

July 2, 2004

EA-04-109

Mr. M. Nazar
Senior Vice President
Nuclear Generation Group
American Electric Power Company
500 Circle Drive
Buchanan, MI 49107

SUBJECT: DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2
NRC INSPECTION REPORT 05000315/2004007(DRS); 05000316/2004007(DRS)

Dear Mr. Nazar:

On June 4, 2004, the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) completed a baseline inspection at your Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2. The enclosed report documents the inspection findings which were discussed on June 4, 2004, with you and other members of your staff.

The inspection examined activities conducted under your license as they relate to safety and compliance with the Commission's rules and regulations and with the conditions of your license. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selected examination of procedures and representative records, observation of activities, and interviews with personnel.

Based on the results of this inspection, one apparent violation involving 10 CFR 50.9 was identified and is being considered for escalated enforcement action in accordance with the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions" (Enforcement Policy), NUREG-1600. The current Enforcement Policy is included on the NRC's Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. On March 24, 2004, your staff provided information to the NRC regarding the medical status of a licensed senior reactor operator (SRO) at your facility. That information indicated the SRO had a pre-existing medical condition since 1996 that was considered a potentially disqualifying condition in accordance with American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society (ANSI/ANS)-3.4 - 1983, "American National Standard Medical Certification and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," and the SRO license should have required the presence of another qualified individual when the SRO was performing licensed duties. On December 28, 1999, your staff provided information to the NRC regarding the medical status of the same individual in an application for renewal of the SRO's license and information provided in that renewal application did not describe the individual's pre-existing medical condition from 1996. The individual's license was renewed by the NRC on February 1, 2000, based on the information your staff provided on December 28, 1999. Therefore, the information provided to the NRC on December 28, 1999, was material to an NRC licensing action. The failure to

provide accurate and complete information to the NRC regarding a pre-existing medical condition of an SRO is a significant regulatory issue. If the information had been complete and accurate at the time provided, the NRC would have taken a different regulatory position and would not have renewed the license without requiring the presence of another qualified individual when the SRO was performing licensed duties.

The circumstances surrounding this apparent violation, the significance of the issue, and the need for lasting and effective corrective action were discussed with members of your staff at the inspection exit meeting on June 4, 2004. As a result, it may not be necessary to conduct a predecisional enforcement conference in order to enable the NRC to make an enforcement decision. In addition, since your facility has not been the subject of escalated enforcement actions within the last two years, and based on our understanding of your corrective action, a civil penalty may not be warranted in accordance with Section VI.C.2 of the Enforcement Policy. The final decision will be based on your confirming on the license docket that the corrective actions previously described to the staff have been or are being taken.

Before the NRC makes its enforcement decision, we are providing you an opportunity to either: (1) respond to the apparent violation addressed in this inspection report within 30 days of the date of this letter; or (2) request a predecisional enforcement conference. If a conference is held, it will be open for public observation. The NRC will also issue a press release to announce the conference. Please contact Mr. Roger Lanksbury at (630) 829-9631 within seven days of the date of this letter to notify the NRC of your intended response.

If you choose to provide a written response, it should be clearly marked as a "Response to An Apparent Violation in Inspection Report No 05000315/2004007(DRS); 5000316/2004007(DRS); EA-04-109" and should include for the apparent violation: (1) the reason for the apparent violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the apparent violation; (2) the corrective steps that have been taken and the results achieved; (3) the corrective steps that will be taken to avoid further violations; and (4) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Your response may reference or include previous docketed correspondence, if the correspondence adequately addresses the required response. If an adequate response is not received within the time specified or an extension of time has not been granted by the NRC, the NRC will proceed with its enforcement decision or schedule a predecisional enforcement conference.

In addition, please be advised that the number and characterization of the apparent violation described in the enclosed inspection report may change as a result of further NRC review. You will be advised by separate correspondence of the results of our deliberations on this matter.

