

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link			
SRO-A1.1 (ADMIN 5)	Crew Staffing Determination (G2.1.5)	3								X			E	2015 NRC Exam NRC: 1. INITIATING CUE; What does "fully qualified" mean as it relates to the Chemist and RP Spec.? Significance? 2. JPM Step 2; Performance Standard (PS) should include a determination (non-critical) that minimum staffing requirements for Licensed Operators is maintained without Craig. 3. PS 3; Revise Standard to include the words "for Fire Brigade" between "staffing" and "must". Also removed procedure reference in the standard. 4. Is there a separate qualification need to be a Fire Brigade Leader? If so the Standard for PS 3 should include an item to designate a Fire Brigade Leader. Response: 1. Chemists and RP qualifications are not annotated on the Operations Org Chart. This tells the examinee that they are qualified Fire Brigade. 2. Added Non-Critical Step 3. Added words to standard. 4. No, there is not a separate qualification for Fire Brigade Leader. NRC (Post OV): The JPM is now SAT
SRO-A1.2 (ADMIN 6)	SRO - NRC License Maintenance Responsibilities (G2.1.4)	2		X									E	2016 NRC Exam NRC: 1. PS 1; Add "when requested" to the end of the Evaluator Cue. Response: 1. Words added as requested.

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
SRO-A2 (ADMIN 7)	LCO 3.0.9 Application Determination (G2.2.40)	2	X										<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The initial conditions, specifically the last bullet, is unnecessarily leading the examinee. The determination of the regulatory impact (TS, TRM, or other applicable requirements) is an SRO responsibility. The bulleted item should end simply with the fact that Door 34 is NOT a fire door. The Initiating Cue should simply be for the examinee to determine the impact of the door being open on any regulatory requirements. The examinee should then determine the applicability of LCO 3.0.9. Add a step prior to JPM step 2 for applicant to identify applicability of step 4.3.2.F.2 JPM step 2; Step number referenced is incorrect (based on references supplied); Should be Step 4.3.2.F.2 <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The task standard for this JPM is to apply Technical Specifications (LCO 3.0.9) and NOT specifically to determine what room Door 34 is for as this information would be provided to the CRS by the operators. The information provided in the ICs allows for the examinee to efficiently work towards the actual task being tested. Removing the IC information and simply asking "what is the regulatory impact" is an open-ended question not specific to the task which will result in a time intensive non-discriminatory JPM. Simplified cue as discussed during OV week. Procedure OWI-02.07 recently revised which adjusted procedure step numbers. LCO 3.0.9 Use now starts with section 4.10. JPM updated. N/A <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
SRO-A3 (ADMIN 8)	ODCM Requirements (G2.3.15)	2	X							X		E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Initiating Cue; Cue is unnecessarily leading the applicant to the ODCM requirements. The cue should simply state: Determine the regulatory impacts associated with these instruments being Non-Functional. Task Standard: Insert "and associated Completion Times" after "actions." PS 3; Standard should include that the examinee determines that with both monitors inoperable the minimum required channels is not met. PS 4; Standard should include that the examinee determines that the minimum required channels (single channel?) is not met. <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Removing the IC information and simply asking "what is the regulatory impact" is an open-ended question not specific to the task which will result in a time intensive non-discriminatory JPM. Revised IC to just state "using ODCM". Updated task standards. PS3 updated PS4 updated. <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>
SRO-A4 (ADMIN 9)	Classify Event According to Security Condition (G2.4.41)	3	X		X							E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> INTIAL CONDITIONS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Add a blank line between the "Duck and Cover..." bullet and the "Approximately 30 minutes ..." bullet to more clearly identify the time separation. Move the "You are the on-shift SRO" to the top of the list and change to Shift Manager. Move/incorporate the "HPCI and RCIC..." bullet with the Reactor Status Bullet. After the "Busses 15 and 16..." bullet may want to repeat that reactor status has not changed.

