

FAQ 36.9

Appeal Process Decision - Not to be used for future reference or incorporation into NEI 99-02.

The licensee took commendable actions in anticipation of potential high turbine vibration conditions. When those conditions were experienced, operator actions were driven by recently implemented procedure changes and training, and resulted in a transient that was not very complicated. However, the risk significance of the transient was limited only because of the low decay heat. The normal heat removal path was lost and it was not easily or readily recoverable from the control room. Operator actions were required for the safety of the turbine. This situation meets the criteria to be counted in the PI.

FAQ 50.1

Yes. The licensee satisfied the conditions described in NEI 99-02, Revision 3, pages 26 and 27^{ok} and the planned overhaul hours may be excluded from the SSU calculation.

FAQ 52.1

No. The licensee started a second contingency plan to be used in the event that the first contingency plan was unsuccessful. To complete this second plan would require a down-power of greater than 20 percent. When the first contingency plan was unsuccessful, the second plan was implemented. The time between starting the second plan and performing the down-power was greater than 72 hours. Therefore the down-power was "planned."^{ok}

FAQ 53.1

No. The condition existed since initial startup and the failure was not capable of being discovered during normal surveillance testing. A statement to that effect should be reported in the comment field.^{ok}