

June 25, 2003

Mr. John L. Skolds, President  
Exelon Nuclear  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
4300 Winfield Road  
Warrenville, Illinois 60555

SUBJECT: LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2  
NRC INITIAL LICENSE EXAMINATION REPORT 50-373/03-301;  
50-374/03-301(DRS)

Dear Mr. Skolds:

On May 23, 2003, the NRC completed administration of initial operator licensing examinations at your LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2. The enclosed report presents the results of the examinations.

NRC examiners administered the operating test during the week of May 19, 2003. Members of the LaSalle County Station training staff administered the written examination on May 23, 2003. Four Reactor Operator (RO) and three Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) applicants were administered license examinations. The results of the examinations were finalized on June 13, 2003. Six applicants passed all sections of their respective examinations. One SRO applicant that failed the written examination and operating test will not be issued an operator license. One RO applicant scored an 80 percent on the written examination and, in accordance with the guidelines of NUREG 1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," ES-501.D.3.c, that RO applicant's license will be withheld until any appeal rights of the proposed SRO applicant failure are exhausted.

In accordance with 10 CFR Part 2.790 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).

J. Skolds

-2-

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

Sincerely,

**/RA/**

Roger D. Lanksbury, Chief  
Operations Branch  
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket No. 50-373; 50-374  
License No. NPF-11; NPF-18

Enclosures: 1. Operator Licensing Examination  
Report 50-373/03-301(DRS); 50-374/03-301(DRS)  
2. Post Exam Comments and Resolution  
3. Simulation Facility Report  
4. Written Examinations and Answer  
Keys (RO & SRO)

cc w/encl: Site Vice President - LaSalle County Station  
LaSalle County Station Plant Manager  
Regulatory Assurance Manager - LaSalle  
Chief Operating Officer  
Senior Vice President - Nuclear Services  
Senior Vice President - Mid-West Regional  
Operating Group  
Vice President - Mid-West Operations Support  
Vice President - Licensing and Regulatory Affairs  
Director Licensing - Mid-West Regional  
Operating Group  
Manager Licensing - Clinton and LaSalle  
Senior Counsel, Nuclear, Mid-West Regional  
Operating Group  
Document Control Desk - Licensing  
M. Aguilar, Assistant Attorney General  
Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety  
State Liaison Officer  
Chairman, Illinois Commerce Commission

cc w/encls 1, 2, 3 & 4: C. Dieckmann, Jr., Training Manager

DOCUMENT NAME: G:DRS\ML031770501.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		
NAME	MBielby:aa	BBurgess	RLanksbury		
DATE	6/25/03	6/25/03	6/25/03		

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

ADAMS Distribution:

AJM

DCT

DFT

DMS6

RidsNrrDipmlipb

GEG

HBC

DEK

C. Ariano (hard copy)

DRPIII

DRSIII

PLB1

JRK1

M. Bies

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Docket Nos: 50-373, 50-374

License Nos: NPF-11, NPF-18

Report No: 50-373/03-301; 50-374/03-301

Licensee: Exelon Generation Company, LLC

Facility: LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2

Location: 2601 N. 21st Road  
Marseilles, IL 61341

Dates: May 19 through 23, 2003

Examiners: M. Bielby, RIII NRC Chief Examiner  
C. Phillips, RIII NRC Examiner  
K. Walton, RIII NRC Examiner  
C. Zoia, RIII NRC Examiner in certification  
R. Caniano, RIII NRC Observer  
R. Lanksbury, RIII NRC Observer  
C. Rogue-Cruz, RIII NRC Observer

Approved by: Roger Lanksbury, Chief  
Operations Branch  
Division of Reactor Safety

## SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ER 05000373-03-301(DRS), ER 05000374-03-301(DRS); Exelon Generation Company, LLC; on 5/19-23/2003, LaSalle County Station; Units 1 & 2; Initial License Examination Report.

The announced operator licensing initial examination was conducted by regional examiners in accordance with the guidance of NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 8, Supplement 1.

### Examination Summary:

- Seven examinations (four Reactor Operator (RO) and three Senior Reactor Operator (SRO)) were administered.
- One SRO applicant failed the written examination and operating test and will not be issued an operator license. (Section 4OA5.1)
- Six applicants (four RO and two SRO) passed all sections of their respective examinations. Five applicants were issued applicable operator licenses. One applicant scored an 80 percent on the written examination and will not receive an RO license until appeal rights of the SRO applicant who failed the examination are exhausted. (Section 4OA5.1)

## **REPORT DETAILS**

### **4. OTHER ACTIVITIES (OA)**

#### 4OA5 Other

##### .1 Initial Licensing Examinations

###### a. Examination Scope

The NRC examiners conducted an announced operator licensing initial examination during the week of May 19, 2003. The facility's training staff used the guidance established in NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 8, Supplement 1, Addendum 1, to prepare the examination outline and to develop the written examination and operating test. The NRC examiners administered the operating test during the week of May 19, 2003. Members of the LaSalle training department administered the written examination on May 23, 2003. Four Reactor Operator (RO) and three Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) applicants were examined.

###### b. Findings

###### Written Examination

The licensee developed the written examination. During their initial review, the NRC 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 28, 2003, examination changes agreed upon between the NRC and the licensee were incorporated according to the guidance contained in NUREG-1021.

###### 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, agreed upon between the NRC and the licensee, were made according to NUREG-1021.