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 by Roy J. Caniano Acting for/

Cynthia D. Pederson, Director
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket Nos. 50-315; 50-316
License Nos. DPR-58; DPR-74

Enclosure: Inspection Report 05000315/2004007(DRS);
05000316/2004007(DRS)
w/attachment: Supplemental Information

cc w/encl: J. Jensen, Site Vice President
M. Finissi, Plant Manager
G. White, Michigan Public Service Commission
Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
Emergency Management Division
MI Department of State Police
D. Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists

M. Nazar

-3-

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 by Roy J. Caniano Acting for/

Cynthia D. Pederson, Director
Division of Reactor Safety

Docket Nos. 50-315; 50-316
License Nos. DPR-58; DPR-74

Enclosure: Inspection Report 05000315/2004007(DRS);
05000316/2004007(DRS)
w/attachment: Supplemental Information

cc w/encl: J. Jensen, Site Vice President
M. Finissi, Plant Manager
G. White, Michigan Public Service Commission
Michigan Department of Environmental Quality
Emergency Management Division
MI Department of State Police
D. Lochbaum, Union of Concerned Scientists

DOCUMENT NAME: G:\DRS\DCC 2004 007 DRS.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 *	RIII	RIII
NAME	NValos:sd	RLanksbury	RNg for EDuncan	CWeil for BClayton	RCaniano for CPederson
DATE	06/25/04	06/25/04	06/28/04	06/30/04	07/02/04

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

ADAMS Distribution:

J. Goldberg, OGC

C. Nolan, OE

R. Franovich, NRR

WDR

DFT

JGL1

FJC

DCD

LAD

RidsNrrDipmlipb

GEG

HBC

C. Weil, RIII

BJK1

CAA1

C. Pederson, DRS (hard copy - IR's only)

DRPIII

DRSIII

PLB1

JRK1

ROPreports@nrc.gov

OEMAIL

OE:ES

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION III

Docket Nos: 50-315; 50-316
License Nos: DPR-58; DPR-74

Report No: 05000315/2004007(DRS); 05000316/2004007(DRS)

Licensee: American Electric Power Company

Facility: Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2

Location: 1 Cook Place
Bridgman, MI 49106

Dates: March 1, 2004 through June 4, 2004

Inspectors: D. McNeil, Reactor Engineer (Lead Inspector)
N. Valos, Reactor Engineer

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

Enclosure

Enclosure

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

IR 05000315/2004007(DRS); 05000316/2004007(DRS); 03/01/2004 - 03/05/2004 (on-site) and 03/30/2004 - 06/03/2004 (periodic in-office review); D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2; Licensed Operator Requalification.

This report covers an approximate 3-month period of periodic on-site and in-office review of baseline announced inspection in the area of licensed operator requalification. The inspection was conducted by two regional specialist inspectors. One apparent violation was identified during the inspection. The significance of most findings is indicated by their color (Green, White, Yellow, Red) using Inspection Manual Chapter (IMC) 0609, "Significance Determination Process" (SDP). Findings for which the SDP 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. Inspector-Identified and Self-Revealed Findings

Cornerstone: Mitigating Systems

- To Be Determined (TBD). D. C. Cook management personnel informed NRC Region III by letter dated March 24, 2004, that one senior reactor operator had a pre-existing medical condition (since 1996) that required the presence of another qualified individual (i.e., "no solo") when performing licensed duties and requested a "no solo" license restriction for the individual. The letter from the company physician also described a medication the individual was taking for the medical condition. The medical condition described by the physician was considered a disqualifying condition in accordance with American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society (ANSI/ANS)-3.4 - 1983, "American National Standard Medical Certification and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants." On December 28, 1999, the licensee provided information to the NRC regarding the medical status of the same individual applying for a renewal of the individual's senior reactor operator license with no recommendation for a "no solo" license. The individual's license was renewed by the NRC on February 1, 2000, based on the information provided by the licensee on December 28, 1999. Again, the medical condition was considered a disqualifying condition in accordance with ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983, and should have been reported to the NRC on NRC Form 396 for the renewal of the applicant's license requesting a "no solo" restriction on the individual's license. Therefore, the information provided to the NRC on December 28, 1999, was material to the NRC licensing action. [Note: The information concerning the individual's specific medical condition is considered medical privacy information under 10 CFR 2.390(2)(6) and is not specifically discussed here.]

