

Oyster Creek Operating Exam Comments

Simulator JPMs

General Comments:

1. Specify if prerequisites have been met for those JPMs that have extensive prerequisites. **Done**
2. Initial off the steps that have been completed on partially completed procedures. Remind licensee - **Done**
3. For alternate path JPMs in the script highlight in bold alt path actions - **DONE**
4. At the end of each JPM you have listed in **BOLD type** a terminating cue. Please delete these. This is really a task standard and does not need to be listed here. This is confusing and doesn't fit our normal template - **DONE**

JPM #1 – Change to have applicant do all switch manipulations. Offered option to startup a recirc pump from cold shutdown (1st pump started) – They elected to use this option. **DONE**

- Step 7 - Why is it necessary to cue the applicant that the scoop tube may indicate less than 100%? After the exam will evaluate as a possible Sim fidelity and if so will document in Sim work request. Resolution: Not an issue during validation. Change cue to examiner note. Changes made - **DONE**

JPM #2 - Perform Core Spray ST – seems like should be repetitive with dynamic in that same flow path also maybe overly simplistic. Replaced simulator event that was similar. **OK**

JPM #3 – Scram TSV closure test – **OK**

Step 6.3 in the procedure is not addressed in the JPM. This is a 'verify – no action" step. Recommend adding a performance step to the JPM or an examiner note. The JPM says to start a step 6.3 but the first JPM step is 6.4. Added examiner note - **DONE**

JPM #4 – Control Reactor Pressure using the Isolation Condenser Tube Side Vents. Recommend adding a pressure control band to the task standard and determining if the applicant can actually control reactor pressure. Need to see how this works in the simulator. - **DONE**

Resolution: Changed cue page so applicant knows to use JPM conditions – not simulator conditions. - No other changes on JPM. Can't see pressure decrease for LONG time due to vents being very small. **DONE

JPM #5 –The initiating cue tells the operator to maintain pressure below 3.0 psig. Should the operator be required to actually maintain pressure? Need to see how drywell

pressure responds in simulator. Resolution: takes too long in simulator – do not have operator do this. **OK**

Step 3 – should read 3.2.2 not 3.2.3 as written Fixed **DONE**

JPM #6 – Transfer Buses – Used from last exam and direct from bank. Is this done prior to any SCRAM?? If so redundant to what will be tested on dynamic. Resolution: Verified that this action is not taken during scenarios. Not done unless the shutdown is controlled and planned. **OK**

JPM 7: Add step close the APRM drawer. - **DONE**

JPM 8 – Swap control room ventilation fans. Performance step 11 – How would the applicant make the decision regarding how many refrigeration compressor circuit breakers should be closed? Can this decision be part of the JPM? Seems like the cue for this step is prompting. Resolution: OK – bring in an RMS alarm 10F1k ARM hi to cue the operator to take the action. Delete last cue to place the system in emergency mode. Now reads “Place the control room ventilation system in the proper **emergency** mode

Add labels to CR vent fans. VERIFY on site

Step 12: remove the word emergency from Cue #2. **Done revised to delete Cue**

Step 13 - reword cue too leading if on back panel at the time we can say that you have alarm don't give alarm response unless requested. If on the front panel let the applicant should ask whether that his alarm and we can say that this your alarm. **Done**

In-Plant JPMs

- Plant JPM 1 Procedure steps 1-4 are skipped. Recommend adding these steps to the JPM. **DONE** in plant portion of JPM (i.e. getting equipment and racking in the SBO breaker (also a simulate / discuss task). Consider moving this JPM into the simulator? This JPM will be done partially in the plant for first 4 steps and the remainder will be performed in the simulator since OC has a fully operational SBO panel. Need to ensure that the in-plant JPM cuing sheet is provided in the in-plant packages + ABN-37 page(s) Revise cuing sheet to clarify scope of task for in-plant and Simulator portions of the JPM **Done**

- Plant JPM 2 - Trip Feed pumps locally - basically a one step JPM repeated 2 times i.e., identical actions to trip and verify all 3 pumps – seems overly simplistic. Agree. Resolution: Revised JPM to trip recirc MG sets and recirc pumps. **DONE**

- Plant JPM 3 – Lineup Fire Water to Core Spray to raise Torus Water Level.

