

## DRAFT OUTLINE COMMENTS

Facility: CPSES

First Exam Date: APRIL 1, 2013

<b>Written Exam Outline</b> (1/28/2013)		
<b>Comment</b>		<b>Resolution</b>
1	No comments	
2		
3		
4		
5		

<b>Administrative JPM Outline</b> (1/28/2013)		
<b>Comment</b>		<b>Resolution</b>
1	No comments	
2		
3		
4		
5		

<b>Control Room / In-Plant System JPM Outline</b> (1/28/2013)		
<b>Comment</b>		<b>Resolution</b>
1	S-1 has been RO only and Safety Fn 1 for past three exams. This is getting predictable so change the JPM that is RO only to another JPM.	Changed to S-8 as RO only.
2	S-5 is similar to S-5 from 2012 exam and has same designator. If it is the same JPM then it should have a P designator for previous exam	Typo by licensee. . It is a different JPM. RO2002 on 2012 exam was a normal JPM this is an Alt path JPM, so its designator will be changed to be RO2002A or something like that.
3	S-4 appears to be not very discriminating, change to AFW system and make it low power so we have two Low power JPMs to stay above the minimum of 1 in case something happens on the exam with the other JPM that is Low Power.	Made recommended changes.
4		
5		

<b>Simulator Scenario Outline Comments</b> (1/28/2013)		
	<b>Comment</b>	<b>Resolution</b>
1	Scenario 1 event 3 change CCP trip with CCP shaft shear since CCP trip has been used a lot over the past three years' exams.	Done.
2	Discussed use of BOL and EOL IC sets for exams, training, and simulator. Should incorporate different times in core life on exams in the future where appropriate and where training value is added. No changes necessary to this exam since one BOL scenario and three MOL scenarios were submitted.	None. Okay as is.
3	Commented that Scenario 2 event 4 and 5 look like 2012 exam scenario 3 events 5 and 6. CP staff replied that it is different in that this scenario requires using EOP contingencies because SG is faulted and ruptured, while previous exam the SG was only ruptured.	Okay as is.
4	Scenario 4 events 2 and 3 are exactly like 2012 exam events 2 and 3. Change event 3 to something else with more discriminating value and is different from LT-459A failure.	Changed to SG level transmitter failure.
5	Scenario 4 event 6 is not a major by itself. When coupled with a failure to trip for reactor, then it becomes a major, although newer Westinghouse guidelines in the EOPs specify that it is not declared an ATWT unless the reactor can not be tripped from within the control room, which then requires entry into FRS-1.	Edited scenario to meet NUREG-1021 guidelines and is now okay.