As noted above, Region III received a letter from the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant dated March 24, 2004, requesting a "no solo" license restriction for the individual. Region III received another letter from the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant dated May 20, 2004, notifying the NRC that the recommendation of the "no solo" license condition for the individual not be implemented. The letter stated that upon further review of the individual's

medical records, the company physician determined that the individual met ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983 to work as an operator in a multi-person facility; therefore, no license condition for solo operation was required. The NRC's medical officer again determined on May 26, 2004, that the operator required a "no solo" restriction to the operator's license. Since NRC intervention was required to identify the requirement for the operator to have a "no solo" restriction, this apparent violation was considered NRC identified.

Because the issue affected the NRC's ability to perform its regulatory function, it was evaluated with the traditional enforcement process. The finding was determined to be of low safety significance because the operator had not acted in a solo capacity prior to the license being amended. However, the regulatory significance was important because the incorrect information was provided under a signed statement to the NRC and impacted a licensing decision for the individual. The issue was preliminarily determined to be an apparent violation of 10 CFR 50.9. (Section 1R11)

B. Licensee-Identified Violations

None.

REPORT DETAILS

1. REACTOR SAFETY

Cornerstone: Mitigating Systems

1R11 Licensed Operator Requalification (71111.11)

.1 Facility Operating History

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed the plant's operating history from January 2002 through February 2004 to assess whether the Licensed Operator Requalification Training (LORT) program had identified and addressed operator performance deficiencies at the plant.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.2 Licensee Requalification Examinations

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors performed a biennial inspection of the licensee's LORT program. The inspectors reviewed the annual requalification operating test and biennial written examination material to evaluate general quality, construction, and difficulty level. The operating examination material reviewed consisted of four operating tests, each containing two dynamic simulator scenarios and five job performance measures (JPMs). The biennial written examinations reviewed consisted of approximately 40 open reference multiple choice questions. The biennial examinations were conducted in February and March 2004. The inspectors reviewed the methodology for developing the examinations, including the LORT program two-year sample plan, probabilistic risk assessment insights, previously identified operator performance deficiencies, and plant modifications. The inspectors also reviewed the licensee's program and assessed the level of examination material duplication during the current year annual examinations as compared to the previous year's annual examinations.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.3 Licensee Administration of Requalification Examinations

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors observed the administration of the requalification operating test to assess the licensee's effectiveness in conducting the test and to assess the facility evaluators' ability to determine adequate performance using objective, measurable performance standards. The inspectors evaluated the performance of one shift crew in parallel with the facility evaluators during six dynamic simulator scenarios. In addition, the inspectors observed licensee evaluators administer several JPMs to various licensed crew members. The inspectors observed the training staff personnel administer the operating test, including pre-examination briefings, observations of operator performance, and individual and crew evaluations after dynamic scenarios. The inspectors evaluated the ability of the simulator to support the examinations. A specific evaluation of simulator performance was conducted and documented under Section 1R11.7, "Conformance With Simulator Requirements Specified in 10 CFR 55.46," of this report. The inspectors also reviewed the licensee's overall examination security program.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.4 Licensee Training Feedback System

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors assessed the methods and effectiveness of the licensee's processes for revising and maintaining its LORT program up to date, including the use of feedback from plant events and industry experience information. The inspectors reviewed the licensee's quality assurance oversight activities, including licensee training department self-assessment reports. The inspectors evaluated the licensee's ability to assess the effectiveness of its LORT program and their ability to implement appropriate corrective actions.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.5 Licensee Remedial Training Program

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors assessed the adequacy and effectiveness of the remedial training conducted since the previous annual requalification examinations and the training planned for the current examination cycle to ensure that they addressed weaknesses in licensed operator or crew performance identified during training and plant operations. The inspectors reviewed remedial training procedures and individual remedial training plans.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.6 Conformance With Operator License Conditions

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed the facility and individual operator licensees' conformance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55. The inspectors reviewed the facility licensee's program for maintaining active operator licenses and to assess compliance with 10 CFR 55.53 (e) and (f). The inspectors reviewed the procedural guidance and the process for tracking on-shift hours for licensed operators and which control room positions were granted credit for maintaining active operator licenses. The inspectors reviewed the facility licensee's LORT program to assess compliance with the requalification program requirements as described by 10 CFR 55.59 (c). In addition, the inspectors reviewed ten licensed operators' medical records maintained by the facility licensee and assessed compliance with the medical standards delineated in ANSI/ANS 3.4 -1983, "American National Standard Medical Certification and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," and with 10 CFR 55.21 and 10 CFR 55.25.

b. Findings

Introduction: The inspectors identified that licensee management provided inaccurate and incomplete information to the NRC regarding the medical condition of one senior reactor operator. The issue was considered to be of very low safety significance, but was considered to have important regulatory significance because the information was provided to the NRC under a signed statement and resulted in a licensing action that would not have been taken had correct information been provided to the NRC. This issue was preliminarily determined to be an apparent violation of 10 CFR 50.9.

