

# 2014 Palisades Outline Review

## Comments/Questions

---

### WRITTEN OUTLINE (ES-401-2, 3, & 4)

1. On ES-401-4 several K/As have a reason for rejection as oversampled. Explain in further detail.
  - a. For example G2.1.32 in Tier 1 Group 1 you state that Generic K/A was oversampled, yet only 1 Generic K/A was selected while the K1, A1 and A2 categories each have 4 samples selected.
  
  - b. T1/G1 – G2.4.4
  
  - c. T3 – G2.2.18
  
2. The first item in ES-401-4 rejected G2.1.32 and states that K3.03 was selected. The E/APE is not identified and K3.03 is not shown anywhere in Tier1/Group 1.

*Response: Items discussed with facility author. Explanations to be enhanced and discrepancy related to K3.03 will be investigated and corrected.*

### ADMIN JPMs (ES-301-1)

1. RO EP/P This same JPM or similar was used on the 2005, 2008 and 2009 Exams. Explain random selection process. Are there not any other E-plan related RO JPMs? Additionally this JPM seems to be rather simplistic.

*Response: The JPM is new and requires applicants to obtain data via alternate means. Additionally the JPM is now classified as time critical since activity supports E-Plan notification.*

2. SRO EP/P – Outline says this is a new JPM. How is this JPM different from one used on the 2009 and 2010 Exams

*Response: Classification related to a Mode 6 Event and requires use of Mode 5, 6, or DEF chart and associated references.*

## SYSTEMS JPMs (ES-301-2)

1. CR-a; Outline says this JPM is new. How is this different from the 2010 CR-a (gravity feed emergency boration)?

*Response: Task is related to normal boron addition with the plant already shutdown and is faulted with the alternate path being gravity feed instead of pumped feed.*

2. All three previously used JPMs were from 2012 Exam. Explain random selection process.

*Response: JPMs were selected randomly from the population of system JPMs used on last two exams. Selection OK based on description of process.*

## SIMULATOR SCENARIOS

1. Scenario One outline identical to 2010 Scenario 1 outline except for new normal evolution. Additionally the major transient was also used on the 2009 exam. The first two events are also repeats from 2012 Scenario 1.
  - a. The addition of the normal event does not constitute a significant modification.
  - b. What changes have been (or will be) made to the events that alter the course of action in the scenario from the 2009 and 2010 scenarios?
2. Scenario Three outline identical to 2010 Scenario 3 outline except for second event which is repeated from 2010 Scenario 2 and 2012 Scenario 2. The major event was also used in a 2012 scenario.
  - a. The addition of the Dilution Water Pump trip does not constitute a significant modification.
  - b. What changes have been (or will be) made to the events that alter the course of action in the scenario from the 2010 and 2012 scenarios?

*Response: Scenarios 1 and 3 will have additional modifications made to ensure that the course of action is altered from the previous versions.*

3. ES-301-5
  - a. Scenario 1
    - i. Evaluate if SRO should get credit for Reactivity Change (Rapid Down Power due to cooling tower pump trip) (Direction/Oversight)
    - ii. Evaluate if SRO should get credit for Normal Evolution (direction/oversight of)
    - iii. Evaluate if BOP operator should also get credit for Reactivity Change (Turbine operations)
  - b. Scenario 2
    - i. Evaluate if SRO should get credit for Reactivity Change (Direction/Monitoring)
    - ii. Evaluate if SRO should get credit for Normal Evolution (direction/oversight of)
    - iii. Evaluate if BOP operator should also get credit for Reactivity Change (Turbine operations)
  - c. Scenario 3
    - i. Evaluate if SRO should get credit for Reactivity Change (Direction/Monitoring)
    - ii. Evaluate if BOP operator should also get credit for Reactivity Change (Turbine operations)

*Response: After discussion with facility author it was decided that SRO would receive credit for Reactivity changes, but not Normal Evolutions (minimal direction and oversight is usually associate with Normal evolutions. BOP would not receive credit for Reactivity changes since they do not usually monitor primary system response to turbine changes (responsibility resides with the ATC operator).*