



**Rafael Flores**  
Senior Vice President  
& Chief Nuclear Officer  
rafael.flores@luminant.com

**Luminant Power**  
P O Box 1002  
6322 North FM 56  
Glen Rose, TX 76043

**T** 254 897 5590  
**C** 817 559 0403  
**F** 254 897 6652

CP-201500611  
Log # TXX-15095

Ref: 10 CFR 55.5(b)(2)  
10 CFR 55.25

June 15, 2015

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Regional Administrator, Region IV  
1600 East Lamar Boulevard  
Arlington, Texas 76011-4511  
ATTN: Mr. Clyde Osterholtz

SUBJECT: COMANCHE PEAK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT  
DOCKET NOS. 50-445/446  
TRANSMITTAL OF LICENSED OPERATOR EXAMINATION MATERIALS

REFERENCE: NUREG-1021, Revision 9, Supplement 1, Examiner Standard ES-403

Dear Mr. Osterholtz:

Enclosed please find the graded written examinations and one completed Form ES-403-1, "Written Examination Grading Quality Checklist," for the initial licensing written examinations administered on June 8, 2015 at Comanche Peak Nuclear Power Plant (CPNPP). These examinations were graded and are submitted based on the guidance in the referenced document. The enclosures with this letter contain sensitive information which should be withheld from public disclosure until the examinations are complete.

This communication contains no new licensing basis commitments regarding CPNPP Units 1 and 2.

If there are any questions regarding this report, contact Mr. Randall J. Blankenship at (254) 897-5890 or (817) 578-1550.

Sincerely,

Luminant Generation Company LLC

Rafael Flores

By: 

Fred Madden  
Director, External Affairs

Enclosure

c - Marc L. Dapas, Region IV clo  
Vincent Gaddy, Region IV clo  
B. K. Singal, NRR clo  
Resident Inspectors, CPNPP clo

Question 3: Applicants were unaware that containment sump indication began at 808° 3' versus 808° 0'. Training weakness incorporated into CR-2015-005220.

Question 21: Applicants were confused by mechanical versus hydraulic for interlocks, believing that hydraulic is a subset of mechanical interlocks. Explanation provided during examination review was adequate with no additional action required.

Question 23: Applicants did not correctly interpret the response of the led-down system that a boration of the RCS was in progress. Inaccurate thought process during tests, students were aware of the plant response.

Question 32: Applicants were unaware that the DRPI alignment method begins with a rod withdrawal. Training weakness incorporated into CR-2015-005230.

Question 52: Applicants were confused by the performance of the BOS and that once the sequencer step has passed the auto start is no longer present. Explanation provided during examination review was adequate with no additional action required.

Question 56: Applicants believed that a Main Steam Line Isolation would have occurred during the earlier maximum rate depressurization but the step clearly states to avoid a Main Steam Isolation. Steam will be improved prior to inclusion in the CPNPP Exam Bank.

Question 70: Applicants were unaware that a non-licensed individual can verify a lag on the Main Control Board. Knowledge weakness of memory item, no additional actions required.

Question 77: Applicants were unaware of the conditions required to complete FRH-0.1 and transition back to EOS-0.1. Training weakness incorporated into CR-2015-005230.

Question 83: Applicants were unable to recall when the isolation of a leaking steam generator was conducted in ABN-106. Training weakness incorporated into CR-2015-005230.

Question 86: Applicants did not interpret the rising VCT level as indication that a suction line break had occurred to the charging pumps. Incorrect assumptions made during test.

Question 94: Applicants were unfamiliar with the reactivity management guideline of ODA--102. Guidance changes resulted in some applicants answering based on prior guidance no additional actions required.

Question 96: Applicants were unable to determine the Tech Spec 3.0.4 b allowance for MODE 3 or the required risk assessment in accordance with the applicable Bases. Training weakness incorporated into CR-2015-005230.