Initiating cue states the applicant should start at step 3.2.4. The JPM initial conditions state that the procedure is complete through step 3.3.3. It appears that

the JPM was modified from Core Spray System 1 to system 2. The steps are not consistent throughout the procedure. Make steps consistent with procedure. **FIXED**

Step 2 references step 3.3.4. Step 3 references procedure step 3.2.4. **Corrected**

Step 7 references procedure step 3.3.5.4 but it stated that core spray system 1 is placed in PTL – not system 2. **Corrected**

SRO Admin JPMs

SRO 1 – Review Turnover Log – Okay but pretty simplistic Resolution: Evaluated in simulator – determined to be acceptable with changes. Added steps to evaluate Tech Specs and determine LCOs and AOTs. For the note on the log regarding APLHGR exceeding the limit - couldn't we give them the log to show the readings instead of the note. At the very least saying the RE is investigating is too leading. Done **Note removed from log and printout provided need to remove Red highlight from out of spec reading - verify on site**

Step 4 – It is not clear how applicants would know that main condenser outlet temperature > 97 degrees? NJDEPs permit questions are not appropriate for NRC exams. Revised step 4 to change to a thermal limits problem. **DONE**

SRO 2 – No key included – provide key prior to exam. Provided key. Also – provide entire procedure. Change cue – ask for reason for notification. **DONE**

SRO 3 – They need to determine the applicable tech spec LCOs and action statements that are associated with the LCOs. Added examiner cue to request information if not provided. **Done**

Step 7.1.4 states that “Incorrect use of temporary procedure change for TS surveillance acceptance criteria of ESW flow > 3000 gpm.” I do not see any indication of a TPC for the JPM? Resolution – make the TPC look more realistic. **Done**

SRO 4 – Modify Task Cue delete second and third bullets and modify first bullet and complete any required actions. The pregnant lady has adequate exposure left with 300 mrem and 162.5 mrem more exposure needed total 462.5 mrem which is less than 500. What is another reason for not picking her **Replaced JPM**

This task is not an SRO required task to authorize this exposure this task is more generic GET level. In addition the task simplistic. Resolution: Replaced JPM with new JPM written at SRO level– Authorize emergency dose limits for 3 workers – **Replacement OK as submitted.**

SRO 5: The PAR flow chart has a note which requires applicants to evaluate the potential sea breeze effect on PARs. Do we need to provide addition info to determine if a sea breeze is blowing? Add initial condition on PAR JPM cue sheet. **DONE**

Part D, Item 4 of Appendix E **indicate whether the task is time critical Fixed DONE**

RO Admin JPMs

RO 1 – The applicants are expected to fill in all values for the log and identify the 2 out of spec readings. Want to validate this JPM in the Sim. Task Standard should say they should note all out of spec readings (safe operator standard) AND they should NOT note any in-spec readings as being out of spec (safe operator standard). Resolution – validated in simulator – **OK**

Step 12 – Differential level is not “250 units” as stated in the task standard. It is 0.4 inches. Why do we need to provide them with the previous day’s water level? Should they determine this from panel 9XR Corrected **DONE**

RO 2 - Want to validate this JPM in the Sim **DONE**. This JPM needs to have an error margin+ or – for all critical steps based on readability (JPM steps 10-16, 18-21) Evaluate by examiner at the time. There are no graphs to read or interpret. Need a better answer key. Answer key provided. No error bands were provided - **okay**

Conduct this JPM in classroom setting. Omit last step – change to calculate core power. (No PPC Comparison) **DONE**

RO 3 – added pages E1-1 and E1-2 of attachment 201.1-2 to procedure given to applicant **Done**.

RO 4 – Recommend changing the Yarway “A” level to 84”. This requires the applicant to determine that this instrument is not qualified for use based solely on step 3.4, not on step 3.5. It would be qualified for use by step 3.5 alone. This makes the JPM a little more challenging. Changed water level for Yarway A. **DONE**

Scenarios – 1) Designate scenario #1 as the spare 2) Need all new QC forms for Operating and Written Exams especially with changes to applicant number and scenario combos considering Scenarios 2, 3, and 4.