Description: In February 2004, during the licensee conducted Licensed Operator Medical Records Quick Hit Assessment SA-2004-TRN-021-QH, a review by the current Medical Review Officer (MRO) for D. C. Cook determined that a license restriction was required for a licensed individual for a previously identified medical condition. The licensee's MRO determined that the operator in question had a medical condition since 1996 that warranted contacting the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 55.25. [Note: The information concerning the individual's specific medical condition is considered medical privacy information under 10 CFR 2.390(2)(6) and is not specifically discussed here.]

Region III received a letter from the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant dated March 24, 2004, requesting a "no solo" license restriction for the individual who had been licensed at D. C. Cook since August 9, 1989. The letter from the company physician described the individual's medical condition and also described a medication the individual was taking for the medical condition. The medical condition described by the physician was considered a disqualifying condition in accordance with American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society (ANSI/ANS)-3.4 - 1983, "American National Standard Medical Certification

and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants.” The Region III operator licensing assistant forwarded the operator’s medical information to NRR for review by the NRC’s medical officer. The NRC’s medical officer determined that the operator required a “no solo” restriction to the SRO license. The individual’s license was modified accordingly on April 8, 2004.

The individual was initially issued a Reactor Operator (RO) license for the facility on August 9, 1989. On February 1, 1994, the individual was issued a Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) license. Prior to license renewal (required every 6 years), the licensee sends to the Region an NRC Form 396, “Certification of Medical Examination by Facility Licensee,” in accordance with 10 CFR 55.21 for each applicant for a license renewal. The NRC Form 396 certifies, when signed by a senior licensee official, that the applicant has been examined by a doctor and meets the medical standards in ANS/ANSI-3.4 (1983 version for D.C. Cook). The NRC Form 396 for the individual’s license renewal was dated December 28, 1999, and did not include a recommendation for a “no solo” license for the individual’s medical condition that had existed since 1996. The individual’s license was renewed by the NRC on February 1, 2000, based on the information provided by the licensee on December 28, 1999; therefore, the information provided to the NRC on December 28, 1999, was material to the NRC licensing action. Again, the medical condition described by the company physician was considered a disqualifying condition in accordance with ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983, and should have been reported to the NRC on NRC Form 396 for the renewal of the applicant’s license requesting a “no solo” restriction on the individual’s license.

As noted above, Region III received a letter from the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant dated March 24, 2004, requesting a “no solo” license restriction for the individual. Region III received another letter from the D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant dated May 20, 2004, notifying the NRC that the recommendation of the “no solo” license condition for the individual not be implemented. The letter stated that upon further review of the individual’s medical records, the D. C. Cook MRO determined that the individual met ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983 to work as an operator in a multi-person facility; therefore, no license condition for solo operation was required. The NRC’s medical officer again determined on May 26, 2004, that the operator required a “no solo” restriction to the operator’s license.

Analysis: Because violations of 10 CFR 50.9 are considered to be violations that potentially impede or impact the regulatory process, they are dispositioned using the "General Statement of Policy and Procedure for NRC Enforcement Actions" (Enforcement Policy), NUREG-1600 instead of the Significance Determination Process (SDP). Using Inspection Manual Chapter (IMC) 0612, Appendix B, “Issue Dispositioning Screening,” the finding was determined to be more than minor because the information associated with the license renewal of the individual was provided to the NRC under a signed statement by the Site Vice President and erroneously impacted an NRC licensing decision. An individual who had a pre-existing medical condition, that at a minimum required a “no solo” restriction on the individual’s license, was issued a license without such a restriction. The inspectors determined that the individual never acted alone in a licensed capacity from the time the initial SRO license was issued until the license was modified to include the “no solo” restriction. The NRC depends upon the licensee to ensure that medical examinations are

performed correctly and that the regulatory requirements and the rigors of the operator's duties are carefully explained to the medical personnel that perform these examinations. An operator that cannot perform licensed duties due to a medical condition that might be exacerbated by the stress resulting from a reactor accident scenario could be a significant distraction to the rest of the crew. Therefore, the safety significance of this issue was determined to be more than minor. However, the regulatory significance was greater because the information was material to an NRC licensing decision and an NRC SRO license was issued without the proper medical restriction because incomplete and inaccurate information was provided to the NRC in the application to renew this SRO's license.

