

February 2014 IP2 Exam

Op Test Outline Comments

The wording for the RO and SRO admin JPMs was identical. The licensee was instructed to ensure that the SRO admin JPMs were sufficiently different to distinguish between and RO and SRO level license.

System JPM d) was designated as a low power JPM. However, the licensee agreed that since the JPM would occur with the plant at 20-25% power that it does not meet NUREG-1021 definition of a low power condition. There is another low power JPM on the exam.

In-plant JPM i) referenced a K/A designation that was erroneous due to cutting & pasting. The correct K/A designation will be used in the final outline.

For all of the scenario summary pages, the examiners requested that the major actions performed by the applicants be specified and clarify, if possible, which applicant (BOP or ATC) would be performing the actions.

Scenario 2 was very similar to Scenario 3 used during the 2010 IP2 exam. Although the licensee met the letter of the law by changing the scenario in accordance with the ES, they were directed to remove 22 AFW pump OOS from the initial conditions and achieve the same effect by making that pump fail to start when required. The RCP malfunction will be replaced with a FRV malfunction that will ultimately initiate a reactor trip.

On summary page for Scenario 3, the examiners informed the licensee that there was a paragraph describing an event that was not listed on the events list (D-1). The licensee will remove this paragraph.

The Form 301-5 for the spare scenario, the BOP should be credited with an N instead of an R.

Comments on Outline & SRO Sample Questions Submitted for Early NRC Review

The written exam outline contained an error. There were not two items in the Generic column for Tier 2. The licensee stated that that was caused by their outline generator in that it defaulted to selecting only one "G" for the Tier 2 systems. The licensee used the generator to randomly select another "G" and the licensee will randomly delete one of the K's or A's associated with one of the other Tier 2 systems.

Some questions were not SRO-only questions and in those instances the examiners explained the reason to the licensee. For other questions, the examiners requested that the licensee include wording in the justification/background page to explain why these questions are SRO-only. For other questions, the examiners suggested clarifications for enhancements. Overall, the sample that was submitted by the licensee was within the range of acceptability and indicated that the exam developers were generally in alignment with NRC guidance.

Op Test Comments on Official Submittal

Sim JPM A:

No comment.

Sim JPM B:

Start JPM at step 4 of the procedure instead of step 6.

Sim JPM C:

No comment.

Sim JPM D:

Set up JPM so that all but one SG FRV is in automatic.
Typos in JPM step 8: FC417 vs 427; Rack B5 vs B4.

Sim JPM E:

No comment.

Sim JPM F:

Same task is done four times. Change to swap only two busses.
Make applicants adjust voltage.

Sim JPM G:

Typo step 8 “targe” vs “target”; “suing” vs “using”.

Sim JPM H:

No comment.

InPlant JPM I:

Change cue to address only one SG.
Typo step 4 “aligh” vs “align”.

InPlant JPM J:

Typo step 6 for standard – closing vs opening.

InPlant JPM K:

Have replacement JPM ready due to possible work in that area during exam week.

RO Admin 1:

Replace JPM with similar one from Limerick exam.

RO Admin 2:

No comment.

RO Admin 3:

No comment.

RO Admin 4:

Step 1 of JPM is not critical.
Correct math error on table

SRO Admin 1:

Replace JPM with similar one from Limerick exam.

SRO Admin 2:

Reword cue to have applicant consider appropriateness of the venting.

SRO Admin 3:

Make JPM step 6 an "OR" statement regarding the correct response.

SRO Admin 4:

Reword cue to cause applicant to consider TS or plant operations and not just leakage checks.

SRO Admin 5:

Provide numerous EP procedures to eliminate examiner providing PAR procedure when asked.

Scenarios

General Comment: Remove footer info from scenario sheets to avoid potential security issue.

Scenario 1:

No comment.

Scenario 2:

Adjust scenario regarding the MSIV so that the CTs are valid.

Scenario 3:

Add post-trip malfunction for BOP.
Remove statement about RCPs being secured when in E-3.