

2023 LaSalle Operating Test Outline Review

Admin JPMs Overall:

- RO and SRO source and source criteria met for all Admin JPMs per Form 3.2-1
- None of the JPMs were pre-identified as having been used on the last two Operating Tests given

RO Admin:

- Equipment Control: Print Reading Exercise
 - **What type of activity will the candidate be required to complete?**
 - **What system will this be used for (balance of coverage)?**
NRC: Print reading and isolation boundaries established for system. Balance of Coverage checks competed SAT.
- Emergency Plan: Reporting Emergencies
 - **What activity will candidate be required to complete?**
 - **Ensure when developing this JPM that it does not cross over into SRO territory**
NRC: Notifications pertaining to injuries onsite will be RO level.

Simulator / In-Plant JPMs:

- RO and SRO source and source criteria met per Form 3.2-2
- None of the JPMs were pre-identified as having been used on the last two Operating Tests given
- **Will the actions performed in Simulator JPM.a to “Insert CRAM Array During Heater Drain Transient” be significantly different from the actions performed in Simulator Scenario 2, Event 2 when inserting rods to the 81% rod line once the 2nd Stage Reheat is secured?**
Discussion with facility and all issues were resolved appropriately.

Scenarios Overview:

- Critical Tasks need to be more specific in terms of bounding criteria. Refer to ES-3.3, Section C.2, “Measurable Performance Standard” for more information. Let’s discuss this further once you have had a chance to review. I would imagine that the CTs will still be worked during the development of the scenarios.
- Number the CT’s as well for easier reference when grading.
Facility aware of CT issues and is supplying scenario for early look for this reason.

Scenario 1:

- Initial Conditions have 1W MPT Cooling Bank 3 OOS for Maintenance. This is the only scenario with this condition and appears leading since the subsequent hi temperature condition occurs. Is there a way to incorporate this event without needing the IC or include it in a way for other scenarios that does not lead candidates to know something is up with the transformer just for this event?
- Event 3 – SROs standing in the ATC position for this event is only opportunity for manual control (something to watch out for).
- Event 6 – SRO TS call identified on Form 3.3-1 as “SRO Evaluates for applicability”. Event 2 has the SRO review TS as well. Keep in mind that for a TS event to count

towards the 3.4-1 requirements that the Technical Specification evaluation must involve entry into action statements.

- Is it expected that the flow balance between loops will be significant to require TS action statements to apply?
- Event 8 – This manual control event occurs after the Major. Should the candidate (RO-4 from 3.4-1) standing in the BOP position not perform this task, the applicant may not meet minimum requirements for the OP Test.

Discussion held regarding the issues. Changes being made prior to proposed submittal.

Scenario 2:

- Event 3 is identified as a Manual Control on Form 3.4-1 but not on Form 3.3-1. Please update Form 3.3-1 to reflect this as a MC item
- What actions are required for Event 5, “Failure of the RR Ganged Controller in Auto”?
 - I suspect that this may require manual control of the controller. If this is the case, then this needs to be identified as a Manual Control item on Form 3.3-1 and Form 3.4-1.
 - This will alleviate issues where candidates have been identified as meeting the minimum requirements of 3.4-1 and should the “bean” be stolen, place them below the requirements. More about this in the Form 3.4-1 assessment below.
- Event 6 identified as the BOP performing a reactivity manipulation by downshifting the RR Pumps. Is this a BOP action, or will the ATC be performing this action?
- Form 3.3-1 Technical Specification items are only identified as ‘T’. Ensure they are identified as ‘TS’

Submitted as early look. All items addressed through this process after discussion with facility

Scenario 3:

- Event 3 is identified as Manual Control for BOP on Form 3.4-1 for 1A Post Treatment RM Fails Downscale. What actions are required following this failure that make it manual control?
- Event 3 is not identified as ‘MC’ on Form 3.3-1 for BOP. Update to reflect I/MC if actions described above do in fact make it a manual control activity.
- Event 6 states the 1A WS Pump Trips. Should this be 1A SW pump as opposed to WS?
- RO-7 and RO-8 are on the same crew for this scenario and both are identified on Form 3.4-1 as having the minimum requirements for I/C. Should either of them steal the other’s bean during this scenario it may require running the spare. Something to watch for during onsite validation. May need to intervene to ensure each candidate performs required action. Nothing further needed for this now.
- Event 9 is a component failure after the Major. RO-7 has exactly the required I/C from Form 3.4-1. Another item to ensure that the candidate is able to perform required actions to meet minimum activities.