Make scenario #1 the backup scenario

Sim 1:

- 1) Stuck rod is described in the event summary and page 18 of D-2 form but not in the D-1 scenario outline. **Fixed – corrected**
- 2) Establish objective failure criteria for critical tasks. Site has no such criteria established. Determine on a case by case basis by examiners. **OK**
- 3) Page 8 – Delete last sentence of Booth cue, page 8 - too leading. Deleted done
- 4) Page 10, typo initiation “LPRM 36-17B” corrected **DONE**
- 5) Page 12, Note: Too leading – if SRO/crew hesitates too long contact lead examiner on head set and ask for direction. However, if they decide to trip the feedpump, then intervene and direct a normal shutdown. Better to swap events 5 and 6 and let them trip the pump if they make that decision. If they trip the pump and the reactor scrams, then initiate event 7. Changed cue – swapped events 5 and 6 **DONE**
- 6) Page 19, bold type – all CT actions in scripts. **DONE**

Have SRO as a follow-up question classify some of the events. **Done**
Event 3 – change exhauster blower cure to annunciator and motor trip. **DONE**
Changed CRD pump to include making metallic noise. **DONE**

Sim 2:

- 1) Event 1 - event duplicates JPM 2. Replace either the event or the JPM. (verify)
Replaced event 1 with new event (RPS channel check failure) replaced with scram
contactor test - **DONE**
- 2) Event 4 – there is a RO Admin JPM #3 also bypasses an APRM that uses
procedure 403 attachment 2. This event duplicates the Admin JPM. Actions
between event and JPM are very different. Also deleted APRM event out of
another scenario. **OK**
- 3) Event 6 – list SRO actions. **done**
- 4) **Generic comment:** Bold type – all CT actions in scripts. **Done**
- 5) Page 19, 1) SRO actions do not include directing SCRAM. List ABN & EOP basis
for SCRAM & ED. Need evaluation standards for scram (time, parameters etc)
Fixed
- 6) Removed event 5 (EMRV failure) and replaced with recirc pump seal failure. **Done**

Sim 3:

- 1) Replace event 7 – redundant to Scenario Sim #1, events 4 & 6. Reviewed in
simulator – determined to be acceptable with added rod drift. The number of
malfunctions available for the ATC is very limited due to limits on ATC. **OK**
- 2) **Generic comment:** Bold type – all CT actions in scripts **DONE - OK**
- 3) Have SRO as a follow-up question classify the event – not a call from SM. **Done**
- 4) Event 6 - Added role play on RBCCW to RWCU - **OK**
- 5) Added cue when to vent scram air header – Move to page 20 **Done**

Sim 4:

- 1) Events 1 in other scenarios for ATC already had several rod malfunctions (outward
drifting and uncoupled). This is the only scenario that addresses a stuck rod –
actions are different (raise drive pressure). **OK**
- 2) Events 3 redundant malfunction APRM (scenario 2, event 4) – please replace. Also
similar to a JPM. Replaced event with RPV GEMACs level failure event. Moved to
event 6. **DONE**
- 3) Typo outline event 1, “rod 26-11 **Fixed OK**
- 4) **Generic comment** – List all titles of support procedures in the scripts **Fixed OK**
- 5) **Generic comment:** Bold type – all CT actions in scripts fixed **OK**
- 6) Have SRO as a follow-up question classify the event **Done OK**

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other			6. B/M/N	7. U/E/S	8. Explanation	
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job-Link	Minutia	#/ units	Backward	Q=K/A	SRO only	Ref needed				
1	H	4											Y	N	Y	N	S	
2	F	4				2					Y		N	N	N	N	U	1) The only thing that makes D incorrect is that the core spray booster pump starts in 10 seconds - not 5 seconds. Are the applicants really required to memorize this nuance? 2) The K/A is for MBT/ABT transfer. This is different than the sequencer. Do they have MBT/ABT transfers for a LOOP? You are testing AK3.03 (Load shedding) not AK3.01 (Manual and auto bus transfer). 3) "A" not plausible to auto load /"B" since no and of a loss of EDG New Q written that matches K/A. Modify "D" to list a critical load that is loaded back to a different bus not re-powered to make "D" more plausible..
3	H	3											Y	N	N	M	S	
4	H	2											Y	N	N	N	S	The license was questioned regarding the importance of testing follow-up actions in the ABN and stated these are very significant actions to test.
5	F	2											Y	N	N	N	E	
6	H	2											Y	N	N	N	S	Why is "D" plausible Revised "D" to improve plausibility.
7	H	2				X							Y	N	N	N	U	"A" distractor implausible fuel pool cooling affected. "C" similar to "D" and "D" seem implausible ??? "A & C" replaced and "D" is plausible.
8	H	2				X							Y	N	N	N	U	NOT CORRECTED Revise "D" distractor to make plausible with low surge tank level not plausible to start pumps. Is it appropriate to test subsequent operator actions from memory? "C" and "D" not plausible with low surge tank level - starting pump won't help <i>Licensee indicated have a valid LO and item was validated by operators</i>
9	F	1				B	BCD						N?	N	N	N	U	Very simple - LOD = 1? Similar to question on SRO exam. K/A is for backup air supply which usually means the redundant air supply (service or station air?) A is the first action - B, C and D are the next subsequent actions - A is a partial answer no matter what instrument air pressure would be. This question very similar to question on SRO 14. Same setup - double jeopardy - "B" doesn't seem plausible Question replaced with a new Q testing the same K/A.
10	H	3				C							Y	N	N	M	E	NOT FIXED "C" not plausible - How can condensate system be used for makeup with main condenser vacuum breaker open?
11	F	2				X							Y	N	N	B	U	"A&B" implausible distractors Distractors revised - Accept as borderline LOD.
12	H	3		1									Y	N	N	N	E	Only the correct answer includes a "time delay" - can this be added to at least one other distracter? Added time delay to "B"

