



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV
611 RYAN PLAZA DRIVE, SUITE 400
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76011-4005

August 25, 2005

R. T. Ridenoure
Vice President
Omaha Public Power District
Fort Calhoun Station FC-2-4 Adm.
P.O. Box 550
Fort Calhoun, NE 68023-0550

SUBJECT: FORT CALHOUN STATION- NRC EXAMINATION REPORT 05000285/2005301

Dear Mr. Ridenoure:

On July 14, 2005, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) completed an initial operator licensing examination at Fort Calhoun Station. The enclosed report documents the examination findings, which were discussed on July 14, 2005, with members of your staff.

The examination included an evaluation of six applicants for reactor operator licenses and four applicants for senior operator licenses. The examinations were developed using NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 9. The examiners determined that all applicants satisfied the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55, and the appropriate licenses have been issued.

A licensee-identified violation, which was determined to be of very low safety significance is listed in this report. If you contest the noncited violation in this report, you should provide a response within 30 days of the date of this inspection report, with the basis for your denial, to the NRC, Attn.: document Control Desk, Washington DC 20555-0001; with copies to the Regional Administrator Region IV; the Director, Office of Enforcement, U. S. NRC, Washington, DC 20555-0001; and the NRC Resident Inspector at Fort Calhoun Station.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter, its enclosure(s), and your response will be made 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/

Ryan Lantz, Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket: 50-285
License: DPR-40

Enclosure:
NRC Inspection Report 05000285/2005301
w/Attachment: Supplemental Information

cc w/enclosure:
Joe I. McManis, Manager - Licensing
Omaha Public Power District
Fort Calhoun Station FC-2-4 Adm.
P.O. Box 550
Fort Calhoun, NE 68023-0550

David J. Bannister
Manager - Fort Calhoun Station
Omaha Public Power District
Fort Calhoun Station FC-1-1 Plant
P.O. Box 550
Fort Calhoun, NE 68023-0550

James R. Curtiss
Winston & Strawn
1400 L. Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20005-3502

Chairman
Washington County Board of Supervisors
P.O. Box 466
Blair, NE 68008

Sue Semerena, Section Administrator
Nebraska Health & Human Services
Dept. of Regulation & Licensing
Division of Public Health Assurance
301 Centennial Mall, South
P.O. Box 95007
Lincoln, NE 68509-5007

Daniel K. McGhee
Bureau of Radiological Health
Iowa Department of Public Health
Lucas State Office Building, 5th Floor
321 East 12th Street
Des Moines, IA 50319

Electronic distribution by RIV:

Regional Administrator (**BSM1**)

DRP Director (**ATH**)

DRS Director (**DDC**)

DRS Deputy Director (**KMK**)

Senior Resident Inspector (**JDH1**)

Resident Inspector (**LMW1**)

Branch Chief, DRP/E (**DNG**)

Senior Project Engineer, DRP/E (**VGG**)

Team Leader, DRP/TSS (**RLN1**)

RITS Coordinator (**KEG**)

DRS STA (**DAP**)

J. Dixon-Herrity, OEDO RIV Coordinator (**JLD**)

RidsNrrDipmlipb

FCS Site Secretary (**BMM**)

SISP Review Completed: __Y__ ADAMS: ☒ Yes ☐ No Initials: __TOM__

☒ Publicly Available ☐ Non-Publicly Available ☐ Sensitive ☒ Non-Sensitive

SOE:OB	SOE:OB	SOE:OB	C:PBE	D:DRS	C:OB
TOMcKernon/lmb	TFStetka	RELantz	DGraves	DDChamberlain	RELantz
/RA/	/RA/	/RA/	/RA/	/RA/	/RA/
8/22/05	8/23/05	8/24/05	08/24/05	08/24/05	08/25/05

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

T=Telephone

E=E-mail

F=Fax

ENCLOSURE

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION IV

Docket: 50-285

License: DPR-40

Report No.: 05000285/2005301

Licensee: Omaha Public Power District

Facility: Fort Calhoun Station

Location: Ft. Calhoun, NE

Dates: July 8-14, 2005

Inspectors: T. McKernon, Senior Operations Engineer, Operations Branch
T. Stetka, Senior Operations Engineer, Operations Branch
R. Lantz, Senior Emergency Preparedness Inspector, Operations Branch

Approved By: Ryan E. Lantz, Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

ER 05000285/2005301 on July 8-14, 2005; Fort Calhoun Station, initial operator licensing examination.