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
													2. There is only one (1) identified critical step . PS 4 should be broken up into two (2) separate critical steps: 1) Locate the appropriate EAL; and 2) make the formal declaration. NOTE procedurally the formal notification is not listed until after the SEC is summoned to the Control Room. 3. PS 7 ; Consider having "summoning the SEC" as a critical step. <u>Response:</u> 1. Updated as requested above. 2. The JPM has 2 critical steps - see 3 below. PS4 encompasses one procedural step that doesn't specifically state "make a formal declaration". Standard has been updated to single bullet. 3. While important, summoning the SEC to the Control Room is NOT critical and is routinely performed by the one of the Control Room ROs. 4. New PS8 was added; Critical step to declare emergency. <u>NRC (Post OV):</u> 1. PS 4 ; Need to add a closing parenthesis after the words "...Security Shift Supervisor...." 2. PS 4 ; Add an Evaluator Note stating that the formal declaration (PS 8) may be performed at this time or may be delayed until later. 3. PS 8 ; Add an Evaluator Note similar to the one added to PS 4 stating that the formal declaration may have been made earlier. The JPM is now SAT
RO-A1.1 (ADMIN 1)	Overtime Restrictions/ Fatigue Management (G 2.1.5)	3	X									E	<u>NRC:</u> 1. JPM step 5 Standard (PS) ; In the last bullet the "9 day stretch" should read "10-day stretch". 2. PS 5 ; The last bulleted item appears to be the "critical" element of the step. There are two parts. Item should be broken up into two separated items, both of which would be "critical." The item related to the 'day off'

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
													<p>needs to specify that the day off needs to be on or before Wednesday to ensure that the 72-hour in 7-day period is not violated. As currently written, this part of the Standard is inadequate.</p> <p>3. PS 6; Define the 24-hour [0700 Fri to 0700 Sat] and 48-hour [0700 Thurs to 0700 Sat] periods in question.</p> <p>4. PS 6; Additionally, the 10-hour break between consecutive work periods [1500 to 1800 on Fri] would be violated.</p> <p>5. TASK STANDARD needs to be revised to reflect the specific actions the applicant is expected to perform. For example, the examinee is expected to identify that they proposed work schedule for weeks 3 and 4 cannot be implemented without violating the 10 CFR 26 work hour restrictions.</p> <p><u>Response:</u></p> <p>1. Standard reworded and associated statement was deleted.</p> <p>2. Standard reworded to simply identify the that 10 CFR 26 restrictions will be violated for at least one of two reasons. Identification of when a day off must be taken is no longer required.</p> <p>3. Times defined.</p> <p>4. Reworded to include 10-hour break as one of the reasons for violating 10CFR26 restrictions.</p> <p>5. Task standard originally written to match the MNGP task list. Standard has been updated.</p> <p>6. Updated JPM to change evaluation to a week to week basis.</p> <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u></p> <p>1. Revise PS 5 and 6 standards to state "...at least ONE" - DONE</p> <p>2. Task Standard needs to be reworded for clarity. - DONE</p> <p>a. Typo; "they" should be "the"</p> <p>b. Add comma after "...proposed work</p>

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
													schedule” and replace “and identify” with “specifically” 3. PS 6 ; In the last bullet, replace “This would exceed” with “There isn’t a” (see last bullet of PS 5 standard). – DONE The JPM is now SAT
RO-A1.2 (ADMIN 2)	Independent Verification of RHR (G2.1.31)	2										E	2016 NRC Exam <u>NRC:</u> 1. PS 3 and PS 5; PS 5 Standard includes step to reposition the valve when directed whereas PS 3 does not. Need to be consistent. Since this is an admin JPM the steps should probably not include valve repositioning. 2. The TASK STANDARD needs to be revised to reflect the specific actions the applicant is expected to perform (i.e., identifies that two valves are not in the expected position) <u>Response:</u> 1. Updated PS 5 evaluator cue. 2. Clarified Task Standard. <u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
RO-A2 (ADMIN 3)	Accident Monitoring Instrument Checks (G2.2.37)	2			X							U	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> PS 2; What is meant by the phrase “normal oscillation”? If data points are not static, then a range of values need to be specified. Additionally, do the recorders provide “digital” values for each parameter or are the readings obtained from a chart that could lead to a range of recorded values; if so, Standard specify a range for each value PS 2 Standard should state “Record the listed parameter values from the specified recorders. If PS 2 is “critical”, then should PS 4 also be “critical?” <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> That is the way the procedure is written in the event the values aren’t stable. However, the data values in the simulator will be static. PS 2 updated and ranges added. PS4 and PS 5 are critical - fixed. <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> PS 3; In standard change “Record and calculates” to “Calculates and records”. - DONE PS 5; In standard change “Record and calculates” to “Calculates and records”. - DONE <p>The JPM is now SAT</p>
RO-A3 (ADMIN 4)	LHRA Entry – Radwaste Pump Room (2.3.7)	3	X		X				X			U	<p>2013 NRC Exam</p> <p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Need to add a TASK STANDARD PS 1; Procedure step D.1 requires the worker to identify area dose rates for ALL regions the worker is expected to enter. The Standard should be revised to include the expected dose rates along the transit route also. PS 2; completion of this step requires the examinee to assume that the highest expected dose rate is to be used for the 45-minute duration and that the expected task

