Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
ALL												E	1. Ensure CUES and STANDARDS line up with the associated arrows. Resolution: Realigned as needed.
A1a-RO; Calculate Boron Volume for RCS Temp Change	Conduct of Operations 2.1.43	2	X	X				X				U	1. Why is it necessary to provide the procedure number and title in the Task Briefing? (E) Resolution: Procedure number and title removed. 2. Spell out NERDS first time. (E) Resolution: Full spelling added. 3. In the Task Briefing insert “RCS” before “Boron Concentration” (E) Resolution: Inserted where appropriate. Data removed from task briefing (See comment 5) 4. Delete sentence associated with provision of missing NERDS data. (E) Resolution: Sentence deleted. 5. The following information should not be provided until the examinee explains how/where to obtain them. Otherwise this JPM is simply a plug and chug task and does not provide for adequate evaluation of the applicants’ ability to obtain the data. a. RCS Boron Concentration b. BAST Concentration c. Core Burnup d. Eff Fuel Temp

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													e. DTC Insert cues at the appropriate steps instead providing in the Task Briefing. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.1, page C-1] Resolution: Data removed from task briefing and inserted as cues where appropriate. 6. In standard for step 4.1.2.a, emphasize (bold font, underline, or italicize) “Reduction” (E) Resolution: Emphasis (bold font) added 7. Change MCT acceptable range to 12.5-13.0; this is within the readability of the graph. (E) Resolution: Acceptance range changed as requested. 8. Change TC acceptable range to 14.735-15.235 due to change in acceptable range for MCT. (E) Resolution: Acceptance range changed as requested. 9. Change PCM acceptable range based on previous changes. (E) Resolution: Acceptance range changed as requested. 10. Units for DBW in step 4.1.2.j standard – units for DBW should be pcm/ppm not pcm/°F and change acceptance range per above changes. (E) Resolution: Acceptance ranges revised. NEW -- Still need to revise DBW units from pcm/°F to pcm/ppm. Acceptance range should be revised to account for rounding

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													-17.682/-8.1=2.183 rounded to 2.18 -18.262/-8.0=2.285 rounded to 2.29 Resolution: Acceptance range changed as requested. 11. The acceptable range for the gallons of boric acid (8.1.2.k) seems excessive. +/-5 doesn't properly evaluate the examinee's ability to read a log scale graph. +/- 2 seems more realistic. Ensure provided TDB has fully readable curves (curve for 1000ppm is not visible on copy provided). (E) Resolution: Acceptance range revised to 22-26 gallons (24±2) 12. Task Briefing -- Instead of telling examinee that another operator will determine effects of previous dilution, tell them that the last addition was a boration. (E) Resolution: Task briefing revised as requested. 13. Provide a standard for step 4.2 indicating that examinee determines that step is not applicable. (E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Performance standard added to step 4.2 as requested. 14. Revise Termination Cue to read: "JPM is complete when completed Attachment 9 is provided to the evaluator." (E) Resolution: Revised as recommended.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													15. NEW - Discuss whether Task completion standard at end of JPM is needed. Response: Will be located at front of JPM and removed for the end. POST VALIDATION CHANGES: 1. In standard for step 4.1.2.a, Replaced "Reduction" with "change." Also added a NOTE to clarify that the dash after (Tavg-Tref) is not a negative sign. (E) 2. In CUE for step 4.1.2.f, added a negative (-) sign to DTC.
A1b-RO Complete Valve Stroke Timing Test-Cont Iso Vlv	Conduct of Operations 2.1.25	2						X				~~U~~ E	1. Revise initiating cue to read "…prepare 1-OHP-4030-114-011 Attachment 1, RCDT and Containment Sump Valves Test, per step 2.4 of the attachment." (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. 2. Clearly identify in the standards which numerical value is IST MIN and IST MAX. (E) Resolution: Standard numerical values identified. 3. Revise Termination Cue to state "JPM is complete when the examinee provides the filled-in Attachment 1 to the evaluator." (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													4. Need to add a TASK/ GENERAL STANDARD (i.e., the end point). (~~U~~E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: General (Task) Standard added after Task Briefing on page 3. DWR – Changed to an enhancement since the identified Critical Steps were appropriate and complete for the assigned task and allowed for the JPM to be administered without even though the TASK STANDARD was missing. 5. What is the purpose of the NOTE following the initiating cue? (Q) Resolution: Note removed. POST VALIDATION CHANGES; 1. Added clarification of when to supply Tech Data Book figure for step 2.4
A2-RO Calculate QPTR	Equipment Control 2.2.12	3			X			X	X			U	1. Per the outline review comment resolution, you were going to change the K/A to 2.2.12. Evaluate K/A and assign appropriate Equipment Control (2.2.x) K/A. (E) Resolution: K/A updated to reflect change to ES-301-1. 2. Add magnifying glass to list of Equipment. (E) Resolution: Added to list of Equipment 3. Label for N42 Lower detector is Reads UPPER DETECTOR B. (E) Resolution: Label corrected.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													4. The acceptance range for the N42 Upper Detector do not match up with meter reading; should be 97 to 98 (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Acceptable values for N42 Upper revised to match up with meter readings. 5. Calibration currents for N42 recorded on Data Sheet 2 do not match provided values. This affects all other calculated values. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Revised provided values to match data sheet entry. 6. Critical Steps (CS) are not identified. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: CS identified. NEW – Revise step 4.2.1.b STANDARD to read “Operator reads and records Upper & Lower Detector currents in the blanks provided for …” (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. 7. Need to add a TASK/ GENERAL STANDARD (i.e., the end point). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: General Standard added.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													8. Revise Termination Cue to state "JPM is complete when the examinee returns the completed surveillance package." (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. 9. NEW – On the acceptable ranges page, explain what is meant by "Lowest, Lowest. Highest" etc labels for the acceptable QTPR values. Resolution: Rephrased 10. NEW – On Data Sheet 2 place "N/A" in blank for highest flux tilt value from PPC. Resolution: N/A added. POST VALIDATION COMMENTS 1. Replaced NI Pictures with a close-up view. 2. Corrected spacing of data entries on Data Sheet 2 3. Revised Acceptable Range bands 4. Added clarification that RANGE selector switches set on the .1 MILLI-AMPS position since replacement pictures do not show range switches.
A3-RO Failed Rad Monitor Response	Radiation Control 2.3.15	2		X	X			X				U	1. Need to add a TASK/ GENERAL STANDARD (i.e., the end point). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: General Standard added. 2. HANDOUTS -typo 2-OHP-4024-211 Annunciator #111 Response: Delta T; should be 211 not 111. (E)

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													Resolution: Correction made. 3. EVALUATOR INSTRUCTIONS – typo 2-OHP-4024-111; should be 211 not 111 (E) Resolution: Correction made. 4. Standard for Ann #211 Drop 49 Step 3.2 needs to specify the alarming channel (ERA-8306). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: added identification of alarming channel 5. Why is reviewing Probable causes for Drop 49 a Critical Step (CS). (~~U~~E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: Removed CS designator. 6. Completion of Drop 49 Step 3.2 (identifying the alarming channel) should be a CS. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: Designated step as a CS 7. Why is identification of 2-OHP-4024-211 Attachment 1 considered critical. Attachment 1 is for Drop 48 alarms. Drop 49 is the affected alarm and only requires completion of Attachment 2. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] NEW – This still needs to be cleared up. STANDARD (CS) Operator refers to 2-OHP-

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													4024-211 Attachments 1 and 2 AND determines that ONLY Attachment 2 is applicable. Replace associated CUE with a NOTE stating completing Attachment 1 in addition to Attachment 2 constitutes failure of this critical step. Resolution: Standard changed to indicate that only completion of Attachment 2 is considered critical. Added an additional cue to state that Attachment 1 will be completed by another operator. 8. Revise Termination Cue to state "JPM is complete when the examinee hands the completed 2-OHP-4024-211 Attachment 2 to the evaluator. (E) Resolution: Cue revised NEW – Identify final CUE as "TERMINATION CUE." Resolution: Termination cue revised a second time to terminate the JPM when the examinee unchecks to box for ERA-8306 to remove it from service. 9. If this is performed in the Simulator, why is it necessary to provide copies of the procedure or attachment. If is necessary, then copies should not be provided until after the associated procedures are located. (E) Resolution: Copies will be withheld until examinee locates the procedure(s).

