

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Reports No. 50-373; 50-374/ OL-89-01

Docket Nos. 50-373; 50-374

Licenses No. NPF-11; NPF-18

Licensee: Commonwealth Edison Company  
LaSalle County Nuclear Station  
Marseilles, IL 61341

Facility Name: LaSalle County Nuclear Station

Examination Administered At: LaSalle County Nuclear Station

Examination Conducted: June 19-24, 1989

Examiner: D. Graves

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

M. Bielby

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

J. Muth

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

M. Morgan

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

T. Bettendorf

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

R. Orton

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

Chief Examiner: D. Graves

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

Approved By: M. Jordan

*M J Jorda for*

*8/1/89*

Date

### Examination Summary

Examination administered on June 19-24, 1989 (Report No. OL-89-01))

Written, oral and simulator replacement examinations were administered to nine SRO and four RO applicants.

Results: All nine SRO and four RO applicants passed these examinations.

No generic training weaknesses were noted during administration of the examination. Two simulator modeling infidelities were identified (Attachment 2).

## REPORT DETAILS

### 1. Examiners

D. Graves, Chief Examiner  
M. Bielby  
J. Muth  
M. Morgan  
T. Bettendorf  
R. Orton

### 2. Exit Meeting

At the conclusion of the examinations, an exit meeting was held. The following personnel attended:

#### Facility Representatives

G. Diederich, Station Manager  
W. Huntington, Services Superintendent  
J. Renwick, Production Superintendent  
J. Schmeltz, Assistant Superintendent Operations  
J. Walkington, Services Director  
J. Shaffer, Training Supervisor  
D. Sheldon, Training

#### US NRC Representatives

M. Bielby, Operator Licensing Examiner  
E. Rau, Operator Licensing  
B. Wetzel, Operator Licensing

#### The following items were discussed:

- a. No generic training weaknesses were noted during administration of the examination. It was noted that although the applicants could adequately answer questions on the site tagging procedure, they were unfamiliar with the procedure. This specific weakness was attributed to implementation of a significant revision on June 10, 1989.
- b. It was also noted that training manuals located in the control room were uncontrolled documents.
- c. Modeling infidelities of the simulators were noted per Enclosure 4.

### 3. Examination Review

Specific facility comments concerning written examination questions, followed by the NRC response are enumerated in Enclosure 2.



ENCLOSURE 2

NRC RESPONSE TO FACILITY COMMENTS  
ON THE RO WRITTEN EXAMINATION ADMINISTERED  
JUNE 19, 1989

Comment:

Question 2.05      Answer 1 should be revised to accept "close drive water pressure control valve" vice "open drive water pressure control valve." Per system designed operation, closing the drive water pressure control valve will increase drive water pressure.

Reference: LaSalle System Description Chapter 8, page 8.

Response: Comment accepted. Answer key revised.

Comment:

Question 3.16      No credit should be subtracted for answers that include a Group III isolation. Group III (Reactor Process Sample Valves) will also isolate on Main Steam Line High Rad conditions.

Reference: LOP-PC-03, pages 7 and 12.

Response: Comment accepted. Answer key revised.

Comment:

Question 3.18      Answer key should be revised to accept all answers which imply that the ground resistance has increased, or that a system ground has been removed.

Response: Comment accepted. Answer key revised.

Comment:

Question 4.02      Answer key should be revised to accept d as the only correct answer. As Keff approaches 1, the time that it takes to achieve a steady state neutron population for a given reactivity addition increases.

Response: Comment accepted. Answer key modified.

Reference: General Electric BWR Academic Series Reactor Theory.

Enclosure 2 (cont)

Comment:

Questions 6.36      Answer c is incorrect, the Shift Foreman is the Fire Brigade Chief. Answer key should be revised to accept answers b and or d. The A-mechanics do respond to a fire but technically are members of station fire company, not the fire brigade.

Response: Comment accepted, questions deleted (two correct answers).

Comment:

Question 6.37      Answer key should be revised to accept answer c or d. The answer to the question does not match the choice in the questions (i.e. answer key states Shift Engineer, question states person in management). Per LAP 1600-10, if an individual is unable to transfer the call to the Shift Engineer, the correct action is to find out as much as possible. Depending upon how the candidate interpreted management, answer c or d could be correct.

Response: Comment accepted, question deleted (two correct answers).

ENCLOSURE 4

SIMULATION FACILITY REPORT

Facility Licensee: LaSalle County Nuclear Station

Facility Licensee Docket No. 50-373, 50-374

Operating Tests Administered At: Braidwood Training Center (LaSalle Simulator)

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

ITEM

DESCRIPTION

(1). Modeling

(1). During Scenario 3-1, Loss of RBCCW, Recirc Pump high temperature alarm was received immediately but CRT displayed temperatures below the alarm setpoint. The backpanel recorder indications were not verified. Applicants chose to believe the CRT rather than responding to the alarm.

(2) Modeling

(2) During Scenario 2-1, Gross Fuel Element Failure with MSL "A" Failure to Isolate, RCIC Room Ventilation was lost and room temperature rapidly increased approximately 100°F in 10 minutes. According to plant operators 20-30°F per hour would be more realistic. The increased room temperatures gave high area temperature alarms and caused one candidate to initially mis-diagnose the event as a steam leak.