NRC examiners evaluated the competency of six applicants for reactor operator licenses and four applicants for senior operator licenses. The licensee developed the examination using NUREG-1021, "Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors," Revision 9. The licensee provided proctors for the administration of the written examination to all applicants on July 8, 2005, in accordance with instructions provided by the chief examiner. The NRC examiners administered the operating test on July 11-14, 2005. One Green noncited violation was identified. The significance of most findings is indicated by their color (Green, White, Yellow, Red) using Inspection Manual Chapter 0609, "Significance Determination Process." Findings for which the significance determination process does not apply may be Green or be assigned a severity level after NRC management review. The NRC's program for overseeing the safe operation of commercial nuclear power reactors is described in NUREG-1649, "Reactor Oversight Process," Revision 3, dated July 2000.

A. NRC-Identified and Self-Revealing Findings

No findings of significance were identified

B. Licensee Identified Violations

Cornerstone: Not Applicable

One violation of very low safety significance was identified by the licensee. Corrective actions taken or planned by the licensee have been entered into the licensee's corrective action program. The violation and corrective actions are listed in Section 4OA7 of this report.

REPORT DETAILS

4. OTHER ACTIVITIES

4OA4 Initial License Examination

.1 Operator Knowledge and Performance

a. Examination Scope

The NRC examination team administered the operating test to the 10 applicants on July 11-14, 2005. The reactor operator applicants participated in 2 dynamic simulator scenarios, a control room and facilities walkthrough test consisting of 11 system tasks and an administrative test consisting of 1 task in each of 4 areas. The 2 applicants for upgrading their operator license to a senior operator license participated in 1 dynamic simulator scenario and a control room and facilities walkthrough test consisting of 5 system tasks. The 2 applicants seeking an instant senior operator license participated in 3 dynamic simulator scenarios, and a control room and facilities walkthrough test consisting of 10 system tasks. The administrative test for all senior operator applicants consisted of performing tasks in 5 areas.

On July 8, 2005, the licensee proctored the administration of the written examinations to all 10 applicants and provided the proposed grades together with the performance analysis to the NRC for approval.

b. Findings

All applicants passed all parts of the examinations. For the written examinations, the average score for the reactor operator applicants was 90.5 percent, and the average score for senior operator applicants was 92.5 percent. The reactor operator applicant scores ranged from 88 to 94.7 percent, and the senior operator applicant scores ranged from 89 to 95 percent.

The licensee conducted a performance analysis for the written examinations with emphasis on questions missed by half or more of the applicants. After reviewing the licensee's analysis, the examiners concluded that all questions were valid and that there were only minor training deficiencies requiring the licensee to address in its corrective action program. Licensee personnel indicated that any training deficiencies would also be reviewed to determine impact on licensed operator requalification training. There was only one post-examination comment provided on examination questions. The licensee submitted Question 2 for review on July 21, 2005, with a recommendation that both answer Choices A or B be accepted as correct answers. The question involved the restoration of letdown after a small break loss-of-coolant accident had occurred, which resulted in a plant protection logic system actuation. Answer Choice A referred to the reset of engineered safeguard relays in accordance with Emergency Operating Procedure-Abnormal Operating Procedure, Attachment 23. Answer Choice B related to the blocking of plant protection logic system, and reset of plant protection logic system and containment isolation actuation signal lockout relays in accordance with the emergency operating procedure floating step, which while performing the emergency

operating procedures is always active and applicable. The chief examiner reviewed the licensee's recommendation and since both answer choices would result in restoration of letdown and were actions to be taken by plant procedures, answer Choices A and B was accepted as correct. The written examinations were regraded based upon the change to the answer key.