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Changed validation time to 15 minutes. 2. Revised Task Briefing to clearly state that applicant is only responsible for Unit 2 actions. 3. Changed STANDARD for step 3.2 to a CUE since ROs do-not make operability determinations. 4. Added clarification to NOTE for Step 1.2 of 2-OHP-4024-211 Attachment 2 exact wording not required. 5. Changed Termination Point to be when applicant unchecks to box which removes channel from scan.
A1a-SRO Review Boron Volume Calculation for RCS Temp Change	Conduct of Operations 2.1.43	2	X	X				X				U	1. Why is it necessary to provide the procedure number and title in the Task Briefing? (E) Resolution: Procedure number and title removed. 2. Spell out NERDS first time. (E) Resolution: Full spelling added. 3. In the Task Briefing insert “RCS” before “Boron Concentration.” (E) Resolution: Inserted where appropriate. Data removed from task briefing (See comment 5) 4. Delete sentence associated with provision of missing NERDS data. (E)

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													Resolution: Sentence removed as requested. 5. The following information should not be provided until the examinee explains how/where to obtain them. Otherwise this JPM is simply a plug and chug task. a. RCS Boron Concentration b. BAST Concentration c. Core Burnup d. Eff Fuel Temp e. DTC Insert cues at the appropriate steps instead providing in the Task Briefing. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.1, page C-1] Resolution: Data removed from task briefing and inserted as cues where appropriate. 6. In standard for step 4.1.2.a, emphasize (bold font, underline, or italicize) “Reduction” (E) Resolution: Emphasis (bold font) added 7. Change MCT acceptable range to 12.5-13.0; this is within the readability of the graph. (E) Resolution: Acceptance range changed as requested. 8. Change TC acceptable range to 14.735-15.235 due to change in acceptable range for MTC. (E) Resolution: Acceptance range changed as requested.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													9. Change PCM acceptable range based on changes in comment 5. (E) Resolution: Acceptance range changed as requested. 10. Evaluate whether steps 4.1.2.g, 4.1.2.h and 4.1.2.j should be critical steps since the only errors are due to the error identified in step 4.1.2.d. (~~U~~E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: Steps 4.1.2.g & h were changed to be non-critical. Step 4.1.2.j remains critical. 11. Units for DBW in step 4.1.2.j standard should be pcm/ppm not pcm/°F and change acceptance range per above changes. (E) Resolution: Acceptance ranges revised. NEW -- Still need to revise DBW units from pcm/°F to pcm/ppm. Acceptance range should be revised to account for rounding -17.682/-8.1=2.183 rounded to 2.18 -18.262/-8.0=2.285 rounded to 2.29 Resolution: Acceptance ranges revised. 12. Ensure provided TDB has fully readable curves (curve for 1000ppm is not visible on copy provided). (E) Resolution: Reevaluated during OV. Actual line in TBD is White therefore not readable.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													13. Task Briefing -- Instead of telling examinee that another operator will determine effects of previous dilution, tell them that the last addition was a boration. (E) Resolution: Task briefing revised as requested. 14. NEW: Task Briefing – Evaluate the necessity of the 2nd to the last sentence. If unnecessary, delete it. Resolution: Leave it as is. 15. Provide a standard for step 4.2 indicating that examinee determines that step is not applicable. (~~U~~E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Performance standard added to step 4.2 as requested. 16. Revise Termination Cue to read: "JPM is complete when the examinee reports that he has completed the review and the identified errors." (E) Resolution: Revised as recommended. 17. TASK (General) STANDARD needs to be more specific; include which errors identified (e.g., the wrong MTC and the need for dilution instead of boration). (~~U~~E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: STANDARD revised as requested. 18. NEW - Discuss whether Task completion

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													standard at end of JPM is needed. Resolution: see RO A1a comment resolution. POST VALIDATION CHANGES: 1. In standard for step 4.1.2.a, Replaced "Reduction" with "change." Also added a NOTE to clarify that the dash after (Tavg-Tref) is not a negative sign. (E) 2. In CUE for step 4.1.2.f, added a negative (-) sign to DTC. 3. The value for the temperature change (from step 4.1.2.a) entered in the formula, in step 4.1.2.h, should not be negative, and the result should be negative; unless you want this to be one of the errors to be found. If so, then revise standards. Also impacts step 4.1.2.j. Data sheet has been updated to correct the data affected.
A1b-SRO Review Valve Stroke Timing Test-Cont Iso Vlv	Conduct of Operations 2.1.25	3						X				U	1. Need to add a TASK/ GENERAL STANDARD (i.e., the end point). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: General (Task) Standard added 2. What is the purpose of the NOTE following the initiating cue? (Q) Resolution: Note removed. 3. Revise initiating cue to read "…review the recently completed 1-OHP-4030-114-011

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													Attachment 1, RCDT and Containment Sump Valves Test." (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. 4. Clearly identify in the standards which numerical value is IST MIN IST MAX and LIMIT. (E) Resolution: Standard numerical values identified. 5. Restate the STANDARD for step 4.1.5 to include that the LIMIT was not exceeded, therefore immediate retest is permitted. (E) Resolution: Partially resolved. Added identification that IST LIMIT was not exceed. However, removed the need to identify that IST MAX was exceeded. Add this requirement back in. Requirement added back in. 6. STANDARD for steps 5.2 and 5.3 should be that a full stroke test for DCR-206 was signed off and that the Fail-Safe Test for DCR 207 was not signed off. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] NEW – STANDARDS (CS) for Section 5, ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA, need to be revisited. DCR 207 "Fail-Safe" (not the Full-Stroke test) was not signed off; DCR-205, failed the "Stroke-Time" test, and was inappropriately re-tested as well as failing the "Stroke-Time" test on the re-test; and DCR-206 also failed the "Stroke-Time" test,

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													but should have been re-tested, and the "Full-Stroke" test was not signed off.. Resolution: Standard updated. 7. Add STANDARD for Signature, Date and Time. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Partially resolved. NEW – Shouldn't the examinee complete both Steps 7.2 and 7.3, as well as identifying entry into applicable LCOs. Provide STANDARDS as appropriate. Resolution: Section 7.2 revised to show department review complete. Standard added for Section 7.3. 8. Revise Termination Cue to state "JPM is complete when the examinee signs ("Reviewed By") for completing the review." (E) Resolution: Revised. May need further changes based on resolution of comment #7. May need to revise initiating cue also. Resolution: Necessary changes were completed. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Added reference to be available to list in HANDOUTS. 2. Highlighted (circled) errors in JPM guide to

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													assist examiner.
A2-SRO Review QTPR	Equipment Control [2.2.40]	3		X				X	X			U	1. Per the outline review comment resolution, you were going to change the K/A to 2.2.12. Evaluate K/A and assign appropriate Equipment Control (2.2.x) K/A; recommend K/A 2.2.40. (E) Resolution: K/A changed to 2.2.40 NEW -- Verify 301-1 was updated. Resolution: Updated. 2. Need to add a TASK/ GENERAL STANDARD (i.e., the end point). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: General Standard added. 3. Add magnifying glass to list of Equipment. (E) Resolution: Added to list of Equipment. 4. Label for N42 Lower detector is Reads UPPER DETECTOR B. (E) Resolution: Label corrected. 5. Calibration currents for N42 recorded on Data Sheet 2 do not match provided values. This affects all other calculated values. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Revised Data Sheet entries to match provided values. 6. STANDARD for Recorded Detector Currents does not align with provided meter

