOCUMENT NAME: W:\DRS\Operations Branch\FISH\Exam 10-GIN Jun 10 (U01766)\Exam Report.doc

ADAMS PKG NO: ML092470059

ADAMS ML102430286

After declaring this document "An Official Agency Record" it will be released to the Public.

OFFICE	RI/DRS/OB	RI/DRS/OB	RI/DRS/OB	
NAME	CJBixler/TF	TFish/	SLHansell/	
DATE	8/31/2010	8/31/2010	8/31/2010	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

EXAMINATION REPORT

**U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION I**

Docket: 50-244

License: DPR-18

Report: 05000244/2010301

Licensee: CENG, A Joint Venture of Constellation Energy and EDF

Facility: R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC

Location: Ontario, NY

Dates: Operating Test: June 21 – 25, 2010
Written Test: July 1, 2010
Exam Grading: June 28 – July 21, 2010
Licenses Issued: August 5, 2010

Examiners: T. Fish, Chief Examiner
P. Presby, Operations Engineer
B. Fuller, Operations Engineer
D. Molteni, Operations Engineer

Approved By: Samuel L. Hansell, Jr., Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ER 05000244/2010301; June 21 – July 1, 2010; R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant; Initial Operator Licensing Examination Report.

NRC examiners evaluated the competency of three applicants for reactor operator licenses, five applicants for instant senior operator licenses, and four applicants for upgrade senior operator licenses at the Ginna facility. The facility licensee developed the examinations using NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 9, Supplement 1. The written examination was administered by the facility on July 1, 2010. Four NRC examiners administered the operating tests from June 21 – 25, 2010. The license examiners determined that nine applicants satisfied the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55, and the appropriate licenses have been issued.

A. NRC-Identified and Self-Revealing Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

B. Licensee-Identified Violations

None.

REPORT DETAILS

4. OTHER ACTIVITIES (OA)

4OA5 Other Activities (Initial Operator License Examination)

.1 License Applications

a. Scope

The examiners reviewed all 12 license applications submitted by the licensee to ensure the applications reflected that each applicant satisfied relevant eligibility requirements. The applications were submitted on NRC Form 398, "Personal Qualification Statement," and NRC Form 396, "Certification of Medical Examination by Facility Licensee." The examiner also audited two license applications in detail to confirm that they accurately reflected the applicants' qualifications. This audit focused on the applicants' experience, on-the-job training, and eligibility to sit for the instant senior operator license exams.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.2 Operator Knowledge and Performance

a. Examination Scope

On July 1, 2010, the licensee proctored the administration of the written examinations to all applicants. The licensee staff graded the written examinations, analyzed the results, and presented their analysis to the NRC on July 21, 2010.

The NRC examination team administered the various portions of the operating examination to all applicants from June 21 – 25, 2010. The three applicants for reactor operator licenses participated in three dynamic simulator scenarios, in a control room and facilities walkthrough test consisting of eleven system tasks, and an administrative test consisting of four administrative tasks. The five applicants seeking an instant senior operator license participated in at least two dynamic simulator scenarios, a control room and facilities walkthrough test consisting of ten system tasks, and an administrative test consisting of five administrative tasks. The four applicants seeking an upgrade senior operator license participated in at least one dynamic simulator scenario, 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 applicants passed all parts of the operating test. Nine of the applicants passed the written examination. For the written examinations, the reactor operator applicants' average score was 82.7 percent and ranged from 80 to 86.7 percent. The senior operator applicants' average score was 83.6 percent and ranged from 71 to 92 percent. The examination questions may be accessed in the ADAMS system under the accession number noted in Attachment 1.

Chapter ES-403 and Form ES-403-1 of NUREG 1021 require the licensee to analyze the validity of any written examination questions that were missed by half or more of the applicants. Seven questions met this criterion. The licensee conducted this performance analysis and submitted it to the chief examiner.

The licensee also submitted post-examination comments for three questions. These comments may be accessed in the ADAMS system under the accession number noted in Attachment 1. Two comments were related to answer key errors. The third comment was related to a question the facility believed had two correct answers based on ambiguity in the plant conditions provided in the question stem. After reviewing the licensee's comments, the NRC decided to accept all three comments, and graded the exam accordingly. See Attachment 2 for a summary of the licensee's comments and associated NRC response.