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other			6. B/M/N	7. U/E/S	8. Explanation	
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job-Link	Minutia	#/ units	Backward	Q=K/A	SRO only	Ref needed				
13	H	3											Y	N	Y	N	S	Do not provide references of large graphs unnecessary and leading just provide EOP as already planned for SRO applicants and for ROs just provide the one EOP flow chart without references? Either a redacted copy of EOP will be provided or all the EOP PCC graphs.
14	H	3				A, B, D?							Y	N	N	N	E	A, B and D? plausibility should be improved. A = 3.5 minutes but distracter says 4 min. B = 8.5 minutes but nearest distracter says 9 minutes. D - not sure what error one might make to select 12 minutes except a simple math error - but an applicant could argue that D is correct because of instrument response lag. C is right on the calculation. Change distracters to line up with plausible errors. Done
15	F	3											Y	N	N	B	S	Explain why K/A matches. Could A be considered to be at least partially correct? Done
16	F	2		1									Y	N	N	M	E	1) What makes comprehension level - looks like memory level? 2) Reword the stem to state the actual water level in the torus in the stem (e.g. 112"). 3) The distracters in the explanation section do not align with the answer or explanations. The explanation section says C is correct - the top block says D is correct. Comments resolved
17	H	3											Y	N	N	N	E	Can we rephrase the distracters to make more credible and provide psychometric balance - maybe use "A" basis twice and "B" twice? "A" bases <u>may</u> be correct. Done
18	H	3											Y	N	N	N	S	Change the explanation to state the reactor is at 60% not 14%. Done
19	F	2											Y	N	N	B	S	
20	F	3											Y	N	N	N	S	
21	H	3											Y	N	N	N	S	Discuss plausibility of A and B? What makes turbine trip a plausible distracter? Done
22	H	3											Y	N	N	N	S	
23	F	2											Y	N	N	M	S	
24	H	2											Y	N	N	N	S	Explain why each of these distracters is plausible but incorrect? Done
25	H	3				X							Y	N	N	B	S	Explain why each of these distracters is plausible but incorrect? Done
26	H	3											Y	N	N	N	S	
27	F	1-2?											Y	N	N	N	U	This is a very borderline level of difficulty. Q rewritten to an acceptable LOD
28	H	3											Y	N	N	N	E	Consider editing stem to read all SDC pumps "automatically trip". Operators may trip the SDC pumps for distracters B and C if they think they have a rupture of SDC piping. Done
29	H	3											Y	N	N	M	S	
30	H	3	1										Y	N	N	N	S	
31	H	3											Y	N	Y	M	S	This is normally an SRO topic to predict impacts and based on impacts use procedures... Licensee stated with reference provided RO level.