.2 Initial Licensing Examination Development

The licensee developed the examination in accordance with NUREG-1021, Revision 9. Licensee facility training and operations staff involved in examination development were on a security agreement.

.2.1 Operating Examination Outline and Examination Package

a. Examination Scope

_____ The licensee staff submitted the operating test outlines on April 1, 2005. The chief examiner reviewed the submittal against the requirements of NUREG-1021, Revision 9. The draft examination package was received by the NRC on May 27, 2005. Examiners reviewed the examination against the requirements of NUREG-1021, Revision 9, and provided comments to the licensee on June 20, 2005. The chief examiner conducted an onsite validation of the examinations and provided further comments during the week of June 20, 2005.

b. Findings

Examiners approved the initial examination outline with minor comments and advised the licensee to proceed with the operating examination development.

The chief examiner determined that the examination initially submitted by the licensee staff was within the range of acceptability expected for a proposed examination.

No findings of significance were identified.

.2.2 Simulation Facility Performance

a. Scope

The examination team observed simulator performance with regard to plant fidelity during the examination validation and administration.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

2.3 Examination Security

a. Scope

The examiners reviewed examination security both during the onsite preparation and examination administration weeks with respect to NUREG-1021 and 10 CFR Part 55 requirements. In addition, the chief examiner sampled historical records of the applicants to verify the accuracy of data on their license applications, in accordance with Examiner Standard 202.C.2.e of NUREG 1021.

b. Findings

One finding was identified during the examination validation week and is discussed below in Section 4OA7. During the examination, the licensee kept the applicants well sequestered and escorted.

4OA6 Meetings, Including Exit

On July 14, 2005, the examiners presented the examination results to Ms. M. Tesar and other members of the staff who acknowledged the findings. The inspectors confirmed that proprietary information was not provided or reviewed during the examination process.

4OA7 Licensee-Identified Violations

The following violation of very low safety significance (Green) was identified by the licensee and is a violation of NRC requirements, which meets the criteria of Section VI of the NRC Enforcement Policy, for being dispositioned as a noncited violation.

- 10 CFR 55.49 states, in part, “. . . The integrity of an examination is considered compromised if any activity, regardless of intent, affected, or, but for detection, would have affected the equitable and consistent administration of the examination. This includes all activities related to the preparation, administration, and grading of examinations.” Contrary to this, on June 22, 2005, during the examination validation, the licensee staff left keys in key lock switches on the simulator control boards following the performance of a job performance measure. Immediately thereafter, the initial licensing applicants entered the simulator for training and observed the keys in the switches. The licensee has documented this issue in Condition Report CR 2005-03502. The licensee staff replaced the job performance measure so there was no impact on the examination.

The finding is more than minor because it could have compromised the integrity and discriminatory validity of the license examination. If the practice had gone undetected, it could have given the applicants unfair advantage and, thus, lowered the discriminatory value of the examination. The finding is of very low safety significance since it was detected before license examination administration and the license examination was modified to replace the job performance measure.

ATTACHMENT

KEY POINTS OF CONTACT

Licensee Personnel

A. Berck, Operations Training Instructor
G. Cavanaugh, Supervisor, Station Licensing
R. Clemens, Division Manager, Nuclear Assessment
J. Cook, Shift Manager, Training Instructor
P. Cronin, Manager, Shift Operations
D. Dryden, Licensing
M. Frans, Assistant Plant Manager
J. Goodell, Manager, Training (Incoming)
J. Koske, Training Consultant
J. Kuzela, Operations Training Instructor
M. Tesar, Division Manager, Nuclear Support and Supply Division
D. Weaver, Supervisor, Operations and Technical Training
R. Westcott, Manager, Training (Outgoing)

NRC personnel

L. Willoughby, Resident Inspector, Fort Calhoun Station