

DRAFT OUTLINE COMMENTS

Facility: Waterford 3

First Exam Date: September 14, 2015

Written Exam Outline (Revision 1)		
	Comment	Resolution
	RO Exam Outline	
1	Tier 2/Group 1, Question #28: If there are high vibrations on a RCP, there are no indications of the amount of deflection (mils) that are indicated in the control room or elsewhere? Trying to understand how there are no indications that an applicant could predict and/or monitor.	Added additional explanation in Form ES-401-4 to explanation of why writing a question to the original K/A statement would not be possible for the licensee. Explanation is acceptable.
2	Tier 2/Group 1, Question #46: It is allowed to use 4 RO and 2 SRO written exam questions that were used on the previous 2 exams at a facility without NRR approval. Why is selecting one that matches the original K/A statement an issue?	Added additional explanation in Form ES-401-4 to explanation of why writing a question to the original K/A statement would not be possible for the licensee. Explanation is acceptable.
3	Tier 2/Group 1, Question #53: The onsite system that fits the description of "Service Water System" does not have a portion that isolates safety-related/non safety-related loads on an ESFAS signal?	Unique to plant design, they don't have an automatic feature that separates loads in their ACCW system. This system is the site equivalent to the Service Water system. Proposed outline change accepted.
4	Tier 2/Group 2, Question #64: When there is a high radiation condition in the Waste Gas system, there are typically automatic isolations of part of the system, or an operator has an action to adjust ventilation in the area. Is the issue that your system is designed differently, or that there is no procedure written to address if such a situation occurs?	Added additional explanation in Form ES-401-4 to explanation of why writing a question to the original K/A statement would not be possible for the licensee. Explanation is acceptable based on specific plant design.
5	Tier 3/Group 4, Question #73: In implementing the EOPs, if there is a situation where multiple recovery paths are necessary, there has to be some decision basis on how to decide which recovery path is prioritized over others. Is it that this isn't addressed in your bases documentation, or that writing a question on this would be very difficult for a RO question?	Added additional explanation in Form ES-401-4 to explanation of why writing a question to the original K/A statement would not be possible for the licensee. The licensee could not propose a question for it written at RO level of knowledge. Explanation is acceptable.

	SRO Outline	
1	Tier 1/Group 2, Question #7: The K/A statement refers to the ability to use the thermocouple temperature readings as a backup method to determine where rods have dropped into the core. Using a core thermocouple map of some sort can help do this. Verify that there is no means of doing this in the plant.	Verified that there is no current procedure at the site using QSPDS data to accomplish this. Change acceptable. Recommend evaluation in corrective action process.
	General	
	<p>For two questions on the ES-401-4's, it gave an explanation that a question could not be written addressing the K/A statement because there is no site procedure that addresses the situation. The K/A statements were developed based on the job tasks that a licensed operator may be called upon to do. Not having a procedure to address these needs to be fixed. Recommend entering into a corrective action document.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • RO Exam, Tier 2/Group 1, Question #49 (064 A2.16); • SRO Exam, Tier 1/Group 1, Question #5 (000057 AA2.10) 	Licensee will enter into the corrective action process.

Administrative JPM Outline (2015 NRC Revision 0)		
	Comment	Resolution
1	No comments.	

Control Room / In-Plant System JPM Outline (2015 NRC Revision 0)		
	Comment	Resolution
1	The outlines are prepared on Form-ES-301-2 from NUREG-1021, Rev. 9, Sup. 1. There are some changes to the form in the Rev. 10 version. Replace it.	The outlines were migrated to the forms from NUREG-1021, Rev. 10.
2	Emergency Diesel Generators can be denoted as "Engineered Safety Features" if they are called out as such in the site FSAR, Chapter 6, "ECCS." Check into this for JPM S6.	The licensee elected to remove the "Engineered Safety Features" designation for this JPM. There is one system JPM besides this one that is clearly an ESF system, so the criteria on Form ES-301-2 is met.
3	JPM S5 for SRO Upgrade applicants: Since it was used on the 2014 NRC exam, verify that none of the applicants had this on that exam.	The licensee verified that this won't be an issue for this exam.

Simulator Scenario Outline Comments (2015 NRC Exam Revision 0)	
Comment	Resolution
1	General comment: The “Scenario Quantitative Attributes” need to be revised to reflect NUREG-1021, Rev. 10. “Total Malfunctions” has been removed.
2	Scenario 1, Event 3: For the purposes of the simulator test, to get credit for use of Tech Specs, the applicant must apply Tech Spec action statements at a minimum. A TRM application is not a Tech Spec application.
3	Scenario 1, Critical Task 1: What quantitative measures are there that examiners can use to measure whether the applicant passes or fails on this one?
4	Scenario 2, Critical Task 2: What quantitative measures are there that examiners can use to measure whether the applicant passes or fails on this one?
5	Scenario 3, Critical Task 2: What quantitative measures are there that examiners can use to measure whether the applicant passes or fails on this one?
6	Scenario 3, Events 6 and 7: This is the same sequence of events as in the 2012 NRC exam, Scenario 2, Events 5 and 6. Can the equipment malfunction after the major event be changed to eliminate any predictability?