Enforcement: Section 50.9 of 10 CFR required that information provided to the Commission by an applicant for a license or by a licensee shall be complete and accurate in all material respects. Section 55.23 of 10 CFR required, in part, that an authorized representative of the facility licensee shall complete and sign Form NRC - 396, "Certification of Medical Examination by Facility Licensee." Form NRC - 396, when signed by an authorized representative of the facility licensee, certifies that a physician conducted a medical examination of the applicant (as required in 10 CFR 55.21), and that the guidance contained in American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society (ANSI/ANS)-3.4 - 1983, "Medical Certification and Monitoring of Personnel Requiring Operator Licenses for Nuclear Power Plants," was followed in conducting the examination and making the determination of medical qualification. ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983, Section 5.3.2(1), provided, in part, that certain medical conditions preclude solo operation of a nuclear power plant. On December 28, 1999, the licensee submitted to the NRC a Form NRC - 396, an application for renewal of a Senior Reactor Operator license, that was not complete and accurate in all material respects. Specifically, the NRC Form - 396 certified that the applicant met the medical requirements of ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983. During December 1996, the applicant developed a permanent physical condition which did not meet the minimum standards of ANSI/ANS-3.4 - 1983, Section 5.3.2(1) and precluded the applicant from "solo" operation. This information was material to the NRC because the NRC relied on Form 396 to determine whether the applicant met the requirements of 10 CFR Part 55 to operate the controls of a nuclear power plant. Since NRC intervention was required to identify the requirement for the operator to have a "no solo" restriction, this apparent violation was considered NRC identified.

The apparent violation (AV 05000315/2004007-01; AV 05000316/2004007-01) was determined to be of very low safety significance, but was of significant regulatory concern because an incorrect licensing action was taken based on the information that was provided by the licensee.

The licensee took the following corrective actions, which were considered to be prompt and comprehensive:

- S The licensee prevented activation of the individual's license from inactive to active status (in accordance with 10 CFR 55.53(f)) until the medical issue associated with the license was resolved with the NRC.

- S The medical records of all licensed operators were reviewed to ensure compliance with applicable standards. No other issues were identified.
- S A self-assessment of all licensed operator medical records will be performed every two years.
- S The administrative procedure governing the medical record reporting process will be changed to ensure the NRC is notified when a potentially disqualifying medical condition is identified.

.7 Conformance With Simulator Requirements Specified in 10 CFR 55.46

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors assessed the adequacy of the licensee's simulation facility (simulator) for use in operator licensing examinations and for satisfying experience requirements as prescribed in 10 CFR 55.46, "Simulation Facilities." The inspectors also reviewed a sample of simulator performance test records (i.e., transient tests, scenario test and discrepancy resolution validation test), simulator discrepancy and modification records, and the process for ensuring continued assurance of simulator fidelity in accordance with 10 CFR 55.46. The inspectors reviewed and evaluated the discrepancy process to ensure that simulator fidelity was maintained. Open simulator discrepancies were reviewed for importance relative to the impact on 10 CFR 55.45 and 55.59 operator actions as well as on nuclear and thermal hydraulic operating characteristics. The inspectors conducted interviews with members of the licensee's simulator staff about the configuration control process and completed the IP 71111.11, Appendix C, checklist to evaluate whether or not the licensee's plant-referenced simulator was operating adequately as required by 10 CFR 55.46 (c) and (d).

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

.8 Written Examination and Operating Test Results

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed the pass/fail results of individual written tests, operating tests, and simulator operating tests (required to be given per 10 CFR 55.59(a)(2)) administered by the licensee during calendar year 2004. This represents one sample.

b. Findings

No findings of significance were identified.