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link		
													time include transit to and from the valve location. Is that expectation documented somewhere? I can foresee applicants attempting to breakdown the task to three parts: transit to the valve, repairs and cleanup, and transit out of the area. it has been done in the past with similar JPMs; especially with applicants who have not made actual entries in the past. (Question) 4. PS 3; The determination that the expected dose will exceed the allowable entry dose should be part of PS 4; step D.3 of the procedure simply requires determination of the allowable entry dose. Should step PS 3 not be critical and PS 4 should be with the Standard specifying that the examinee; 1) determines allowable entry dose will be exceeded <u>and</u> 2) contacts RPC for resolution. <u>Response:</u> 1. Task standard added. 2. Updated ICs to state transit time dose is negligible. 3. Specified ICs to state the job is 45 minutes at the valve. 4. Updated PS4 to make it critical. PS3 would still be critical. NRC (Post OV): The JPM is now SAT

Facility: Monticello			Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020										
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1	2	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5	6
	Safety Function and K/A	LOD (1-5)	I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link	U/E/S	Explanation
S1; CRD Pump Swap-over	SF1 201001 A4.01 (Alt Path)	2							X			E	<p>2018 NRC Exam</p> <p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TASK STANDARD needs to be revised to indicate that task includes response to loss of CRD Pump Flow (sheared shaft on the 12 CRD Pump). [NUREG 1021; App C; B.3] PS 8; This JPM needs to be terminated by the evaluator. The assigned task is not completed since the 12 CRD Pump has failed and transition was made to AOP. Although not specifically stated in the AOP, there should be a step to verify system parameters returned to normal. This could be incorporated into the "Standard" for PS 6. [NUREG 1021; App C; B.3] <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Task standard revised This is part of our standard JPM template. PS8 removed. Added parameter monitoring to PS6. <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u></p> <p>The JPM is now SAT</p>
S2; Place 12 RFP In Service from Warm-Up	SF2 259001 A4.02 (Alt Path)	2							X			E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TASK STANDARD needs to be revised to indicate that task includes response to severe vibrations on the 12 Reactor Feed pump. [NUREG 1021; App C; B.3] PS 6 and 7; <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Why is this NOT a "critical" step? The procedure gives specific guidance to shut down the feed pump if <u>any</u> abnormal noise or vibration. If trouble alarm comes in immediately with activation of malfunction, consider switching the order of steps PS 6 and 7. Alternatively consider combining the two steps.

Facility: Monticello			Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020										
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1	2	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5	6
	Safety Function and K/A	LOD (1-5)	I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link	U/E/S	Explanation
													c. Condition the evaluator cue on 12 RFP vibrations until after the trouble alarm comes in. d. ALT PATH begins upon either acknowledgement of high vibration report OR verification high vibrations per ARP. 3. Delete PS 9; Per PS 8, this JPM is terminated by the evaluator. The assigned task is not completed since the 12 Reactor Feed pump has failed. <u>Response:</u> 1. Performance task revised. Task Standard was revised to include response to high vibration. 2. PS 6 and 7 a. The critical step would be to shutdown the RFP, not monitor parameters. PS 6 revised to respond to Alarm 6-A-2 and validate cause of alarm. b. The alarm doesn't come in immediately. c. Conditioned cue. d. Updated Alternate Path start step as requested. PS 7 (formerly PS-8), now a "critical step," to reflect that Trip of RFP can be due to either step D.8 of the OP or step 2 of the ARP. Original actions of PS-7 incorporated into PS 6. 3. This is part of our standard JPM template. PS9 removed. <u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT

