

DRAFT OUTLINE COMMENTS

Facility: BRAIDWOOD STATION

Exam Date: MAY 28 – JUNE 8, 2018

Written Exam Outline (Prepared by NRC)		
	Comment	Resolution
G	Several KAs needed to be replaced due to inapplicability and/or inability to write an operationally valid question at the appropriate license level.	Replacement KAs were randomly selected within the applicable category and approved by the Chief Examiner.
G	Ensure ES-401-4 has been updated.	Replacement KAs were properly documented on the ES-401-4 form.

Administrative JPM Outline (2/19/2018)		
	Comment	Resolution
1	Ensure RO COO2 is Significantly modified from the Bank JPM R-112. Why is the Simulator required for the JPM? Is the applicant recording the data for panel indications, or simply using data from the surveillance paperwork?	This JPM is new due to the set-up changes for the new Ovation digital control controllers, but is not modified in required actions from the bank JPM. Licensee will change the ES-301-1 to reflect 'Classroom' and 'Direct from Bank.' ES-301-1 corrected.
2	Is R-405 really new (new system) or simply modified from using an old system?	This is a new Job Task for newly qualified RO operators.
3	Is S-106 a new JPM? Never previously performed for a SG Tube Leak previously?	Will validate the operational validity of the JPM for an Admin task. JPM is a SAT admin JPM.
4	How does applying GOCAR (?) apply to TS entry conditions?	The licensee will provide the tie to TS for the fire suppression system. Reference TS 5.4.1.c

Control Room / In-Plant System JPM Outline (2/19/2018)		
	Comment	Resolution
G	Per ES-301 D.1.h, "The walkthrough and simulator portions should not be redundant, nor should they duplicate material that is covered on the written examination." Verify that 'S4(d)' and 'P3(k)' JPMs do not duplicate the administrative topics from the written.	See ES-201-2, 4.e. The licensee will validate the KAs for the Admin Topic JPMs. JPMs significantly different from the written exam admin topics.
G	Per ES-301 D.4.a, "Each of the control room systems and evolutions (and separately each of the in-plant systems and evolutions) selected for RO and SRO-I applicants should evaluate a different safety function, and the same system or evolution should not be used to evaluate more than one safety function in each location." In the Control Room Systems, 'S1(a)' and 'S2(b)' use the same system (CVCS, 004).	See ES-201-2, 3.a.(1). The licensee will look for a replacement JPM for JPM (b). The reference system changed to Pressurizer Level Control System for JPM S2(b).

1	Is JPM 'P3(k)' associated with System 079?	Yes. ES-301-2 corrected.
Simulator Scenario Outline Comments (2/19/2018)		
Comment		Resolution
G	<p>Per ES-301 D.5.b, "To maintain test integrity, every scenario shall be new or significantly modified to ensure that the applicant has not had the opportunity to rehearse or practice the scenario. A significant modification means that, for each scenario, at least two events have not been used on the previous two NRC initial licensing operating exams."</p> <p>How is it determined that each scenario is new or significantly modified? How many repetitive events are allowed from the previous 2 NRC Exams?</p>	<p>The licensee has a database spreadsheet to flag repetitive events from the last two NRC Exams administered, which precludes not having at least 2 new events in each scenario.</p>
G	<p>Per ES-301 D.5.d, "With the exception of the SRO TS evaluations, each evolution, failure, or transient should only be counted once per applicant; for example, 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.</p> <p>Scenario 2, events 6 & 7 appear to go against the above requirement.</p>	<p>The licensee will not count the ATC component failure which follows the Major event, since the failure is required to set-up the Major.</p>