4OA2 Problem Identification and Resolution

1. Biennial Sample Review

a. Inspection Scope

The inspectors reviewed several licensee training department self-assessment reports. The licensee's self-assessments reviewed the licensed operator training program for approximately 12 months prior to this inspection activity. The self-assessments were reviewed to ensure that any issues identified during the self-assessment were appropriately evaluated, prioritized, and controlled.

b. Findings

There were no findings of significance.

4OA6 Meetings

.1 Exit Meetings

The inspectors presented the inspection results to Mr. M. Nazar and other members of licensee management at the conclusion of the inspection on June 4, 2004. The inspectors asked the licensee whether any materials examined during the inspection should be considered proprietary. No proprietary information was identified.

.2 Interim Exit Meetings

An interim exit meeting was conducted for:

- Biennial Operator Requalification Program Inspection with Mr. M. Nazar on March 5, 2004.

ATTACHMENT: SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

SUPPLEMENTAL INFORMATION

KEY POINTS OF CONTACT

Licensee

J. Jensen, Site Vice President
M. Nazar, Senior Vice President, Chief Nuclear Officer
R. Brown, Programs Assurance
M. Finissi, Plant Manager
I. Fleetwood, Training Instructor
D. Frie, LOR Training Instructor
R. Gillespie, Operations Director
R. Jervey, Regulatory Compliance
J. Newmiller, Regulatory Compliance
B. Nichols, LORT Supervisor
A. Robertson, Shift Manager
R. Sieber, Operations Training Supervisor
R. Strasser, Shift Manager
T. Vriezma, Simulator Supervisor
T. Woods, Compliance Supervisor
J. Zwolinski, Director of Design Engineering and Regulatory Affairs

LIST OF ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

Opened

05000315/200407-01	AV	Failure to Provide Complete and Accurate Information to the NRC Which Impacted A Licensing Decision. (Section 1R11)
05000316/200407-01		

Closed

None.

Discussed

None.

LIST OF DOCUMENTS REVIEWED

The following is a list of documents reviewed during the inspection. Inclusion on this list does not imply that the NRC inspectors reviewed the documents in their entirety but rather that selected sections of portions of the documents were evaluated as part of the overall inspection effort. Inclusion of a document on this list does not imply NRC acceptance of the document or any part of it, unless this is stated in the body of the inspection report.

1R11 Licensed Operator Requalification

LER 316/2002-004-00; Unanticipated Start of the Turbine Drive Auxiliary Feedwater Pump; dated March 15, 2002

LER 315/2002-002-00; Pressurizer Power Operated Relief Valves Inoperable Due to Control Switch Position; dated April 19, 2002

LER 316/2002-005-00; Unit 2 Trip Due to Instrument Rack 24-Volt DC Power Supply Failure; dated July 10, 2002

LER 315/2002-005-00; Unit 1 Manual Trip Due to Trip of East Main Feedwater Pump; dated August 13, 2002

LER 316/2002-006-00; Unit 2 Reactor Trip Due to Low Condenser Vacuum; dated September 6, 2002

LER 315/2003-001-00; Unit 1 Turbine and Reactor Trip Due to Main Transformer Fault and Fire; dated March 17, 2003

LER 316/2003-002-00; Unit 2 Reactor Trip Due to Instrument Rack 24 VDC Power Supply Failure; dated April 7, 2003

LER 315/2003-003-00; Dual Unit Manual Trip Due to the Failure of the Intake Traveling Screens and Failure to Comply with Technical Specification 3.8.1.1; dated June 23, 2003

LER 315/2002-008-00; Failure to Complete Unit Shutdown as Required by Technical Specification 3.6.5.1; dated August 1, 2003

D. C. Cook ROP Plant Issue Matrix from 01/01/2002 to 02/24/2004; dated February 24, 2004

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 NRC Inspection Report 50-315/02-03(DRP); 50-316/02-03(DRP); dated July 30, 2002

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 NRC Inspection Report 50-315/02-06(DRP); 50-316/02-06(DRP); dated October 28, 2002

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 NRC Inspection
Report 50-315/02-09(DRP); 50-316/02-09(DRP); dated January 27, 2003

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 NRC Integrated Inspection
Report 50-315/03-02(DRP); 50-316/03-02(DRP); dated April 29, 2003

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 NRC Special Inspection
Report 50-315/03-08(DRP); 50-316/03-08(DRP); dated July 3, 2003