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													indications; N42 Upper reads 97.5 NOT 95.5. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: N42 Upper Meter reading changed to 95.5 and data sheet entry left at 97.5. 7. NEW – Need to add a STANDARD (CS), related to identifying incorrect Normalized values and resultant change in Upper and Lower Totals. This must be done to determine correct QTPR. Additionally, the STANDARD(s) for the final QTPR values need to be corrected (with the correct number the Upper QTPR = 1.018, and the Lower QTPR = 1.032. Also, both values exceed the "Notification Limit" of 1.015 Resolution: Revised as requested. 8. In STANDARD for Tech Spec Required action A.1, change note to state that action is MET because of current power. (E) Resolution: Note revised as requested. 9. Explain why STANDARDS for TS Required Actions A.2, A.3, and A.4 are not Critical Steps (CS). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: All 3 re-designated as CS NEW – Add completion times to STANDARD(s) for A.3, A.5, and A.6.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													Additionally, A.5 is required PRIOR to raising power above A.1 limit. Resolution: Revised as requested. 10. Revise Termination Cue to state "JPM is complete when examinee identifies all applicable Tech Spec Required Actions. (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. POST VALIDATION COMMENTS 1. Replaced NI Pictures with a close-up view. 2. Corrected spacing of data entries on Data Sheet 2 3. Revised Acceptable Range bands 4. Added clarification that RANGE selector switches set on the .1 MILLI-AMPS position since replacement pictures do not show range switches.
A3-SRO Approve Cont Purge Release	Radiation Control 2.3.6	1				X						U	1. Need to add a TASK/ GENERAL STANDARD (i.e., the end point). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: General Standard added. 2. Simply identifying that signatures are missing and that a release method has not been designated does not provide the discriminatory value need to determine an SROs ability to approve a release. (U) [ES-301, Section D.2.c, page 9 of 33] Resolution: Revised to have examinee identify different errors.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													3. NEW – Consider requiring the examinee to determine/select the release method, then sign for Section 2.0. Resolution: Changed to have examinee identify that inappropriate purge path is checked. 4. NEW – For Section 3.0, have the examinee obtain Chemistry Approval. Resolution: Section 3 now has all signatures, but STANDARD now revised to have applicant identify that >24-hours elapsed since approval signatures. 5. NEW – For Section 3.0, revise STANDARD for SM signature, to state that applicant Signs approval AFTER designating release method AND obtaining Chemistry approval. Resolution: See post validation changes. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Revised TASK BRIEFING to indicate that plant is cooling down following a shutdown due to RCS leakage, and that a Containment Entry is to be made, as the plant is being cooled down, to locate the leak. 2. Revised Task Standard to reflect change in JPM scope. 3. Revised STANDARD for Section 2.0 to identify that an inappropriate purge path had been selected. 4. Revised STANDARD for Section 3.0 to identify that >24 hours has elapsed since

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2												Exam Date: August 3, 2020
Admin JPMs	1 ADMIN Topic and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													approvals of Chem, RP, and ENV.
A4-SRO Determine PAR-if Needed	Emergency Proc/Plan 2.4.44	2						X				E	1. This should be a time critical JPM since it is a required element in making the upgraded event notification to state and county officials. (E) [Appendix C, Section B.5, page C-4] Resolution: JPM reclassified as Time Critical. NEW – Critical Completion Time should be something less than 15 minutes, since information must be input to Notification form and transmitted within 15 minutes of declaration. Resolution: Completion time changed to 12 minutes. 2. NEW – STANDARD for Step 1.1 should not be critical and simply say that examinee proceeds to Initial PAR flowchart; OR Step 1.1 remains a CS and flow chart markup is NOT critical. Resolution: Removed CS classification from Step 1.1 STANDARD. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Corrected spelling errors in Task Briefing. 2. Minor formatting changes.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
Sim01 (U2) Boration-Inadequate S/D Margin [Alt Path]	1 APE 024 AA1.17	2	X		X							~~U~~E	1. In the initiating cue (2nd paragraph of Task Briefing), move phrase "of 500 gallons" to just after "initiate Emergency Boration and delete "from the blender." The current wording is confusing since use of the blender is not the "preferred" method. (E) Resolution: Revised as recommended. 2. Revise TASK STANDARD to specify "from the RWST using Attachment 2 of 2-OHP-4021-005-007." (E) Resolution: Revised as recommended. 3. Add NOTE after STANDARD for Step 4.1.2.f to state that "Alternate Path begins here." (E) Resolution: NOTE added as requested. 4. Why is step 4.2.1 of Attachment 2 considered a CS? Is there any reason to believe that at least one of the charging pumps is not running? If both pumps are available, revise to state at least one charging pump running. (~~U~~E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: Step reclassified as non-critical. 5. Add a STANDARD/CUE for step 4.1.3 of attachment 2. (~~U~~E) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Added CUE stating that it is not desired to perform step 4.1.3 and STANDARD to indicated step is N/A

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2												Exam Date: August 3, 2020
Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													6. Revise Termination Cue to state: "The JPM is complete when the applicant has established Emergency Boration from the RWST to the RCS." (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. POST VALIDATION CHANGES Minor editorial changes.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
Sim02 Fill ECCS Accum	2 SYS 006 A1.13	3										E	1. In the TASK BRIEFING, combine the annunciator status and cause into one statement that indicates alarms were confirmed to be due to chemistry sampling. (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. 2. Revise TASK STANDARD to state that accumulator level and pressure restored to within Tech Spec limits. (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. 3. Revise Termination CUE to state: JPM is complete when examinee has verify the accumulator level and pressure are within TS LCO limits. (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. 4. NEW – Consider adding contingencies for venting the accumulator if pressure rises to high because applicant overfills. Resolution: JPM revised so that JPM is terminated (failed critical step) if high level or pressure alarms are received. POST VALIDATION CHANGES: 1. Added clarifying statement for simulator operator to provide immediate feedback upon SI pump start. 2. Removes references to venting of accumulator. Over filling of accumulator (specified level is reached well before the high level or pressure alarms are received) is considered failure of a critical step.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
Sim03 PZR Htr Capacity Check	3 SYS 010 A4.02	2	X		X							U	1. Task briefing need to specify current plant condition (necessary for determining if prerequisites are met). (U) Appendix C, Section B.1, page C-1] Resolution: Initial Condition (full power) added. 2. Replace CUE for Section 2 Prerequisites with a STANDARD (e.g., Determines that prerequisites met by evaluating current conditions). (~~UE~~) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: Replaced CUE with a STANDARD as requested. 3. STANDARD (CS) is missing for step 4.2.8 (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: STANDARD added. 4. STANDARDS for steps 4.1.4 and 4.2.5 should state “Record current AMP reading and verifies 0 amps” and specify where current is read. (E) Resolution: Instruments identified. 5. STANDARDS for steps 4.1.6 and 4.2.7 should specify where current is read. (E) Resolution: Instruments identified. 6. Revise Termination Cue to read: “JPM is complete when examinee returns completed test package to evaluator. (E)

