



Pacific Northwest Laboratories
P.O. Box 999
Richland, Washington U.S.A. 99352
Telephone (509) 375-3765
Telex 15-2874

March 7, 1986

Ms. Lynn Kolonauski
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Operator Licensing Section/Region I
631 Park Avenue
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Dear Ms. Kolonauski:

The following is the follow-up to the transmittal of the Nine Mile Point-2 results on January 24, 1986.

Enclosed is a summary of the resolutions to the unresolved comments on both the RO and SRO written examination given on December 17, 1986. Only those comments left unresolved at the time of leaving the site are included in the letter and all comments were incorporated in the Master Examinations Keys. If you have any questions please call me on (509) 375-3765.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "G. A. Sly".

G. A. Sly
BWR Coordinator

/c
Enc

RO COMMENTS:

All facility comments were either minor (i.e., typo) in nature or resolved during review of the SRO exam. Those comments which were unresolved in the SRO exam will be referenced there. All corrections and resolved comments have been incorporated into the Master Examination. One RO answer was modified during grading.

Question 1.09

Old Answer: a. power higher
flow higher

b. power lower
flow lower

New Answer: a. power higher
flow lower

b. power lower
flow higher

Reason: Since the orificing of the bundles is fixed, the same amount of potential flow would exist at the inlet of each bundle and only 2-phase flow would affect the bundle flow. This then leads to the new answer as being correct. The answer key reflects this change.

SRO COMMENTS:

Only those facility comments left unresolved or major in content are included in this list. All corrections and resolved comments have been incorporated in the Master Exam.

Question 6.11/2.02 c.

Comment: Some students were told "modes" meant "physical differences." Therefore, answer should also include:

1. MOV's to radwaste system
2. Service water x-tie (containment Spray/Flooding)

Ref: N2-IOP-31, p. 13, Shutdown Cooling, p. 28 Serviced Water Injection into the RPV/containment.

c. Answer in answer key is incorrect.

No. RHS does not realign because the system is in the Shutdown Cooling Mode. The Suppression Pool Suction (MOV-1) and SOC Suction Valves (MOV-2) are interlocked (MOV-1 does not have shut signal on LPCI injection) and the suction will not shift.

Also, the question stated the injection valve was manually closed (overridden) therefore, it will not automatically reopen without resetting the initiation logic.

Ref.: RHS Ops Tech, page 9 of 17.

Resolution: Comment accepted. The answer key was changed to reflect the proper answer.

Question 7.03 c.

Comment: Answer could be 1.

Group 1 Ref: Reg. Guide, 8.29-9, Item 6
Group 2 Ref: RP-7, ALARA, p. 2,3.

Resolution: Following a check of the Regulatory Guide, 8.29-9, Item 6, Group (1) was deemed to be the correct answer.

Question 7.06

Comment: Answer is incorrect. Answer should be:

- a. "Reduces natural circulation driving head, thereby reducing core flow, reducing power, which reduces rate at which heat is rejected to suppression pool."
- b. Answer should stop at HCTL. Rest of answer is not in reference material.

Ref: NMP2, N2-EOP-RQ Lesson Plan, p. 12 of 21.

Resolution: Comment was accepted. Answer key was changed to reflect correct answer.

Question 7.08

Comment:

- a. There is no precaution as stated in question in our procedure or Ops. Tech. material.

Acceptable answer should include either:

1. For reactor water level control due to either CRD injection or vessel heat-up,

or

2. For rejecting water to the condenser or Radwaste System to prevent use of Reactor Drain to Drywell Equipment Drain Tank.

Ref: NMP2, Ops. Tech, RWCU, p. 8 of 12.

Resolution: Only Part 2 of Part a. was accepted as being correct.

Question 8.09

Comment:

1. There are 3 pumps per loop in service water system, therefore, "both" does not apply.

If student interpreted this question to be 1 pump/loop is inop, no action would be required because a loop is defined as 2 operable pumps (3.7.1.1, p. 3/47)

2. The question stated "no specific action statement in Tech. Specs.", however answer key referenced a Tech. Spec. action statement.
 - a. Actions in answer key would be stated if student determined 2 pumps/loop were inoperable, then question statement of no specific action statement would apply is false.

Resolution: The facility comment was determined to have some merit, even though two (2) announcements of clarification were made during the written exam. For this reason the answer was modified to grade for concept only. This question should be reworded in the future to more specifically address the required knowledge. The answer key reflects the proper response for full credit.