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 NRC Integrated Inspection
Report 05000315/2003010; 05000316/2003010; dated October 30, 2003

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2 NRC Inspection
Report 05000316/2003014(DRP); dated December 18, 2003

D. C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2 NRC Integrated Inspection
Report 05000315/2003012; 05000316/2003012; dated January 20, 2004

Ten Licensed Operators Medical Records; various dates

TPD-600-LOR; Licensed Operator Requalification Training Program Description; Revision
6; dated March 21, 2003

TI-TROP-01; Operations Training Program Examination Guidelines; Revision 14; dated
February 23, 2004

2 Year Training Cycle (2002/2003); Cook Plant LO Requal; dated March 31, 2003

Classroom Attendance Computer Listing for Licensed Operators; dated various

TAP-300; SAT Development; Revision 5; dated January 16, 2004

TAP-600-030; Simulator Configuration Control; Revision 2; dated December 12, 2003

TAP-600-031; Simulator Training Request Implementation; Revision 1; dated
January 15, 2002

TAP-600-032; Simulator Performance Testing; Revision 2; dated December 12, 2003

SIM-NPE; Simulator Normal Plant Evolution Testing; Revision 3

Normal Plant Evolution Test Record (1999-2002); dated various

Normal Plant Evolution Test and Performance Record (2003-2004); dated various

SIM-STEADY STATE; Simulator Steady State Testing; Revision 3

Simulator Steady State Testing (2002-2003); dated various

SIM-TRANSIENT; Simulator Transient Testing; Revision 1

Simulator Transient Testing (2002-2003); dated various

Simulator Malfunction Test Status (2002-2004); dated various

Unit 2 Cycle 14 Reactor Core Testing Guideline; Revision 1; dated February 2003

Simulator Configuration Review Board Meeting Minutes; dated various from January 9, 2002 through December 15, 2003

Simulator Design Change Status Report; dated various

List of Simulator DRs Closed since 1/1/2003; dated March 1, 2004

List of Simulator Open DRs; dated March 1, 2004

02-HP-4023-E-0; Reactor Trip or Safety Injection; Revision 22

OHI-2070; Operations Training and Qualification; Revision 15; dated February 28, 2003

OHI-2070; Operations Training and Qualification; Attachment 4; Active License Watchstanding Record; dated various in 2003

OHI-2070; Operations Training and Qualification; Attachment 6; New or Inactive License/STA Upgrade Record; dated October 16, 2003

OHI-2070; Operations Training and Qualification; Attachment 7; New or Inactive License Watchstanding Record; dated October 16, 2003

OHI-2070; Operations Training and Qualification; Revision 15; Attachment 8; Operator License/STA Status Report; dated Current Quarter 1st, Year 2004

OHI-4000; Conduct of Operations: Standards; Revision 4; Change 3; dated January 23, 2004

Curriculum Development Committee Meeting Agenda Minutes; dated various from January 9, 2003 through February 5, 2004

Weekly Feedback Session Licensed Operator Training; dated various from July 19, 2002 through January 30, 2004

Dynamic Simulator Scenarios for 2004 Requalification Examination (10 total); dated various

Simulator Job Performance Measures for 2004 Requalification Examination (15 total); dated various

In-Plant Job Performance Measures for 2004 Requalification Examination (10 total); dated various

DIT-B-01061-09; EOP Operator Action Times from Accident Analyses; dated July 20, 2003

D. C. Cook Updated Final Safety Analysis Report; Section 14.2.4; Steam Generator Tube Rupture; Revision 18.1

EOP Verification and Validation Report; 02-0HP-4023-E-3; Steam Generator Tube Rupture; Revision 10

Cook Nuclear Plant Dynamic Simulator Evaluation Guide; Attachment 3; dated various from June 18 through June 25, 2002

RQ-S-2811; Screenhouse Forebay Degraded Condition; Revision 0; dated May 14, 2003

RQ-S-2820; Period 2802 Operations Review; Revision 0; dated June 16, 2003

RQ-S-2840; Period 2804 Operations Review; Revision 0; dated August 20, 2003

RQ-S-2842; Steam Break and Screenhouse Forebay Degraded Condition; Revision 0; dated August 27, 2003

SA-2002-TRN-001; Operations Licensed Operator Requal Training Assessment; dated February 22 through March 15, 2002