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 U/E/S	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													Resolution: Cue revised as requested. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Corrected typos in breaker ID numbers 2. Added acceptance ranges for heater currents.
Sim04 Run TDAFP	4S SYS 061 2.1.23	3				~~X/N~~						E	1. Recommend changing K/A to SYS 061 A1.05. (E) Resolution: OK as is. No changes made 2. To increase operational validity, revise initial conditions (as necessary) and step 4.17 CUES to require examinee to vary TDAFP speed. (E) Resolution: After discussions with facility, decided to make no changes. 3. Revise Termination Cue to read: “Another operator will restore the TDAFP to Standby, JPM is complete.” Move cue to end of step 4.19.1. (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Added cue for step 4.2 2. Added additional statement to cue for 4.14. 3. Minor editorial changes.
Sim05 Verify Cont Phase A [Alt Path]	5 SYS 103 A3.01	3	X	X								E	1. Task Briefing needs to specify current plant conditions (i.e., reason for performing Attachment A). (E) Resolution: Plant condition/status added.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													2. Add reason for picking up Attachment A in the middle. (e.g., you are an extra operator and Attachment A has been turned over to you with steps 1-7 completed) (E) Resolution: Initiating cue revised to address comment. 3. Revise HANDOUTS to specify Attachment A with steps 1-7 marked as completed. (E) Resolution: Change made as requested. 4. Revise 1st NOTE on JPM page 4 to clarify that individual valve status may be verified using the PPC CISA pages (1 and 3) and/or SUP-003. (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. 5. Move NOTE at bottom of JPM page 4 to just prior to STANDARDS on JPM Page 6. (E) Resolution: Note relocated as requested. 6. Revise Termination Cue to include a statement that another operator will continue beginning with step 8.c. Add a condition statement specifying that “After ensuring at least one valve in each Phase A containment penetration has been closed…” (E) Resolution: Cue revised as requested. POST VALIDATION CHANGES

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													1. Added examiner note to refer to screen shot on Page 6 of JPM guide. 2. Minor formatting changes.
Sim06 (U2) Restore T21A from SDG [Alt Path]	6 SYS 062-A2.11				X				X			E	1. In the initiating cue remove the word “the” from just before EP. (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. 2. Revise STANDARD for SUP-009 Step 1 to simply state that EP Bus 1 is NOT energized; i.e., delete “by SDGs” (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. 3. Add NOTE jus prior to STANDARD for SUP-009 step 1 RNO a.4), stating the Alternate Path begins here. (E) Resolution: Note added as requested. 4. Revise STANDARD for SUP-009 step 1 RNO a.4), to state “Transitions (or Goes to) SUP-009, Attachment I.” -. (E)] Resolution: Revised as requested and re-classified as a CS. 5. In STANDARD for SUP-009, Attachment I, step 1.b., is there any reason to believe that SDGs are not running? If NO, then delete the word “may.” (E) Resolution: The word “may” was removed. 6. Revise STANDARD for SUP-009, Attachment 1, step 8 to state “Return to

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													Supplement Body Step 2 (SUP-009 page 4). (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Added NOTE to identify that touch screen controls require two actions, selection and confirmation. 2. Removed unnecessary cue from bottom of page 4 3. Remove (CS) designation from procedure transition steps.
Sim07 (U2) Restore Scaler Timer Drawer	7 SYS 015 A4.02	2										~~U~~ E	1. Revise STANDARD for step 4.6 to reflect two verification actions (one for each bullet). (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. 2. ~~Explain why steps 4.10.1 and 4.10.2 are NOT (CS). (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3~~] Resolution: Audio Count Rate Drawer will function properly without these steps. These reset the current period so the drawers first rate would be incorrect but next 60 second (or period selected) would be correct 3. Revise Termination Cue to state: JPM is complete when examinee requests “Verified Complete By” signature. (E) Resolution: Revised as requested.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Added setup step to ensure Multiplier switch set to the 10 position. 2. Revised Task Briefing to include "… sample by performing Attachment 1 of OHP…"
Sim08 Perform CR Actions for FHA [Alt Path?]	8 SYS 034 A2.01	4	X		X			X				U	1. ES 301-2 indicates that this is an Alternate Path JPM, but there is no identifier in the JPM to indicate such. (E) Resolution: Title updated to indicate Alternate Path. 2. Add initial plant conditions to TASK BRIEFING. (info may be needed to perform subsequent steps; specifically Step 7). (~~U~~E) [Appendix 3, Section B.1, page C-1] Resolution: Initial condition (shutdown preparing for refuel) added. NEW – Examinee Task Briefing Sheet needs to be changed to reflect addition of plant condtions. Resolution: Initial condition (shutdown preparing for refuel) added to examinee briefing sheet. 3. Revise STANDARD for PA announcement to include direction to assemble at the RCA control point. Also, the announcement should be a (CS) since initiating the alarm does not specify which location(s) should be evacuated. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3]

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2													Exam Date: August 3, 2020
Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													Resolution: STANDARD revised as requested. NEW – Typo (repeated word). Additionally, was it intentional to change from "non-essential people" to "plant personnel?" Yes 4. Add NOTE to evaluator identifying where the Alternate Path begins. (E) Resolution: Note added as requested. 5. STANDARD for Step 3.d states verify yet is identified as a (CS). If fan must be started, then re-state the standard to "starts fan", otherwise remove the (CS) designation. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: STANDARD revised to state that examinee must stop one of the fans. 6. STANDARD(S) for Step 5.a states to verify valves position. If operator action is required, then re-state STANDARDS to operate the necessary controls. (NOTE this may be necessary in other JPMs where (CS) STANDARDS stated "verify/verifies" (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: STANDARDs revised to state that examinee manipulates required components.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													7. Add STANDARD for Step 6, stating that the operator answers YES, determines that no additional manual actions are necessary, and continues to step 7; i.e., does NOT skip step 7 per RNO for step 6. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, top of page C-3] Resolution: STANDARD added. 8. Clarify STANDARD for Step 7 to indicate that the operator determines that the conditions specified in Step 7.a are not met. (E) Resolution: Clarification added. 9. Recommend changing Termination point to Step 11 after verifying that there are no alarms for the monitors referenced in step 8. (E) Resolution: Termination point moved, and actions added for steps 8, 9, and 10. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Added cue to that Nuclear Emergency alarm is sounding. (Audible alarm disabled for the JPM) 2. Moved Termination Point to eliminate unnecessary verification steps.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
IP02 Locally Isolate Spurious Pump Start [Alt Path]	2 2.4.34	3	X					X				E	1. ES 301-2 indicates that this is an Alternate Path JPM, but there is no identifier in the JPM to indicate such. (E) Resolution: Title updated to indicate Alternate Path 2. Add initial plant conditions (e.g., Mode, power level, etc.). (E) Resolution: Plant condition (power level) added. 3. Include statement in TASK BRIEFING related to implementation of 1-OHP-4025-001-001. (E) Resolution: Statement added as requested. 4. In STANDARD for Step 1 change “verifies” to “determines.” (E) Resolution: Change made as requested. 5. Attached pictures need to be labelled to identify which is which. (E) Resolution: Pictures labeled as requested. 6. Add NOTE to evaluator just prior STANDARDs on JPM Page 5 stating that “Alternate Path begins here.” (E) Resolution: Note for alternate path start inserted prior to STANDARD for step 2.b
IP06	6	3		X				X				U	1. ES 301-2 indicates that this is NOT an Alternate Path JPM but is identified in the