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other			6. B/M/N	7. U/E/S	8. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job-Link	Minutia	#/ units	Backward	Q=K/A	SRO only	Ref needed			
32	H	2										Y	N	N	N	S	
33	H	4										Y	N	N	B	S	Tighten wording in stem V-19-25 is "in the" closed position Done
34	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
35	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
36	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
37	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
38	H	4										Y	N	N	N	S	
39	F	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
40	H	3										Y	N	Y	N	S	Stem states (see attached drawing) but question data form states no references provided. Recommend provide attached drawings. Done
41	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
42	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	Licensee rated this question as a fundamental knowledge - I think it is comprehension Done
43	F	3										Y	N	N	N	S	Could "B" be considered correct if the applicant assumed that "the last good value of steam flow" was the last good total steam flow value - which is equivalent to the correct answer? Done - Licensee explained not possible
44	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	Would any of the references provided in the SRO reference package aide in answering One distractor modified to address concern
45	F	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
46	F	2										Y	N	N	N	S	
47	H	3										Y	N	N	M	S	
48	H	4										Y	N	N	N	S	
49	F	3										Y	N	N	B	S	
50	F	2										Y	N	N	N	S	
51	F	3				X						Y	N	N	M	E	Please explain why logically "A&B" are plausible distractors to assume that the standby compr will start and swap to the lead compr.? Distractors changed to make more plausible.
52	F	3										Y	N	N	N	S	okay to ask strait power supply Q in limited #.
53	H	3				X						Y	N	N	B	U	Distracter D is not plausible. Recommend changing to "C" "Receive an automatic trip signal but CAN be bypassed and manually started. "D" "Receive an automatic trip signal and CAN be manually started without bypass". Revised "C&D to make more plausible.
54	H	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
55	H	4										Y	N	N	M	S	
56	F	3										Y	N	N	N	S	
57	F	2										N	N	N	M	E	The K/A asks for voltage, power and current - yet the question only tests voltage. No references provided. Q choices all modified and reference provided
58	F	2				X						Y	N	N	N	E	"C" distractor does not appear to be plausible i.e., manual start. "C" revised
59	H	2										Y	N	N	N	S	
60	F	3										Y	N	N	N	S	

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. B/M/N	7. U/E/S	8. Explanation		
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job-Link	Minutia	#/ units	Backward	Q=K/A	SRO only				Ref needed	
61	F	3											Y	N		M	S	
62	H	2				X							Y	N		M	E	Distracter C does not appear to be plausible. Change distracter C. No reference provided " C " <i>revised and reference provided.</i>
63	H	3											Y	N		N	S	Please provide references that better support the answer Done
64	F	3											Y	N		N	S	
65	F	1				X							Y	N		M	E	Revise distracter A not plausible. Done
66	F	1				X							Y	N		N	U	REPLACE Q - SAME COMMENTS "B&D" distractors are not plausible. Important info but too simplistic LOD=1 the answer is obvious or should be. Replacement question UNSAT - A and D not plausible - revise as directed
67	H	2				X							Y	N		N	U	Working - Delete last sentence in first para. of stem not necessary and confusing. Why are distracters A and B plausible given that 100F per hour or less is a universal limit? You have an administrative cooldown limit of 90F. This plotted cooldown rate is only 69F in the first hour (300-230F) making A&B implausible. The question might be improved by increasing cooldown and approach that limit and then take actions to mitigate. Also A&B actions should be similar to C and D actions (i.e. throttle shut RBCCW into the SDC Hxs?) This would be psychometrically balanced and more plausible for controlling heat removal? Sam H. agreed change would improve Q.
68	H	3					1						Y	N		M	E	Not Fixed Replace Q - Q67 & 68 are both testing the same area of allowed C/D. Sam H. agrees.
69	F	1				X							Y	N		N	U	Replace Q - Distracters A and B still not plausible -150F. LOD=1.
70	F	3				X							Y	N		N	E	Change distracter B to read "Remove bundles 2 & 3 /Insert blade guide/Remove bundles 1 & 4 " Done
71	F	2				X							Y	N		N	U	Distracters A and C do not appear plausible. Why would opening vent valves to inert the DW be plausible? Revised all distracters to make more plausible.
72	F	3					X						Y	N		N	E	Could an applicant argue that D is correct? Q revised to tighten stem
73	H	3				X							Y	N		N	E	"B" not plausible with high RPV pressure. Lowered RPV temp to make more plausible.
74	F	3				1							Y	N		M	E	Why is "D" plausible? Explanation of plausibility added.
75	F	2											Y	N		N	S	

Total	75	2.7	1	2	0	20	3	0	1	0	0	75	75	75	75	Sum
F	32	42.7%							U		B	Bank =	9%	7	11	UNSAT
H	43	57.3%							E		M	Modified=	20%	15	17	Enhancement required
		100.0%							S		N	New =	71%	53	47	SATISFACTORY
														75	75	Total graded
															14.7%	% UNSAT

