



**Entergy Nuclear South**  
Entergy Operations, Inc.  
17265 River Road  
Killona, LA 70066  
Tel 504 739 6440  
Fax 504 739 6698  
kpeters@entergy.com

**Ken Peters**  
Director, Nuclear Safety Assurance  
Waterford 3

**W3F1-2002-0075**  
**A4.05**  
**PR**

August 6, 2002

Mr. E.W. Merschoff  
Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive, Suite 400  
Arlington, TX 76011

Subject: Waterford 3 SES  
Docket No. 50-382  
License No. NPF-38  
Operator Examination Comments

Dear Mr. Merschoff:

On July 31, 2002, a NRC Reactor Operator (RO) examination was administered to a candidate at Waterford 3. We are hereby submitting the following information per the guidance in NUREG 1021, ES-402, Section E. Attached to this letter are: Question Changes with Justification; Examination Security Agreement; ES-403-1, RO Examination Grading Quality Checklist; Graded RO Examination and a Clean Copy; RO Master Examination; RO Master Examination Key; Examinee Questions and Proctor Responses; Written Examination Seating Chart; and Post Exam Evaluation Results.

This submittal does not contain any commitments. If you have any questions concerning the above, please contact R.W. Fletcher at (504) 739-6038.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "K.J. Peters" followed by a horizontal line.

K.J. Peters  
Director, Nuclear Safety Assurance

KJP/OPP/cbh  
Attachments

cc: NRC, Document Control Desk, N. Kalyanam (NRC-NRR), J. Smith,  
N.S. Reynolds, NRC Resident Inspectors Office

Waterford 3 post-examination review identified three questions that had two correct answers or could not be answered given the information available in the question. Waterford 3 is submitting this list for information but does not propose to request any changes to the exam itself. Waterford 3 will correct the exam questions in the exam bank.

Dave Vincent

Waterford 3 Senior Instructor

## FORMAL QUESTION COMMENTS WITH REFERENCES

- Question #39 (5975A)

Evaluation result – remove question from exam

Justification – Not enough information was given to the student. Question should have stated that RCP 1A CCW Return Temperature was  $>160^{\circ}\text{F}$  and rising. Without this information, the student could not be expected to know that the RCP1A CCW Isolation valve had closed.

Waterford 3 proposed action – correct question stem to include information about RCP 1A CCW Return Temperature.

- Question #43 (5978A)

Evaluation result – accept answer A.

Justification – A review of CWD LOU-1564-B-424 -E530(attached) shows that the RAS signal would defeat any SIAS signal. This would make the Low Pressure Safety Injection Pumps inoperable. Therefore answer A would also be correct.

Waterford 3 proposed action – change answer A to make it incorrect for the question.

- Question 45 (5980A)

Evaluation result - accept answer A.

Justification – The Boron Dilution Monitor alarms occur when the process exceeds the setpoint. The question does not have indication that the process has exceeded the setpoint. By the information given in the question, there is no reason for the alarms to be in. With no indication of rising temperature or power, the only possible response would be to declare the Boron Dilution monitors inoperable. Therefore, answer A would be correct. (Attached – annunciator responses for Boron Dilution Monitor alarms).

Waterford 3 proposed action – Change question to have dilution monitor process readings to be higher than the listed setpoint readings.