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date: August 3, 2020**

Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
Restore N-Battery Charger ~~[Alt Path]~~	APE 058 AA1.01												JPM title as such. It appears that the JPM should be Alt Path. Update the 301-2. (E) Resolution: ES-301-2 updated. 2. Provide photo or graphic of 1-AM-D-4A cubicle internals. (E) Resolution: Photo added. 3. In CUE for Drop 57 Step 3.4 acknowledging breaker failure remove direction to restore Train B N Train Battery Charger. Examinee should earn this by referring to 1-OHP-4021-082-015 (U) [Appendix C, Section D.1.a, page C-5] Resolution: Revised as requested. 4. Add NOTE to the evaluator at bottom of JPM page 5, stating “Alternate Path begins here.” (E) Resolution: Note added. 5. Add cues for steps 4.2.4-through 4.2.6 (U) [Appendix C, Section D.1.a, page C-5] Resolution: Cues were added. 6. Other than the light status, are there any other cues that should/could be provided to indicate charger status after reenergization? (Q/E) Resolution: Ammeter reading added. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Due to quality issues with provided graphic

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2												Exam Date: August 3, 2020
Simulator/ In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	2 LOD (1-5)	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5 **U/E/S**	6 Explanation
			I/C Focus	Cues	Crit Steps	Scope (N/B)	Over	Perf. Std.	Key	Min	Job Link		
													lack of labelling on breaker internals, JPM was revised to remove alternate path.
IP07 Verify Control Room Pressuriza-tion	7 2.1.30	2						X				U	1. STANDARD for Step 4.3.2.b. – Restate to places switch in AUTO. (U) [Appendix C, Section B.3, 2nd paragraph on page C-3] Resolution: Restated as requested. 2. Revise TERMINATION CUE to state: "JPM is complete when "Verified Complete By:" is signed and the examinee returns the completed form to the Evaluator. (E) Resolution: Revised as requested. POST VALIDATION CHANGES 1. Shortened validation time to 10 minutes from 20 minutes. 2. Moved Termination Point to completion of step 4.3.5.

Instructions for Completing This Table:

Check or mark any item(s) requiring a comment and explain the issue in the space provided using the guide below.

1. Check each JPM for appropriate administrative topic requirements (COO, EC, Rad, and EP) or safety function requirements and corresponding K/A. Mark in column 1. (ES-301, D.3 and D.4)

2. Determine the level of difficulty (LOD) using an established 1–5 rating scale. Levels 1 and 5 represent an inappropriate (low or high) discriminatory level for the license that is being tested. Mark in column 2 (Appendix D, C.1.f)

3. In column 3, "Attributes," check the appropriate box when an attribute is **not met**:
   - The initial conditions and/or initiating cue is clear to ensure the operator understands the task and how to begin. (Appendix C, B.4)
   - The JPM contains appropriate cues that clearly indicate when they should be provided to the examinee. Cues are objective and not leading. (Appendix C, D.1)
   - All critical steps (elements) are properly identified.
   - The scope of the task is not too narrow (N) or too broad (B).
   - Excessive overlap does not occur with other parts of the operating test or written examination. (ES-301, D.1.a, and ES-301, D.2.a)
   - The task performance standard clearly describes the expected outcome (i.e., end state). Each performance step identifies a standard for successful completion of the step.
   - A valid marked up key was provided (e.g., graph interpretation, initialed steps for handouts).

4. For column 4, "Job Content," check the appropriate box if the job content flaw **does not meet** the following elements:
   - Topics are linked to the job content (e.g., not a disguised task, task required in real job).
   - The JPM has meaningful performance requirements that will provide a legitimate basis for evaluating the applicant's understanding and ability to safely operate the plant. (ES-301, D.2.c)

5. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the JPM as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory? Mark the answer in column 5.

6. In column 6, provide a brief description of any (U)nacceptable or (E)nhancement rating from column 5.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound JPM is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: NRC2020-1				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Real/ Cred.	3 Req'd Actions	4 Ver. Actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Over	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
GENERIC									1. List the actions that are expected for performing "Plant Stability Checks." Resolution: List of parameters to be checked were added in the appropriate places. 2. NEW – Need to expand all table row heights so that all text in a row is visible.
1 (N)							X	S	2016 Scenario 1, Event 1
2 (R)								E	1. Is there a time delay in the trip of the North PW pump or does it trip immediately upon placing the Makeup C/S to START? Resolution: North PW Pump trips when PW flow is >0.003 2. NEW -- Insert a note just prior to the RO action for Dilution, to state that Event 3 will be initiated when the North PW pumps starts following the placement of the Makeup Blend C/S in START. Resolution: Changed as requested. 3. The scenario guide implies that the US will direct the RO to stop the dilution (i.e., place the Makeup C/S to STOP) prior to attempting the start the South PW pump. Is that the expected sequence? If not, and the RO is expected to manually start the South PW pump, then why stop the dilution. Resolution: Event 3 rewritten to give the RO the option to stop the dilution prior to starting the South PW Pump. NEW – Change the line item in Event 3 describing that the RO may stop the North PW pump to a NOTE. Resolution: Change made as recommended.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: NRC2020-1				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Real/ Cred.	3 Req'd Actions	4 Ver. Actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Over	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
3 (C)								E	1. Add CREW actions for dispatching personnel to investigate pump trip. Resolution: Action to dispatch AEO added. 2. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested. 3. If the dilution is placed on hold, need to add a contingency action for the Shift Manager/Supervisor to step in and direct re-start of the power ascension. Resolution: Contingency step added for SM to step in.
4 (I)					X(3)	X(1)	X	E	2018 Scenario 2, Event 5 1. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: NRC2020-1				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Real/ Cred.	3 Req'd Actions	4 Ver. Actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Over	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
5 (I)					X(1)		X	E	2020 Scenario 4, Event 5 (Different Channel and 1 additional TS LCO) 2018 Scenario 4, Event 3 (Different Channel and 1 additional TS LCO) 1. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested. NEW – Typo; *pump* should be *instrument*. Fixed 2. Due to similarity to Scenario 4, Event 5, this scenario shall not be administered to any individual who participated in Scenario 4. Resolution: Scenario 4 is no longer being used.
6 (C)								E	1. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Action added as requested.
7 (M)							X	E	2018 Scenario 1, Event 6 1. Lengthen the ramp period to allow crew to exercise off-normal procedures (diagnose, determine leak-rates, establish trip criteria, down-power, etc.). This also modifies the major event which is repeated from the last NRC exam. [1021 Appendix D, C.1.f page D-8] Resolution: A new event added for leaking Safety Valve which results in a slowly dropping Pzr Press, and initially a slow drop in pressurizer level that can be compensated with an increase in charging flow. ARP procedure for changing SV temp and PRT

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2				Scenario: NRC2020-1					Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Real/ Cred.	3 Req'd Actions	4 Ver. Actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Over	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
									pressure should lead to calculation of the leak rate. Crew may enter Excessive RCS Leakage and will scram most likely on lowering pressurizer pressure. Upon trip of the Reactor the SV will fail open (the current event 7 now becoming 8) 2. Identify the bases for the Reactor Trip decision by the US. Resolution: Reason(s) for Reactor Trip added. 3. List E-0 activities to be performed by RO/BOP not just high-level steps (e.g., list the items to be checked by the RO for verifying Reactor Trip Status; not complete actions through step 19 as directed). Resolution: Activities added as requested. 4. Identify the indications to be checked that indicate SI has/hasn't actuated and is/isn't required. Resolution: Parameters added as requested. 5. Provide a separate section/attachment for E-0 Attachment A actions. Resolution: Facility will provide Attachment A's preprinted for evaluators to grab when examinee performs.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: NRC2020-1				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Real/ Cred.	3 Req'd Actions	4 Ver. Actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Over	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
8 (C), 9 (C)						X(2)	X	E	2018 Scenario 1, Event 7 & 8 2018 Scenario 3, Event 9 1. While these are separate malfunctions, this is 1 event; SI failure to actuate. Resolution: Events 8, 9, and 10 incorporated into the Major event. While they involve post-EOP entry malfunctions they are not be credited as part of the required minimum number of IC malfunctions for individuals. 2. Clarify the actions to be taken to satisfy Critical Task 2 a. Clearly identify which actions are necessary to establish Train A; and b. Clearly identify which actions are necessary to establish Train B. Resolution: clarification added. 3. Rephase Critical Task 2 performance criteria 1 to state "ECCS Flow is indicated from at least one train…." Resolution: Change made as requested.
10 (C)?		X	X				X	E	2018 Scenario 1, Event 9 2018 Scenario 3, Event 9 1. Explain how this event is different from event 8. Resolution: Events 8, 9, and 10 incorporated into the Major event. 2. If this event is intended to be separate from Event 8, then clearly identify the actions to performed for this event Resolution: Events 8, 9, and 10 incorporated into the Major event.
8(9?)	0	1	1		2	2	2	E	