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. B/M/N	7. U/E/S	7. Explanation	
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job-Link	Minutia	#/ units	Backward	Q=K/A	SRO only				
1	H	2											Y	Y	N	S	
2	H	3											Y	Y	N	E	<i>Revised to classify Q as Higher Cog</i>
3	H	3					X						Y	Y	N	E	The explanation states that the reactor mode switch position is not stated in the stem. Yet the 3rd bullet states that the reactor mode switch is in RUN? Can it be argued that the purpose of the anticipatory scram is to maintain margin to fuel safety and integrity limits - making D correct? Modified TS Basis for "C&D" .
4	H	2											Y	Y	N	E	The explanation for why answer A is incorrect does not address the distractor (talks about SFP level not RPV level)? Should A provide RPV level - not just level drop? Could an applicant argue that loss of RPV level is tantamount to RU2.1.a using ED judgment? Explanations provided explaining link between RPV and SP level. Also stem clarified.
5	H	2											Y	Y	B	E	modified one distractor to provide more balance in distractor choices
6	H	2					X						Y	Y	N	E	To agree with EOP wording "A." distractor reword "Open EMRV to establish a cool down rate below 100F/hr". "B" is a subset of "D" consider revising "B" Open EMRV ... and discontinue use of Isolation Condensers" Revised "A" distractor as recommended and also revised "D" to avoid "D" being a subset of "A" .
7	H	3											Y	Y	M	S	
8	H	2		X									Y	Y	N	E	Revise one distractor to read like correct "C" answer for required TS action just change bases to something plausible but incorrect. Is it necessary to include the last bullet in the stem it kind of cues the answer and makes it a direct look-up. Deleted last bullet. DONE
9	F	2				X							Y	Y	N	S	
10	H	1				X							Y	Y	N	U	NOT FIXED - Unsat direct look-up with flow chart provided. Replace Q. - Attempted to revise - did not address concern
11	H	3											Y	Y	N	S	
12	H	3											Y	Y	M	E	NOT FIXED - Typo on explanation - still not fixed Answer in explanation does not agree with suggested answer.
13	H	3				X							Y	Y	N	E	Working - revise "B". "D" does not seem plausible to the right of P-T curve is okay and "B" not plausible .01%/k/k "D" revised still don't think "B" plausible? Revised B
14	F	1											Y	Y	N	S	Note: This is a new tech spec. Several operators missed this question during validation.
15	H	3											Y	Y	N	S	
16	H	2											Y	Y	N	S	

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. B/M/N	7. U/E/S	7. Explanation	
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job-Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back-ward	Q=K/A	SRO only				
17	H	2				X							Y	N	N	U	Working Q needs work- The answer appears to be obvious. However, will Rx pressure decrease to below the shutoff head of the Core Spray pumps without operator action? If not the second part of the answer seems overly simplistic and maybe it could be argued not completely correct since the required action would be to lower RPV pressure to allow core spray to inject. Distractors do not appear to be plausible. REPLACE
18	F	2				X							Y	Y	B	E	Enhance distracter B and D: B: 24 hour notification to NRC. D: 8 hour notification to NRC because that is what it is for a sea turtle. Revisions made to "B&D"
19	F	2				X							Y	N	N	E	"A" not plausible Revised "A" .
20	F	1											Y	Y	B	U	Not Fixed Replace Q - Direct look-up with the TS in hand.
21	F	3											Y	Y	M	E	Working - Explanation incorrect for SRM upscale talks about downscale. assume what you are saying is that the 3 distractors are listed in the TS but the proposed changes would be more conservative - if that is the case revise the explanation to add this additional explanation. Also provide references to support the distract B&C explanations revised but "A" explanation doesn't make sense also need TS ref 3.1.1.
22	F	2											Y	Y	N	E	Revise distractors "B" SQR + SRO in 90 days, "C" Site Functional Manager + SRO in 14 days, "D" Site Functional Manger +SRO in 90 days.
23	F	3											Y	N	M	S	Licensee's exam team considers this to be a legitimate SRO question because this is a custom tech spec requirement
24	H	3											Y	N	M	S	
25	F	02-Jan				X							N	Y	N	S	Replace Q (both Q23 and 25 low LOD replace one of these Qs "D" not plausible. Revised "D" Discussed with Sam H. and he agrees
Total	25	1580.2	0	1	0	8	4	0	0	0	0	0	25	25	25	25	Sum
F	9	36.0%											U	B	3	3	UNSAT
H	16	64.0%											E	M	5	12	Enhancement required
		100.0%											S	N	17	10	SATISFACTORY
													Total	Total	25	25	Total Graded
														0	0	0	Number not graded
																12.0%	% UNSAT