

Facility:		Susquehanna		Exam Date: 7/26/21									
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	A1-2.1.20	2.7										S	
RO	A2-2.2.14	2.9										S	
RO	A3-2.2.12	2.9										S	
RO	A4-2.3.7	3.1										S	
SRO	A1-2.1.7	3.3										S	
SRO	A2-2.2.14	3.1										S	
SRO	A3-2.2.22	3.2										S	
SRO	A4-2.3.11	3.3										S	K/A is met b/c work request approval could result in rad release into secondary containment.
SRO	A5-2.4.41	3.0										S	
Simulator/In-Plant JPMs	1 Safety Function and K/A	[Redacted]											
A	1-202002A205	3.0										S	
B	2-259001A402	3.0										E	Reclassified step 13 as critical
C	3-239001A401	3.2										S	
D	4-205000A206	3.2										S	
E	5-223002A403	3.0										S	
F	6-264000A103	3.3										E	Enhanced task standard
G	7-215005A107	3.3										S	
H	8-400000A201	3.1										S	
I	1-201001A106	3.0										S	
J	7-212000A202	3.1										S	
K	5-295024EA119	3.1										S	K/A is met b/c manual burst of the rupture disc is a method to control containment atmosphere IRT hi DW press.

**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.









**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  $\geq 2$  for each scenario. (ES-301, D.5.d)
- In column 7, preidentified CTs should be  $\geq 2$  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:		Susquehanna							Exam Date:	
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	9	0	1	0	2	0	0	E	Added additional TS related event; enhanced boundary for CT	
2	9	0	1	0	3	1	0	E	Added additional TS related event; eliminated 1 CT	
3	8	0	2	0	2	0	0	E	Enhanced boundaries for CT's	
4	8	0	2	0	2	0	0	S	Minor boundary revision to 1 CT	

**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: Susquehanna

Exam Date: 07/26/21

## OPERATING TEST TOTALS

	Total	Total Unsat.	Total Edits	Total Sat.	% Unsat.	Explanation
Admin. JPMs	9	0	0	9		
Sim./In-Plant JPMs	11	0	2	11		MINOR EDITS TO CLARIFY INITIATING CUES AND RECLASSIFY SOME JPM STEPS AS CRITICAL STEPS
Scenarios	4	0	14	4		REVISED DEFINITIONS OF SEVERAL CT'S; DOWNGRADED SEVERAL TS RELATED EVENTS B/C MALF DID NOT REQUIRE CREW ACTIONS
<b>Op. Test Totals:</b>	24	0	16	24	0	

**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 postscenario 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).