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2				Scenario: NRC2020-2					Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
GENERIC								E	1. List the actions that are expected for performing "Plant Stability Checks." Resolution: List of parameters to be checked were added in the appropriate places. 2. NEW – Need to expand all table row heights so that all text in a row is visible.
1 (C)				X			X	~~U~~ E	2016 Scenario 5, Event 4 1. This appears to be a low LOD event. Resolution: Facility pointed out that the eve has been used in past exams. Agreed that change was not necessary. NEW -- Do you have a degraded pump malfunction that would cause pressure to drop without the pump tripping and the auto-start failure of the standby pump? NO 2. Add CREW actions for dispatching personnel to investigate pump trip. Resolution: Action added as requested. 3. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Action added as requested.
2 (R)								E	Events 2 and 3 are not separate events. They are one event power ascension. Resolution: Remains separated per facility request to identify reactivity for RO and manual actions for BOP.
3 (N)									

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2				**Scenario: NRC2020-2**					**Exam Date: August 3, 2020**
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
									1. List indications that the RO uses to verify reactivity feedback. Resolution: Indications added. NEW – Change from alphabetical list to open-bullet (◦) list. 2. Won't the direction to manually control feedwater be include with the pre-shift brief since controls are already in MAN? Resolution: Yes, but the BOP operator will have to make several adjustments as power is increased.
4 (I)					X(5)	X	X	E	2018 Scenario 2, Event 3 1. RO Action #3 on page 7, is not specified by 4022-013-009 until ready to return to automatic control. Resolution: 4022-013-009 Step 1 RNO for failed channel. NEW – Only if the examinees do not use manual control of the spray valves. Either way it should be listed between steps 8 and 9. Resolution: Additional step (#9) added to match procedure. 2. US action to trip bi-stables should appear after referring to Tech Specs Resolution: Action moved as requested. 3. Please explain how failure of the Pzr Press Instrument affects operability of the CCPs Resolution: Pressure instrument failure causes Emergency Leak Off to not open on an SI. 4. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2				Scenario: NRC2020-2					Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
5 (I)					X(2)		X	E	2018 Scenario 3, Event 5 2016 Scenario 4, Event 6 2016 Scenario 3, Event 6 1. 4022-IFR guidance directs manual control and shutting only after verifying an instrument failure. BOP action should be prefaced by identification of MPP-121 failure. Resolution: MPP-121 failure report moved to just prior to action to take manual control. 2. Explain why MRA-1601 is inoperable? Resolution: Procedurally directed. Additionally, if controller is in manual with PORV closed, and pressure is allowed to rise to the safety valve setpoint, an unmonitored release could occur. 3. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested. 4. Add that TS 3.7.4 may be referred to, but that the LCO is still met if the PORV can be manually opened. Resolution: Added as requested.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2				**Scenario: NRC2020-2**					**Exam Date: August 3, 2020**
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
6 (C)		X			X		X	E	2018 Scenario 5, Event 4 1. Typo Annunciator *108* – Drop 11 should be Annunciator 109 – 11 Resolution: Corrected. 2. Include RO Actions for starting West CCP Resolution: Actions added as requested. 3. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested. 4. D1 identifies Event 6 as a Tech Spec Event but there are no TS references in D2 Resolution: Required TS and TRM LCOs, Conditions, and Completed Times added.
7 (M)						X		E	2018 Scenario 5, Event 7 (Event includes an ATWS but the reactor power level are very different. Additionally the 2018 event is coincident with a faulted steam generator) 1. List E-0/FR-S.1 activities to be performed by RO/BOP not just high-level steps (e.g., attempts to trip Reactor at both locations, shutdown verifications, turbine trip indications etc.). Resolution: Additional verification activities added. NEW – RO activities for verifying reactor trip status incomplete (…*All* Rods *less than* 10 steps…). Additionally, RO immediate actions should include RNO action to manually insert control rods; if rods cannot be moved, then action should be to attempt manual rod insertion. Resolution: Corrections made.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2			**Scenario: NRC2020-2**						**Exam Date: August 3, 2020**
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
									2. Clarify actions to be performed to satisfy CT-2 Resolution: Steps for starting Emergency Boration added.
8 (C)		X	X					~~U~~E	1. What specific actions are required to mitigate the Inadvertent FW Isolation Resolution: No longer listed as a creditable event. Malfunction inserted to prevent crew from trying to stay at power.
9 (C)		X	X					~~U~~E	1. What specific actions are required to mitigate the MDAFW Pump Trip Resolution: No longer listed as a creditable event. Malfunction inserted to prevent crew from trying to stay at power.
8?		3	2	1	2	2	2	~~U~~E	Events 8 and 9 were not being credited as I/C events and were simply reclassified.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: NRC2020-3				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
GENERIC								E	1. List the actions that are expected for performing "Plant Stability Checks." Resolution: List of parameters to be checked were added in the appropriate places. 2. NEW – Need to expand all table row heights so that all text in a row is visible. Resolution: Adjustments made.
1 (N)								E	1. Need to clarify the pre-start status of the West MFP. Resolution: Running at approx 3800 rpm. 2. Include other activities associated with MFP startup (e.g., turning gear shutdown, shutting of drains, steps associated with placing in D/P control and sharing, bias adjustments etc.) Resolution: Activities added.
2 (R)								E	1. NEW – List indications that the RO uses to verify reactivity feedback. Resolution: 2. Add steps for Turbine Ramp setup. Resolution: Added step for selecting target and ramp rate. NEW – Where are actions for initiating ramp. 3. NEW – Identify the Tavg/Tref deviation limits. Resolution: Limits added.
3 (I)		X			X(?)		X	U	2016 Scenario 1, Event 4 1. Identify the procedure(s) and step that permit rod control to be placed in MANUAL to stop rod motion. Resolution: IFR-001 Step 5.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: NRC2020-3				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
									NEW – Referenced Proc/Step is applicable to normal rod motion. Why is it applicable here? Resolution: Swap Events 2 and 3. 2. D1 identifies Event 3 as a Tech Spec Event but there are no TS references in D2 Resolution: Tech Spec implementing actions added. 3. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested.
4 (I)					X(2)	X		E	1. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested.
5 (C)					X		X	E	2016 Scenario 3, Event 4 2018 Scenario 1, Event 5 1. Clarify reason for not satisfying TS 3.4.9 LCO Resolution: Loss of 11PHC results in loss of the 'A' Train of Pzr Backup Heaters. 2. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					**Scenario: NRC2020-3**				**Exam Date: August 3, 2020**
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
6 (C)								~~E~~ S	2018 Scenario 3, Event 4 1. Are there any maintenance activities that should be initiated by this malfunction? Resolution: No requirement for one-time response.
7 (M)						X			These are not separate events. They are all directly related to the Major event (un-isolable steam line break outside the containment. Resolution: Events 8 and 9 incorporated into event 7. While they involve post-EOP entry malfunctions they are not be credited as part of the required minimum number of IC malfunctions for individuals. 1. List E-0 activities to be performed by RO/BOP not just high-level steps (e.g., list the items to be checked by the RO for verifying Reactor Trip Status; not complete actions through step 19 as directed). Resolution: Activities added. 2. One of the ROs should be assigned to perform E-0 Attachment A. Provide a separate section/attachment for E-0 Attachment A actions. Resolution: Facility will provide Attachment A's preprinted for evaluators to grab when examinee performs. 3. Clarify feed requirements for SGs. CT performance indicator states that flow not be more than 25,000 pph per SG, but the CAUTION in ECA 2.1 before step 2, specifies a minimum of 25,000 pph to each SG. Both can't be right. Resolution: Performance indicator revised to state "not less than 25,000 pph. Additionally added statement to allow for momentary dips below 25,000 pph. NEW – Is there, or should there be, an upper bound. NO
8 (C)		X	X						
9 (C)		X	X					E	
7	0	3	2	0	3?	2	4	E	

