

DRAFT OUTLINE COMMENTS

Facility: CGS

First Exam Date: 4/24/15

Written Exam Outline	
(Date)	
	Comment
	Resolution
1	RO Q#48 – K/A was replaced due to “could not write a question to this K/A topic.” Request more detail.
2	SRO Q#95,97 – K/As replaced due to “Could not write discernable SRO only question.” Request more detail.
	Exam writer spent a day attempting to correlate High Drywell pressure and Drywell Radiation levels and could not develop a question making this correlation.
	SRO #95 – While a question could be written, the exam writer could not develop three credible distractors. SRO #97 – This generic KA applies to both RO and SRO candidates alike. All questions developed could have been deemed to be RO knowledge also.

Administrative JPM Outline	
(Date)	
	Comment
	Resolution
1	The SAG flowchart does not meet the intent of an E-Plan JPM. Which K/A covers SAG knowledge? Need to justify or replace JPM.
	This JPM was removed from the exam and replaced with an EP type JPM..

Control Room / In-Plant System JPM Outline	
(Date)	
	Comment
	Resolution
1	S2, S4, & S7 – all have electric plant shifts. Need further justification as to why they meet the various safety functions.
2	S7 has been on both previous exams – need to replace this JPM due to predictability.
3	It does not appear that any ESF systems are actually operated in S2. Need to justify or replace JPM.
4	Does the simulator model the remote shutdown panel? Does the remote shutdown panel JPM have other in-plant actions?
5	Is P-3 in the RCA – the ‘R’ count says
	S2 has no electrical plant actions. S4 does have electrical board actions. S7 was replaced due to comment 2.
	S7 was removed from the exam and a new JPM was developed as a replacement.
	The EN designations for this JPM was removed from the outline.
	The operation of RCIC from the RSD panel was removed from the exam and replaced with a different plant JPM.
	Added ‘R’ to this JPM designation.

	'3,' but there is no 'R' designation for P-3	
--	--	--

Simulator Scenario Outline Comments		
(Date)		
	Comment	Resolution
1	Only 1 scenario that is going to be run (Scenario 4) has any instrument failures. Scenarios 1, 2, & 3 are all component failure exclusive. Need to replace some C's with I's.	Added an instrument failure to scenario 1. I took a look at the event types for the remaining scenarios and noted some that were classified as 'C' should have been classified as 'I' Scenario 2 has two 'I's; Scenario 3 has one 'I'; Scenario 4 has three 'I's; Scenario 5 (Spare) has two 'I's.
2	In general - Critical tasks need to be bounded with some conditions that state by when the task must be accomplished.	In progress.
3	Scenario 1 – I7&I10 are listed as SRO and BOP. Their BOP should be moved to Scenario 2.	Corrected.
4	I2, I5, I8 & I11 only get one I/C in ATC position (3 in BOP position). This leaves us close to missing a requirement if these applicants do not respond to this one event. Need to add "I" for these applicants at the ATC position.	Added note to scenario guide. Reviewed guide and fairly confident ATC will get his bean.
5	Scenario 1 – what is the reason for the second normal (DG surveillance)?	Removed TSW pump swap normal evolution.
6	Scenario 1 – does the uncoupled rod have verifiable actions?	Yes – fully insert the control rod.
7	Scenario 2 – does not have any I/C failures after the major event designated. Need to clarify what is being taken credit for or add two malfunctions.	Corrected. Event 8 has a component failure which has been indicated on its D-1.
8	Scenario 3 – DG fails to auto start – are there verifiable actions?	Yes – Start the DG's.
9	Scenario 4 – Is the electrical ATWS truly an instrument failure or is it a component failure?	Yes – relays are failed to give ATWS condition.
10	Scenario 5 – CRD flow controller failure should be "I" not "C."	Corrected.