Facility: Monticello			Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020										
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1	2	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5	6
	Safety Function and K/A	LOD (1-5)	I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link	U/E/S	Explanation
S3; Start No. 11 Recirc Pump	SF4 202001 A4.01 (Alt Path)	3						X				E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TASK STANDARD needs to be revised to indicate that task includes response to failure of Recirc MG Drive Motor Breaker to automatically trip. [NUREG 1021; App C; B.3] PS 16; This JPM needs to be terminated by the evaluator. The assigned task is not completed due to malfunction. PS 10; The operator should perform this step. OK to have another operator record completion. <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Task standard revised. This is part of our standard JPM template. PS 16 removed. IAW validating operators, this step would be completed by another operator and a TS SR brief would have occurred. No change made to this step. <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>
S4; Manually Insert A Group 5 Isolation	SF5 223002 A4.02 (Alt Path)	2						X				E	<p>2016 NRC Exam</p> <p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> TASK STANDARD needs to be revised to state that examinee manually closes at least one of the RCIC Steam Line Isolation Valves. PS 1; Standard should specify how the examinee verifies that NO Group V isolation is present (i.e., list the indications that should be checked). PS 5; Identification of the leak should be a separate step or incorporated into PS 6. PS 6; Responds to, and implements to ARP for, annunciator 4-A-05 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Confirms validity of alarm Determines failure to automatically isolate.

Facility: Monticello			Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020										
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1	2	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5	6
	Safety Function and K/A	LOD (1-5)	I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link	U/E/S	Explanation
													5. PS 7; should specify IAW ARP C.6-004-A-05 Operator Action Step 1 AND/OR AOP C.4-B.04.01.E Subsequent Operator Action Step 1 (provided reference shows Step 2 as the applicable step) 6. PS 7; Standard should be to close both valves but indicate that closure of either valve satisfy the "critical" element of he step. 7. Delete PS 8; Per PS 7, this JPM is terminated by the evaluator. The assigned task is not completed due to the malfunction. <u>Response:</u> 1. Task standard revised. 2. Updated PS 1 3. Leak is triggered by this action and should remain in this step as this is where it will be recognized. No changes made. 4. Updated PS 6 and added evaluator note for response using ARP guidance. 5. PS7 updated 6. PS7 updated 7. PS8 removed. <u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT
S5; Restore LC-103 from LC-104	SF6 295003 AA1.01	2	X		?							E	<u>NRC:</u> 1. INITIATING CUE; Combine the 1 st and 3 rd bullets into one statement. 2. PS 2; is 103/104 LC BUS TIE ACB-52-309 expected to be closed. If so, then step is NOT critical. <u>Response:</u> 1. 1 st and 3 rd bullet combined 2. Yes, the tie breaker is expected to be closed. PS2 is not critical <u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT

Facility: Monticello			Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020										
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1	2	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5	6
	Safety Function and K/A	LOD (1-5)	I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link	U/E/S	Explanation
S6; Removing the Bypass of a LPRM	SF7 215005 A4.04	2										S	
S7; Transformer Deluge Initiation from Control Room	SF8 286000 A4.01	2										E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> PS 1; Recommend initiating the TB Siding Deluge system as part of the Simulator Setup. Delete PS 5; Actions completed in PS 4. <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> This Deluge wouldn't have necessarily initiated due to the initial conditions. This is an automatic feature that adds no value to the JPM. No changes made to step. PS 5 removed. Updated PS1 and PS2 standard to include the non-critical portion of step to verify amber light is lit. <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>
S8; Manually Initiate SGBT A Train	SF9 261000 A4.07	2										E	<p>2016 NRC Exam</p> <p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> INITIATING CUE; Specifying performance of step 1-4 is unnecessarily leading the applicant. Include step for determining need to perform step 5 of procedure. <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> IC changed as requested. Included PS for procedure step 5. Changed "when" to "if" in evaluator cue for PS2 <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>