NOTE: Scenario 4 was removed from the examination.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2				Scenario: 2020NRC-4				Exam Date: August 3, 2020	
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
GENERIC								E	1. List the actions that are expected for performing "Plant Stability Checks." Resolution: List of parameters to be checked were added in the appropriate places. 2. NEW – Need to expand all table row heights so that all text in a row is visible. Adjustment made.
1 (N)				X				U S	1. This appears to be a low LOD event. Resolution: Have used in past exams. Can change if not acceptable. Evaluate performing Attachment 7 of same procedure. This could also be the 2nd Tech Spec Event.
2 (R)								E	1. Add steps for Turbine Ramp setup. Resolution: Added step for selecting target and ramp rate. NEW – Where are actions for initiating ramp. 2. Include T_{ave}/T_{ref} Deviation Limits Resolution: Limits added. 3. Delete duplicate RO action for monitoring/controlling RCS temperature and delta I Resolution: Duplicate action deleted.
3 (C)								E	1. US response actions mention a possible load reduction that appears to be unnecessary due to previous load reduction. NEW – US response actions bulleted list should be open bullets if actions are not expected. Resolution: Changed power reduction to open bullet. Action is a management expectation but is not procedurally driven.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: 2020NRC-4				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
4 (C)							X	E	2018 Scenario 4, Event 2 1. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as recommended.
5 (I)					X(2)		X	E	2020 Scenario 1, Event 5 (One less LCO Entry) 2018 Scenario 4, Event 3 1. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested. 2. Due to similarity to Scenario 1, Event 5, this scenario shall not be administered to any individual who participated in Scenario 1. Resolution: 3. Add LCO Action and Completion Time for TSLCO 3.3.4 Resolution: Added that minimum channels are met (still available?) NEW – If minimum channels are met for LCOs 3.3.3 and 3.3.4, why the 30 day completion time.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: 2020NRC-4				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
6 (I)						X		E	1. Typo in alarm title "…Drop C-16 *m2C*_2016…" should be "…Drop C-16 m1C_2016…" Resolution: corrected 2. If examinee takes manual control of all SG Feed Reg Valves and maintains levels within the required range, is the CT still accomplished? Resolution: Yes. Revised standard to so state. 3. ARP does not give specifics on how to disable input. Add steps to the BOP actions. Resolution: Steps added for disabling input.
7 (M)							X	E	2018 Scenario 4, Event 7 (2018 Scenario includes a loss of power that results in NO RHR pumps available and potential FR-P.1 and ECA-1.1 entry) 1. List E-0 activities to be performed by RO/BOP not just high-level steps (e.g., list the items to be checked by the RO for verifying Reactor Trip Status; not complete actions through step 19 as directed). Resolution: Action items listed as requested. NEW – Shouldn't review of fold-out page criteria occur before implementing subsequent action steps? Resolution: 2. Provide a separate section/attachment for E-0 Attachment A actions. Resolution: Facility will provide Attachment A's preprinted for evaluators to grab when examinee performs. 3. Shouldn't "Adverse Containment" conditions apply? If so, correct the required values. Resolution: Adverse containment parameters included.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2			Scenario: 2020NRC-4				Exam Date: August 3, 2020		
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
									NEW – Adverse Containment parameters should be added to applicable steps of E-1 actions. 4. Control of AFW flow should be either RO/BOP Resolution: changed to RO/BOP
8 (C)						X	X	S	2018 Scenario 4, Event 9
9 (C)		X	X				X	U	2018 Scenario 4, Event 10 1. No required or verifiable actions, therefore, should not be listed as a separate event. Resolution: No longer listed as a separate event or as a component failure (C).
9		1	1	1	1		3	U	Need to add another Tech Spec Event.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: 2020NRC-5				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
GENERIC								E	1. List the actions that are expected for performing "Plant Stability Checks." Resolution: List of parameters to be checked were added in the appropriate places. 2. NEW – Need to expand all table row heights so that all text in a row is visible. Adjustments made where necessary.
1 (I)					X	X	X	E	2018 Scenario 4, Event 4 2016 Scenario 2, Event 4 1. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested.
2 (I)					X			E	2. Add US actions for initiating corrective maintenance. a. Expected notifications to management and maintenance organizations. b. Directing initiation of work request Resolution: Actions added as requested.
3 (C)		~~X?~~					X	~~U?~~ S	2018 Scenario 4, Event 5 1. It is not clear whether there are any specific actions REQUIRED to be performed by the RO/BOP to mitigate this transient. It appears that systems will respond with no action required to be performed. Resolution: BOP has several immediate actions to prevent a unit trip on either overfeed or loss of feed.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2					Scenario: 2020NRC-5				Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
4 (R)								E S	These two events appear to be simply continuation of the previous event. Do not list them as separate events. Resolution: Remains separated per facility request to distinguish documentation of reactivity and Normal ops events. It is still one event; and the event can have both a Reactivity Change and a Normal Evolution. Response: Leave as is.
5 (N)									
6 (C)								S	
7 (M)						?	X	E	2016 Scenario 2, Event 5 (2016 event include Turbine Failure to Trip that is not repeated; 2020 includes failure of both SI Trains to automatically actuate) 1. List E-0 activities to be performed by RO/BOP not just high-level steps (e.g., list the items to be checked by the RO for verifying Reactor Trip Status; not complete actions through step 19 as directed). Similarly applies to E-1 actions. Resolution: E-0 actions expanded. NEW – Move RO reactor trip verification steps from RO/BOP to table row of RO actions, prior to tripping RCP. Resolution: Actions copied to RO actions for tripping RCP. Reactor Trip verification remains part of list for E-0 Immediate actions for purpose of immediate action verbal reports. 2. Is the leak big enough to ensure that SI actuation criteria will be met when performing Immediate Actions steps or is there a possibility the crew may first transition to ES 0.1? Is containment pressure expected to exceed 2.8 psig? Resolution: SI – Yes, CTS- No 3. Provide a separate section/attachment for E-0 Attachment A actions. Resolution: Facility will provide Attachment A's preprinted for evaluators to grab when examinee performs.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2				Scenario: 2020NRC-5					Exam Date: August 3, 2020
1 Event	2 Realism/ Cred.	3 Required Actions	4 Verifiable actions	5 LOD	6 TS	7 CTs	8 Scen. Overlap	9 U/E/S	10 Explanation
									4. Add step to evaluate safety function status when transitioning to E-1 and step to review E-1 Foldout Page. Resolution: Steps added as requested. 5. In 2016 event, tripping RCPs was a Critical Task; why not in this scenario. Resolution: No longer a critical task, based on change to DC Cook Critical Task list based on WOG clarifications.
8 (C)						X	X	E	2018 Scenario 1, Events 7&8 2018 Scenario 3, Event 9 1. Clarify the actions to be taken to satisfy Critical Task 2 (e.g., Depresses SI Manual Initiation Push-buttons); Should ensuring Phase A isolations be included with NOTE for E-0 Attachment method. Resolution: Performance Indicators enhanced with required switch manipulation. 2. NEW – Rephrase Critical Task 2 performance feedback criteria 1 to state “ECCS Flow is indicated from at least one train….” Resolution: Changed as requested.
6	0	0	0	0	2	2	2	E	

Instructions for Completing This Table:

Use this table for each scenario for evaluation.