SA-2002-TRN-004; Operations Training Focused Self-Assessment of Exam Process; dated April 8 through April 19, 2002

SA-2002-TRN-005; Operations Training Focused Self-Assessment of Licensed Operator Biennial Written Examination; dated July 19 through August 16, 2002

SA-2003-TRN-005-QH; Quick Hit Self-Assessment; dated April 24, 2003

SA-2003-TRN-006-QH; Quick Hit Self-Assessment; dated April 4, 2003

SA-2003-TRN-009-QH; Quick Hit Self-Assessment; dated August 28 through September 12, 2003

SA-2003-TRN-010-QH; Quick Hit Self-Assessment; dated May 9, 2003

SA-2003-TRN-011-QH; Effectiveness Review of Corrective Actions Taken for Operations Training Finding ACC-6.1; dated December 1 through December 23, 2003

SA-2003-TRN-012-QH; Quick Hit Self-Assessment; dated August 8, 2003

SA-2003-TRN-016-F; Self Assessment of Licensed Operator Requalification Program; dated December 16, 2003 through January 31, 2004

SA-2003-TRN-018-QH; Quick Hit Self-Assessment; dated September 1, 2003

PA-02-07, Training; Performance Assurance Audit; dated March 15 through April 18, 2002

Condition Report 02092042; The Selection of Job Performance Measures for the Annual Operating Examinations for Licensed Operators Resulted in Greater Than 50 Percent Repeatability When Considering the Validation Crew Along with the Operating Shifts; dated April 2, 2002

Condition Report 02268007; A Test Item Challenge to LOR Quiz RQ2705A was Denied Based on the Reasoning Used in the Challenge. Upon Later Review, the Question was Deemed to Have Alternate Correct Answers; dated September 25, 2002

Condition Report 02268011; Exam Bank Question on Carbon Dioxide Fire Protection Had High Failure Rate; dated September 25, 2002

Condition Report 03014016; Implementation of Simulator Evaluation Scenario Did Not Meet Standards; dated January 14, 2003

Condition Report 03052036; While Performing a Job Performance Measure During the Annual Operator Examination, 2 of 5 Operators Chose a Path that was Different Than Intended in the Design of the JPM; dated February 21, 2003

Condition Report 03149062; All Lesson Plan Materials which Describe the RCP Seals Need to be Updated to Capture the Changed #1 Seal Leakoff Flow Rates Exhibited by the Silicon Nitride Faced #1 Seals; dated May 29, 2003

Condition Report 03175020; A Simulator Evaluation Scenario was Inadvertently Left Uncontrolled in the Operator Simulator Briefing Room; dated June 24, 2003

Condition Report 03205050; Directions to Initiate Safety Injection were Deleted from Appropriate Steps During Revision of Both Unit's Steam Generator Tube Leak Procedures; dated July 24, 2003

Condition Report 03329070; Simulator Evaluations Conducted with Superseded E-0; dated November 25, 2003

Condition Report 04036042; During the Annual Licensed Operator Requal Exam an SRO was Mistakenly Given an RO Written Exam While an RO was Mistakenly Given an SRO Written Exam; dated February 5, 2004

Condition Report 04038007; While Administering the Annual Licensed Operator Requalification Written Exam on February 5, 2004, a Potential Exam Compromise Situation Existed. No Actual Compromise Occurred; dated February 5, 2004

Condition Report 04040028; Conduct Quick Hit Self-Assessment #SA-2004-TRN-021-QH, Licensed Operator Medical Records; dated February 9, 2004

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED

ANS	American Nuclear Society
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DC	Direct Current
DR	Discrepancy Report
DRP	Division of Reactor Projects
EOP	Emergency Operating Procedure
IMC	Inspection Manual Chapter
JPM	Job Performance Measure
LO	Licensed Operators
LOR	Licensed Operator Requalification
MRO	Medical Review Officer
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRR	Nuclear Reactor Regulation
RCP	Reactor Coolant Pump
RO	Reactor Operator
ROP	Reactor Oversight Process
SAT	Systematic Approach to Training
SDP	Significance Determination Process
SRO	Senior Reactor Operator
STA	Shift Technical Advisor
TBD	To Be Determined
VDC	Volts Direct Current