Facility: Monticello			Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020										
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1	2	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5	6
	Safety Function and K/A	LOD (1-5)	I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link	U/E/S	Explanation
P1; Depressurize the Scram Air Header from ASDS Panel	SF1 295037 EA1.05	2										E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> INITIAL CONDITIONS; In the last bullet, or earlier, specify that C.5-3101 is being implemented. TASK STANDARD; Revise to include "from the ASDS Panel." PS 1; Evaluator Note should simply state that this JPM is administered in the Simulator. PS 1; Evaluator Cues should be conditioned by "After the examinee explains where the procedure(key) can be obtained..." PS 7 and the Terminating Cue should match. PS 7 implies that the task (JPM) is complete when <u>reported</u> as complete. The Terminating Cue implies that the evaluator terminates the JPM. <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> ICs have been updated. Task standard updated. This JPM was originally going to be administered at the Simulator ASDS Panel. However, due to the simulator time constraints from compressing the operating exam into one week, this JPM will be simulated in the plant. Evaluator cues added to applicable steps. Cue updated. Terminating cue updated. Updated evaluator cue in PS6 <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>

Facility: Monticello			Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020										
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1	2	3 Attributes							4 Job Content		5	6
	Safety Function and K/A	LOD (1-5)	I/C Focus	Cues	Critical Steps	Scope (N/B)	Overlap	Perf. Std.	Key	Minutia	Job Link	U/E/S	Explanation
P2; Use of Alternate Injection Systems for RPV Makeup	SF2 295031 EA1.08	3										E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. INITIAL CONDITIONS <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Separate the current bullet statement into two separate statements. b. Add a new item to state that the Control Room Supervisor has directed implementation of C.5-3203 PART C. (Could be added to the statement that two Service Water pumps and both Condensate pumps are in service.) 2. TASK STANDARD; Recommend revising to state that the in-plant lineups to crosstie Service Water to Condensate/Feedwater have been completed. 3. PS 4 and PS 5; Revise the last Evaluator Cue to state that hotwell level is rising and that the JPM is complete. Delete PS 5. <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. ICs updated. 2. Task Standard updated 3. PS4 revised, PS5 removed. 4. Updated initiating cue to direct that SW-147 is to be opened 4 turns. <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>
P3; Reset the Leak Rate Change High Alarm Timer	SF9 223001 A1.10	3										E	<p><u>NRC:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Recommend removing the examples in PS 2, 3, and 6. <p><u>Response:</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Removed example from standard in PS 2, 3 and 6. 2. Updated ICs to include sumps have been pumped down to 4.1”. 3. Updated PS 7 evaluator cue to provide guidance if the black pointer is already at the required position. <p><u>NRC (Post OV):</u> The JPM is now SAT</p>

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: Monticello			Scenario: 1					Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
1 Swap SWC Pumps							X	S	Normal Event
2 APRM Fails Dwnc								S	
3 SRV Stuck Open					X			E	Reactivity Event <u>NRC(Post OV)</u> 1. Facility revised event trigger 13 to delay full closure of the SRV until power reduced to <90% on ARPM 1 as requested by the NRC. 2. Facility removed reference to TLCO 3.4.4 based on OV comment. The event is now SAT
4 HPCI Steam Leak					X		X	E	BOP manually isolates HPCI on a steam leak after Group IV Auto Isolation fails. <u>NRC(Post OV)</u> 1. Adding a Critical Task (CT) to isolate the HPCI steam leak before conditions require a SCRAM was discussed during OV. Provide an explanation for why this is <u>not</u> a CT. Response: The leak is isolable, therefore EOP step to SCRAM is not applicable to the event even though max safe parameters will be exceeded in two areas due to the leak severity. The event is SAT
5 SRV Reopens SCRAM						X	X	S	
6 SRV Tailpipe Steam Leak						X		E	<u>NRC:</u> CT-30 does not have a boundary condition for initiating DW spray after containment pressure reaches 12 psig. If applicant does not perform this action, what will be the consequences for this scenario? What is the applicant performing this action to prevent from happening, will containment design parameters be exceeded? Response: Updated CT-30 as follows:

Facility: Monticello			Scenario: 1					Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
									When drywell pressure reaches 12 psig then initiate drywell spray to restore and maintain the safe region to PSP. Failure mode is based on fatigue failure and must be completed within 22 minutes. The CT is now SAT
7 LFFRV Fails							X	S	ATC manually controls RPV level with LFFRV.
7	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	E	