2 Check this box if the events are not related (e.g., seismic event followed by a pipe rupture) OR if the events do not obey the laws of physics and thermodynamics.

3, 4 In columns 3 and 4, check the box if there is no verifiable or required action, as applicable. Examples of required actions are as follows: (ES-301, D.5f)

- opening, closing, and throttling valves
- starting and stopping equipment
- raising and lowering level, flow, and pressure
- making decisions and giving directions
- acknowledging or verifying key alarms and automatic actions (Uncomplicated events that require no operator action beyond this should not be included on the operating test unless they are necessary to set the stage for subsequent events. (Appendix D, B.3).)

5 Check this box if the level of difficulty is not appropriate.

6 Check this box if the event has a TS.

7 Check this box if the event has a critical task (CT). If the same CT covers more than one event, check the event where the CT started only.

8 Check this box if the event overlaps with another event on any of the last two NRC examinations. (Appendix D, C.1.f)

9 Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the event as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory? Mark the answer in column 9.

10 Record any explanations of the events here.

In the shaded boxes, sum the number of check marks in each column.

- In column 1, sum the number of events.
- In columns 2–4, record the total number of check marks for each column.
- In column 5, based on the reviewer's judgement, place a checkmark only if the scenario's LOD is not appropriate.
- In column 6, TS are required to be ≥ 2 for each scenario. (ES-301, D.5.d)
- In column 7, preidentified CTs should be ≥ 2 for each scenario. (Appendix D; ES-301, D.5.d; ES-301-4)
- In column 8, record the number of events not used on the two previous NRC initial licensing exams. A scenario is considered unsatisfactory if there is < 2 new events. (ES-301, D.5.b; Appendix D, C.1.f)
- In column 9, record whether the scenario as written (U)nacceptable, in need of (E)nhancement, or (S)atisfactory from column 11 of the simulator scenario table.

Facility: DC Cook Units 1 & 2								**Exam Date: August 3, 2020**
Scenario	1 Event Totals	2 Events Unsat.	3 TS Total	4 TS Unsat.	5 CT Total	6 CT Unsat.	7 % Unsat. Scenario Elements	8 U/E/S	9 Explanation
1	8/9?	0	2	0	2	0	0%	E	Need to clarify Critical Task required actions. Two events appear to overlap and need clarification as to why they are separate events. Several instances where additional detail is needed to aid the evaluator in assessing performance.
2	8	3	3	1	2	0	30%	~~U~~E	Need to clarify Critical Task required actions. Tech Spec event with no actions required and two events with no apparent verifiable actions. Several instances where additional detail is needed to aid the evaluator in assessing performance.
3	7	1	3	1	2	0	16%	E	Need to clarify Critical Task required actions. Several instances where additional detail is needed to aid the evaluator in assessing performance.
4	9	3	1	1	2	0	33%	U	Need to clarify Critical Task required actions. One event initially determined to be LOD 1, one event with no apparent verifiable actions, and only one Tech Spec Event. Several instances where additional detail is needed to aid the evaluator in assessing performance.
5	6	1	2	0	2	0	10%	E	Need to clarify Critical Task required actions. Several instances where additional detail is needed to aid the evaluator in assessing performance.

Instructions for Completing This Table:

Check or mark any item(s) requiring comment and explain the issue in the space provided.

1, 3, 5 For each simulator scenario, enter the **total** number of events (column 1), TS entries/actions (column 3), and CTs (column 5). This number should match the respective scenario from the event-based scenario tables (the sum from columns 1, 6, and 7, respectively).

2, 4, 6 For each simulator scenario, evaluate each event, TS, and CT as (S)atisfactory, (E)nhance, or (U)nsatisfactory based on the following criteria:

a. Events. Each event is described on a Form ES-D-2, including all switch manipulations, pertinent alarms, and verifiable actions. Event actions are balanced between at-the-controls and balance-of-plant applicants during the scenario. All event-related attributes on Form ES-301-4 are met. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory events in column 2.

b. TS. A scenario includes at least two TS entries/actions across at least two different events. TS entries and actions are detailed on Form ES-D-2. Enter the total number of unsatisfactory TS entries/actions in column 4. (ES-301, D.5d)

c. CT. Check that a scenario includes at least two preidentified CTs. This criterion is a target quantitative attribute, not an absolute minimum requirement. Check that each CT is explicitly bounded on Form ES-D-2 with measurable performance standards (see Appendix D). Enter the total number of unsatisfactory CTs in column 6.

7 In column 7, calculate the percentage of unsatisfactory scenario elements: $\left(\frac{2+4+6}{1+3+5}\right)100\%$

8 If the value in column 7 is > 20%, mark the scenario as (U)nsatisfactory in column 8. If column 7 is ≤ 20%, annotate with (E)nhancement or (S)atisfactory.

9 In column 9, explain each unsatisfactory event, TS, and CT. Editorial comments can also be added here.

Save initial review comments and detail subsequent comment resolution so that each exam-bound scenario is marked by a (S)atisfactory resolution on this form.

Site name: DC Cook Units 1 & 2 **Exam Date:** August 3, 2020

OPERATING TEST TOTALS

	Total	Total Unsat.	Total Edits	Total Sat.	% Unsat.	Explanation
Admin. JPMs	9	7	2	0		Numerous issues with incomplete or missing Performance Standards. Several JPMs missing "Task Standards." Several errors in designation of "Critical Steps." All JPMs required significant enhancements.
Sim./In-Plant JPMs	11	4	7	0		Numerous issues with incomplete or missing Performance Standards. Several errors in designation of "Critical Steps." All JPMs required significant enhancements.
Scenarios	4	0	4	0		
Op. Test Totals:	24	11	13	0	46%	Unsat Submittal.

Instructions for Completing This Table:

Update data for this table from quality reviews and totals in the previous tables and then calculate the percentage of total items that are unsatisfactory and give an explanation in the space provided.

1. Enter the total number of items submitted for the operating test in the "Total" column. For example, if nine administrative JPMs were submitted, enter "9" in the "Total" items column for administrative JPMs. For scenarios, enter the total number of simulator scenarios.
2. Enter the total number of (U)nsatisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the two JPMs column 5 and simulator scenarios column 8 in the previous tables. Provide an explanation in the space provided.
3. Enter totals for (E)nhancements needed and (S)atisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the previous tables. This task is for tracking only.
4. Total each column and enter the amounts in the "Op. Test Totals" row.
5. Calculate the percentage of the operating test that is (U)nsatisfactory (Op. Test Total Unsat.)/(Op. Test Total) and place this value in the bolded "% Unsat." cell.

   Refer to ES-501, E.3.a, to rate the overall operating test as follows:
   - satisfactory, if the "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is ≤ 20%
   - unsatisfactory, if "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is > 20%
6. Update this table and the tables above with post-exam changes if the "as-administered" operating test required content changes, including the following:
   - The JPM performance standards were incorrect.
   - The administrative JPM tasks/keys were incorrect.
   - CTs were incorrect in the scenarios (not including post scenario critical tasks defined in Appendix D).
   - The EOP strategy was incorrect in a scenario(s).
   - TS entries/actions were determined to be incorrect in a scenario(s).