###### Examination Results

Four RO applicants and three SRO applicants were administered written examinations and operating tests for initial operator licensing. Six applicants passed all sections of their respective examinations. One SRO applicant failed the written examination and operating test and will not be issued a license. One RO applicant scored an 80 percent on the written examination and will not receive a license until all appeal rights of the SRO applicant that failed the written examination and operating test are exhausted. Should the senior reactor operator candidate who failed the written examination and operating test appeal, a subsequent review of the written exam may result in question deletions or changes which may affect the licensing decision of the RO applicant with a score of 80.

The other five applicants were issued applicable operator licenses.

.2 Examination Security

a. Inspection Scope

The NRC examiners briefed the facility contact on the NRC's requirements and guidelines related to examination physical security (e.g., access restrictions and simulator considerations) and integrity (e.g., predictability and bias). The examiners observed the implementation of examination security and integrity measures (e.g., security agreements, sampling criteria, bank use, and test item repetition) throughout the examination process.

b. Findings

The NRC examiners determined that the licensee's examination security practices associated with the development and administration of these operator license examinations were satisfactory.

4OA6 Meetings

Exit Meeting

The chief examiner presented the examination team's preliminary observations and findings on May 23, 2003, to Mr. Barnes and other members of the Operations and Training Department staff. The licensee acknowledged the observations and findings presented.

**PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED**

Licensee

G. Barnes, Site Vice President  
C. Dieckmann, Training Director  
D. Enright, Operations Manager  
M. Entwistle, Operations Training Manager  
G. Kaegi, Regulatory Assurance Manager  
S. Landahl, Station Manager  
J. Rappeport, NOS Lead Assessor  
S. Russell, MWROG, Operations Training

NRC

M. Bielby, Chief Examiner  
D. Kimble, Senior Resident Inspector  
C. Zoia, Examiner in Training

## **LIST OF ACRONYMS USED**

ADAMS	Agency-Wide Document Access and Management System
DRS	Division of Reactor Safety
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
PARS	Publicly Available Records
RO	Reactor Operator
SRO	Senior Reactor Operator



Post Examination Comments and Resolution

Question #56 on the Reactor Operator and Senior Reactor Operator examination was reviewed:

QUESTION: 056 (1.00)

Unit 1 Primary Containment Chillers A & C are off.

Unit 1 Primary Containment Chiller "B" trips.

Which below describes...

- (1) the status of containment cooling, AND
  - (2) the expected IMMEDIATE (within one minute) effect on Unit 1 Drywell pressure?
- A. (1) All cooling is lost.  
(2) Drywell pressure will rise.
  - B. (1) All cooling is lost.  
(2) Drywell pressure will remain constant.
  - C. (1) Limited cooling is still maintained.  
(2) Drywell pressure will rise.
  - D. (1) Limited cooling is still maintained.  
(2) Drywell pressure will remain constant.

Comment: The answer key stated the correct answer was "C." The correct answer is "D." The explanation in the answer key supports "D" as the correct answer.

Resolution: The submitted lesson plan reference (with applicable paragraph circled) for the question was entitled "096 Primary Containment Cooling," page 16 of 56, paragraph "7. Chiller Unit Trip," LIC Objective 096.00.12 was also identified. The identified reference did not support question answer "D." As stated in the reference, the Holdup Tank provides enough cooling to allow starting standby equipment; however, the same paragraph also states that Drywell air temperature and pressure will begin to rise when the chiller unit trips. As a result, the reference supports the original answer "C."

Question #80 on the Senior Reactor Operator examination was reviewed:

QUESTION: 080 (1.00)

Unit 1 is Refuel.

Spent fuel movements within the Unit 1 Spent fuel pool are in progress.

Post Examination Comments and Resolution  
(continued)

Which of the following is the minimum water level that would meet the requirements to perform this evolution?

\_\_\_\_\_ above the spent fuel seated in the fuel pool.

- A. 20 feet
- B. 21 feet
- C. 22 feet
- D. 23 feet

Comment: The question asked the minimum water level in the fuel pool that would still allow fuel movement. Validation of the exam looked strictly at the Technical Specification requirement ( $\geq 21.4$  feet) and not the EAL threshold value of 23 feet as stated in the MU11 of the LaSalle Annex. This level would require an Unusual Event classification and support the action of stopping fuel moves. The correct answer was changed from "C" to "D."

Resolution: NRC examiner, licensee training, and an operations representative agreed during the facility written examination review that the question term "minimum water level that would meet the requirements..." was sufficient to illicit the water level identified in Technical Specification 3.7.8. The EAL (Emergency Action Level) MU11 is based on an "unplanned decrease in Spent Fuel Pool level" which was not part of the initial conditions. Basically, the question asked for the minimum required water level for spent fuel movement, and that minimum water level was specified by Technical Specifications. There was no reference documentation submitted that would prevent operators from performing a planned decrease of spent fuel pool water level (ie, for pool clarity) below the MU11 level of 23 feet as long as they did not exceed the minimum required Technical Specification water level of 21 feet 4 inches. There were no applicant concerns recorded for this question during the written examination administration. As a result, the reference supports the original answer "C" not "D."

SIMULATION FACILITY REPORT

Facility Licensee: LaSalle County Station

Facility Docket No.: 50-373; 50-374

Operating Tests Administered: May 19 - 23, 2003

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
None	None.

WRITTEN EXAMINATIONS AND ANSWER KEYS (RO/SRO)

RO/SRO Initial Examination ADAMS Accession #ML031640156.