Changes addressed and fixed as part of the proposed exam package

Scenario 4:

- Event 6 states “1B or 1D RHR WS pump fails...”. Should this be SW instead of WS?

System nomenclature is correct.

Form 3.4-1 Items:

- All ROs are either at the minimum requirements for I/C or have one extra. Based on the events, and with some being after the major, there may be times when a “bean” may be stolen by one of the other candidates. Since all of the minimum requirements are met, there is no need to take any further action at this time. We will just want to watch for this during onsite validation and during the exam.
- As stated above, Scenario 2, Event 5 may alleviate some of this concern if, in fact, this is a manual control action that the candidates will be performing.

Scenario 2 comment addressed.

Operating Test Administration Schedule Review:

- Monday is listed as an entire day for Badging, Dosimetry and possibly starting JPMs
 - We will have all badging and dosimetry arranged during the Onsite validation week. I will work with you to ensure that Reg Affairs has what they need prior to our arrival and that all examiners will be ready to get badged/renew badges and dosimetry prior to arrival.
 - It would be best to pull the scenarios up to Monday and hit the ground running with those. If you prefer to administer JPMs on Monday, that is fine. However, it is our preference to knock out the scenarios earlier in the week just in case something was to occur with the simulator to delay the exam, we want to ensure that we have time to address those items. Our exam team will be arriving to the area on the Sunday before the exam.
 - We expect to get started with exam administration around 0700 the Monday of the exam administration week.
 - This exam will have 4 examiners present from the NRC during exam administration. Therefore, we will want to administer Admin JPMs using the 4th examiner administering the Admin JPMs to the candidates that are not actively being tested in the Simulator. This will be done in parallel to the Simulator Scenarios.
 - Simulator JPMs will be performed on days when the scenarios are not being performed. Such as Thursday and Friday and into the following week as necessary.
 - In-Plant JPMs will all be performed on the same day. It is not necessary to spread out the In-Plants across three days. We would expect that half of the candidates would go to the plant to perform these while the other half are being tested on simulator JPMs at the same time. The two groups will swap when they are completed, or however best works with the sequesters.
 - Keep in mind that if two JPMs can be run at the same time in the Simulator using the same IC without impacting the other JPM, we would like to administer these in parallel. This will help reduce the overall time of exam administration.
- Crew staffing amongst the candidates from day-to-day is different. It appears that there may be 4 members per some crews. Example is Crew 1 on Day 2 which has SRO-1, SRO-2, and RO-1; and then on Day 3, Crew 1 consists of SRO-1, SRO-2, and RO-2.

Are the candidates aware that this may be the case? Will they be working together in this arrangement prior to the exam administration? Will they be comfortable working with others enough to accommodate these swaps?

- Day 3 (Wed) on the schedule has an “EXTRA” labeled for Crew 2 and a Surrogate for the following crew. Is the extra supposed to be a surrogate? Based on our review, each RO is standing their required number of positions during the scenario testing. None of them have had an N+1, therefore, if the “extra” is supposed to be a surrogate, we would expect that the facility determine which candidate will be standing an N+1 and place that candidate in the “extra” position instead of using a surrogate.
- Based on our review, the surrogate in the CRS position for Day 3 is correct and we will brief the individual who will be standing in the surrogate position during the week of onsite validation, with a quick refresher the day of their involvement.

All scheduling issues addressed and fixed as part of the proposed package and through discussions with facility following review.