Facility: Monticello			Scenario: 2					Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
1A/B Raise Power with RR Pumps/ Scoop Tube Locks Up								E	<p>Reactivity Event <u>NRC:</u> This event credits the OATC with a reactivity maneuver and a component failure. This is specifically, prohibited in NUREG 1021, ES-301 which states in part, “a power change can be counted as a normal evolution or as a reactivity manipulation, and, similarly, a component failure that immediately results in a major transient counts as one or the other, but <i>not</i> both.” <u>Response:</u> The 12 Recirc Pump Scoop Tube lock occurs immediately prior to any significant power change. Once corrected, the OATC will continue with and complete the reactivity manipulation. Recommend administratively separating these into two separate events. This was done for the MNGP 2018 NRC Exam Scenarios 2 and 4. Events split into 1A and 1B. The events are now SAT</p>
2 Start 2 nd Condensate Pump								S	<p>Normal Event</p>
3 CS Valve Leak					X		X	E	<p>(Post OV) Added item to Expected Student Response for the BOP to determine that 11 CS Subsystem must be isolated. The event is now SAT</p>
4 RCIC Spurious Start					X		X	S	<p>BOP manually shuts down RCIC when it spuriously starts.</p>
5 RWM Failure								S	<p>Event added post review. See note for event 8.</p>
6 CW Pumps Trip								S	
7 Electric ATWS								E	<p>ATC manually controls RPV Level until power downscale on APRMs and restores to normal shutdown level band when all rods inserted. <u>NRC:</u> CT-47 does not have a boundary condition for inserting control rods. If applicant does not perform this action by a certain time/condition, what will be the consequences for this scenario? <u>Response:</u> The bounding condition is to promptly achieve an all rods in condition as verified on the RWM and the C-05 full core display.</p>

Facility: Monticello			Scenario: 2					Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
									<p><u>NRC(Post OV)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> After the transition is made to C.5-2007, all expected RO applicant responses for Events 7 and 8 should be assigned to CREW vice OATC/BOP. Availability of OATC will largely depend on ability to control RPV water level after T&P. All actions listed under Event 8, except for determination of first SBLC pump failure to start and start of the other pump, should be listed under Event 7. Consider the following revision to CT-47 “During failure to scram conditions with a critical reactor, PRIOR to exceeding a Torus Temperature of 110°F: inject SBLC; AND/OR promptly begin control rod insertion using one or more of the methods contained within C.5-3101 to achieve reactor shutdown under all conditions.” <p>The event is now SAT</p>
8 SBLC Pump Fails								E	<p>Added RWM failure for and additional OATC malfunction in the event this malfunction is not addressed in the fast-moving scenario.</p> <p><u>NRC(Post OV)</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> D1 should be revised to reflect that the event may be completed by either the OATC or BOP operator. <p>The event is now SAT</p>
78	0	0	0	0	2	2	5	E	

Facility: Monticello			Scenario: 3					Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation	
1 Place MPR in Service								S	Normal Event	
2 RR Pump Trip					X			S		
3A/B Emergency Downpower							X	E	Component Failure/Reactivity Event <u>NRC:</u> This event credits the ATC with a reactivity maneuver and a component failure. This is specifically, prohibited in NUREG 1021, ES-301 which states in part, "a power change can be counted as a normal evolution or as a reactivity manipulation, and, similarly, a component failure that immediately results in a major transient counts as one or the other, but not both." <u>Response:</u> The RMCS failure occurs immediately prior to any power change. Once corrected, the OATC will continue with and complete the reactivity manipulation. Recommend administratively separating these into two separate events. This was done for the MNGP 2018 NRC Exam Scenario 4. Event split into 3A and 3B The events are now SAT	
4 XFMR Oil Leak		X			X			E	<u>NRC:</u> Include specific components to be manipulated in the D-2 for transferring busses 11-14 to 1R. <u>Response:</u> Components added. The event is now SAT	
5 Rods Drift						X	X	S		
6 LOCA with Loss of HP Injection						XX	X	E	<u>NRC(Post OV)</u> 1. After the SCRAM immediate actions are completed, all expected RO applicant responses for Events 6 and 7 should be assigned to CREW vice OATC/BOP. Availability of any particular operator for a specific response will depend on the flow of the scenario. 2. Add an Expected RO action to ensure 2 or more Injection Subsystems (Detail R) are aligned for injection with the pumps running. The event is now SAT	
7							X	S	ATC/BOP restores RPV Level with Low Pressure ECCS.	