.3 Initial Licensing Examination Development

a. Examination Scope

The facility licensee developed the examinations in accordance with NUREG-1021, Revision 9, Supplement 1. All licensee facility training and operations staff involved in examination preparation and validation were on a security agreement. The facility licensee submitted both the written and operating examination outlines on April 8, 2010. The chief examiner reviewed the outlines against the requirements of the NUREG, and provided comments to the licensee. The facility licensee submitted the draft examination package on May 5, 2010. The chief examiner reviewed the draft examination package against the requirements of the NUREG, and provided comments to the licensee on the examination on May 21, 2010. The NRC conducted an onsite validation of the operating examinations and provided associated comments during the week of May 24, 2010. The facility licensee satisfactorily completed comment resolution on June 8, 2010.

b. Findings

The examiners determined that the written and operating examinations initially submitted by the licensee were within the range of acceptability for a proposed examination.

No findings of significance were identified.

.4 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.

.5 Examination Security

a. Examination Scope

The examiners reviewed examination security for examination development and during both 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.

4OA6 Meetings, Including Exit

The chief examiner presented the examination results to Mr. Robert Adams, Operations Training Manager, on August 5, 2010.

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

ATTACHMENT 1: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION
ATTACHMENT 2: SUMMARY OF FACILITY POST EXAM COMMENTS AND NRC
RESOLUTION OF FACILITY POST EXAM COMMENTS

ATTACHMENT 1

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

KEY POINTS OF CONTACT

Licensee Personnel

G. Cizin, Facility Exam Developer
P. Landers, Facility Exam Developer
R. Adams, Operations Training Manager

ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

Opened

NONE

Closed

NONE

Discussed

NONE

ADAMS DOCUMENTS REFERENCED

Accession No. ML102320386	FINAL-Written Exam
Accession No. ML092470059	Licensee Post-Exam Comments on Written Exam
Accession No. ML102320408	FINAL-Operating Exam

ATTACHMENT 2**SUMMARY OF FACILITY POST EXAM COMMENTS AND
NRC RESOLUTION OF FACILITY POST EXAM COMMENTS****Question 12:**

This question was related to reactor coolant pump (RCP) seal leakage. Given plant conditions that indicate "A" RCP has developed a seal leakage problem, the applicant is asked what actions are required. As originally proposed, the required action is to secure the RCP in eight hours.

During its post exam review, the facility noted this question had two correct answers for actions to take in response to indications of seal leakage: the original answer, choice A (secure the RCP in eight hours), as well as choice C (continue RCP operation, but increase surveillance frequency). The applicants were to base their choice of actions on the plant conditions provided in the question stem. Key among the given conditions was the 2.0 gpm leak rate into the reactor coolant drain tank (RCDT).

The facility staff noted the 2.0 gpm leak rate was ambiguous. The stem did not make clear whether the 2.0 gpm was the *initial* leak rate into the RCDT (before the RCP seal began to leak) or the *final* leak rate into the RCDT (after the RCP seal began to leak). Therefore, the rate of RCDT level increase - and the basis for any action to be taken regarding "A" RCP - had multiple answers. For example, if the applicant believed the initial leak rate into the RCDT was 2.0 gpm, and that it was now still 2.0 gpm, then the rate of level increase into the RCDT would be 0.0 gpm. This condition would then make choice C correct (continue pump operation, and increase surveillance frequency). However, if the applicant assumed the initial leak rate into the RCDT was 0.0 gpm, and that the leak rate had now increased to 2.0 gpm, then that increase would be 2.0 gpm. Such an increase would exceed permissible continued RCP operation, and therefore, choice A (as originally proposed) would be the correct answer.

NRC Resolution:

Comment accepted. The trend of the leak rate into the RCDT is crucial for determining what action to take regarding RCP operation. The plant conditions given in the question stem did not clearly provide this information. Therefore, two choices can correctly be picked, depending on how the applicants applied the given 2.0 gpm leak rate. Accordingly, choices A and C are both correct for this question.

Question 55:

During its post exam review, the facility staff noted an error in the answer key. B should have been shown as the correct answer, not D.

NRC Resolution:

Comment accepted. The answer key was wrong; the correct answer is choice B, not D.

Question 75:

During its post exam review, the facility staff noted an error in the answer key. D should have been shown as the correct answer, not B.

NRC Resolution:

Comment accepted. The answer key was wrong; the correct answer is choice D, not B.