Facility: Monticello			Scenario: 3					Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
CS Pump Fails to Start									<u>NRC(Post OV)</u> 1. The CRS expected response to injection sources lined up for injection is incomplete and should probably be included in Event 6. (see related Event 6 comment) The event is now SAT
7	0	1	0	0	2	3	3	E	

Facility: Monticello			Scenario: 5 (SPARE)						Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation	
1 Test BPVs					X			S	Normal Event	
2 Main Turbine Vibes							X	S	Reactivity Event	
3 RBM Upscale							X	S	<p><u>NRC</u>: RBM is required to be operable at power levels > 30%, that is when RBM is in effect. Why is TS 3.3.2.1 not applicable? Are we expecting to lower power below 30% in the previous event?</p> <p><u>Response</u>: Greater than 30% is the power of applicability; however, the applicability also requires MCPR to be below the limit specified in the COLR. MCPR is not below the limit in the COLR, therefore this LCO is not applicable, and as such, it is NOT being credited for a TS call.</p>	
4 ADS Timer Initiation					X		X	S	<p>BOP manually inhibits ADS.</p> <p><u>NRC(Post OV)</u></p> <p>1. Inhibiting ADS should be a critical task since failing to do so will result/require a Reactor Scram.</p> <p><u>Response</u>: Due to the nature of the malfunction, ADS valves will not open even if timer times out.</p>	
5 Loss of LC-107								S		
6 Design Basis Earthquake						XX	X	E	<p><u>NRC</u>: CT-10 does not have a boundary condition for ordering reactor scram following a design basis earthquake. If applicant does not perform this action by a certain time/condition, what will be the consequences for this scenario?</p> <p><u>Response</u>:</p> <p>1. <u>CT-10</u> Manually scram the reactor if a design basis earthquake has occurred causing plant degradation (Torus Rupture) and has been verified by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All three Panel C-06 earthquake annunciators in alarm <u>And</u> • One of the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Actually having felt the indications <u>OR</u> ○ By confirmation from outside agencies 	

Facility: Monticello			Scenario: 5 (SPARE)					Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
Event	Realism/ Cred.	Required Actions	Verifiable actions	LOD	TS	CTs	Scenario Overlap	U/E/S	Explanation
									Following a DBA, Safety System degradation may occur from continued operation with these condition that could challenge the ability to protect the health and safety of the public.
									<u>NRC(Post OV)</u> The event is now SAT
7 Control Rod Fails to Insert								S	ATC manually inserts control rod which failed to scram.
7	0	0	0	0	2	2	3	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 judgment, 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, pre-identified 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: Monticello									Exam Date: October 19-30, 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	11 Explanation	
1	7	0	2	0	2	0	0	E		
2	8	0	2	0	2	0	0	E		
3	7	0	2	0	3	0	0	E		
4									N/A	
5	7	0	2	0	2	0	0	E		

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 pre-identified 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 11, 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.

Facility: Monticello		Exam Date: October 19-30, 2020				
OPERATING TEST TOTALS						
	Total	Total Unsat.	Total Edits	Total Sat.	% Unsat.	Explanation
Admin. JPMs	9	2	7	0		All Admin JPMs required editing before being considered satisfactory for administration.
Sim/In-Plant JPMs	11	0	10	1		
Scenarios	4	0	4	0		All Scenarios required editing before being considered satisfactory for administration.
Op. Test Totals:	24	2	21	1	8%	

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.

- 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.
- 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.
- Enter totals for (E)nhancements needed and (S)atisfactory JPMs and scenarios from the previous tables. This task is for tracking only.
- Total each column and enter the amounts in the "Op. Test Totals" row.
- Calculate the percentage of the operating test that is (U)nsatisfactory $(\text{Op. Test Total Unsat.})/(\text{Op. Test Total})$ 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 $\leq 20\%$
 - unsatisfactory, if "Op. Test Total" "% Unsat." is $> 20\%$
- 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).