# COVER SHEET

# -- ADMINISTRATIVE DOCUMENTS -- ALL IN ONE ADAMS DOCUMENT

## SURRY EXAM 50-280/2000-301

## SEPTEMBER 14 - 21, 2000

- ES-201-1 - Exam Preparation Checklist
- ES-201-2 - Exam Outline Quality Checklist (2 PAGES)
- ES-301-3 - Operating Test Quality Checklist
- ES-301-4 - Simulator Scenario Quality Checklist
- ES-301-5 - Transient & Event Checklist
- ES-301-6 - Competencies Checklist
- ES-401-7 - Written Exam Quality Checklist (2 PAGES)
- ES-401-9 - Written Exam Review Worksheet
- ES-403-1 - Written Exam Grading Quality Checklist
- ES-201-3 - Exam Security Agreements
- ES-501-1 - Post Exam Check Sheet

Facility: Surry Nuclear Plant Date of Examination: Written: September ___, 2000
Examinations Developed by: NRC Operating: September 18 - 22, 2000

| Target Date* | Task Description / Reference | Chief Examiner's Initials |
|---|---|---|
| -180 | 1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a & b) | RSB |
| -120 | 2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e) | RSB |
| -120 | 3. Facility contact briefed on security & other requirements (C.2.c) | RSB |
| -120 | 4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d) | RSB |
| [-90] | [5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c)] | RSB |
| -75 | 6. Integrated examination outline(s) due (C.1.e & f; C.3.d) | NA |
| -70 | 7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e) | NA |
| -45 | 8. Proposed examinations, supporting documentation, and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g & h; C.3.d) | RSB |
| -30 | 9. Preliminary license applications due (C.1.l; C.2.g; ES-202) | RSB/late |
| -14 | 10. Final license applications due and assignment sheet prepared (C.1.l; C.2.g; ES-202) | RSB |
| -14 | 11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f) | RSB |
| -14 | 12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f & h; C.3.g) | RSB |
| -7 | 13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h) | RSB |
| -7 | 14. Final applications reviewed; assignment sheet updated; waiver letters sent (C.2.g, ES-204) | RSB |
| -7 | 15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee and authorization granted to give written exams (if applicable) (C.3.k) | RSB |
| -7 | 16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i) | RSB |

* Target dates are keyed to the examination date identified in the corporate notification letter. They are for planning purposes and may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the facility licensee.

[ ] Applies only to examinations prepared by the NRC.

ES-201 | Examination Outline Quality Checklist | Form ES-201-2

Facility: Surry Nuclear Plant | Date of Examination: Written: September _14,, 2000 Operating: September 18 - 22,, 2000

| Item | Task Description | Initials a | b* | c |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. WRITTEN | a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401. | NA | | |
| | b. Assess whether the outline was systematically prepared and whether all knowledge and ability categories are appropriately sampled. | NA | SEE ATTACHED DEVIATION QA SHEET | |
| | c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics. | NA | | |
| | d. Assess whether the repetition from previous examination outlines is excessive. | NA | | |
| 2. SIM | a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, and major transients. | | | |
| | b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity; ensure each applicant can be tested using at least one new or significantly modified scenario, that no scenarios are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s)*, and scenarios will not be repeated over successive days. | | | |
| | c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D. | | | |
| 3. W/T | a. Verify that:<br>(1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks,<br>(2) no more than 30% of the test material is repeated from the last NRC examination,<br>(3)* no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s), and<br>(4) no more than 80% of any operating test is taken directly from the licensee's exam banks. | | | |
| | b. Verify that:<br>(1) the tasks are distributed among the safety function groupings as specified in ES-301,<br>(2) one task is conducted in a low-power or shutdown condition,<br>(3) 40% of the tasks require the applicant to implement an alternate path procedure,<br>(4) one in-plant task tests the applicant's response to an emergency or abnormal condition, and<br>(5) the in-plant walk-through requires the applicant to enter the RCA. | | | |
| | c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities. | | | |
| | d. Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on successive days. | | | |
| 4. GENERAL | a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. | | | |
| | b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. | | | |
| | c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. | | | |
| | d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. | | | |
| | e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. | | | |
| | f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). | | | |

| | Printed Name / Signature | Date |
|---|---|---|
| a. Author | Richard S. Baldwin (Walk Through) / Ronald F. Aiello (Simulator) | 8/8/00 |
| b. Facility Reviewer(*) | | |
| c. Chief Examiner | ~~Ronald F. Aiello (Walk Through)~~ / Richard S. Baldwin (Simulator/Operating) | 8/24/00 |
| d. NRC Supervisor | ~~Harold O. Christensen~~ MIKE EANSTEL | 9/11/00 |
| | 8/24/00 | |

(*) Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations.

Facility: Date of Examination:

| Item | Task Description | Initials a | b* | c |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. WRITTEN | a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401. | JHW | A | JSM |
| | b. Assess whether the outline was systematically prepared and whether all knowledge and ability categories are appropriately sampled. | JHW | A | JSM |
| | c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics. | JHW | A | JSM |
| | d. Assess whether the repetition from previous examination outlines is excessive. | JHW | A | JSM |
| 2. SIM | a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, and major transients. | | N/A | |
| | b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity; ensure each applicant can be tested using at least one new or significantly modified scenario, that no scenarios are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s)*, and scenarios will not be repeated over successive days. | | N/A | |
| | c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D. | | | A |
| 3. W/T | a. Verify that:<br>(1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks,<br>(2) no more than 30% of the test material is repeated from the last NRC examination,<br>(3)* no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s), and<br>(4) no more than 80% of any operating test is taken directly from the licensee's exam banks. | | | |
| | b. Verify that:<br>(1) the tasks are distributed among the safety function groupings as specified in ES-301,<br>(2) one task is conducted in a low-power or shutdown condition,<br>(3) 40% of the tasks require the applicant to implement an alternate path procedure,<br>(4) one in-plant task tests the applicant's response to an emergency or abnormal condition, and<br>(5) the in-plant walk-through requires the applicant to enter the RCA. | | N/A | |
| | c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities. | | | |
| | d. Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on successive days. | | | A |
| 4. GENERAL | a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. | JHW | A | MM |
| | b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. | JHW | A | MM |
| | c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. | JHW | A | MM |
| | d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. | | N/A | |
| | e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. | | N/A | |
| | f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). | JHW | A | MM |

| | Printed Name / Signature | Date |
|---|---|---|
| a. Author | James H. Warren, JR / James H. Warren | 7/27/00 |
| b. Facility Reviewer(*) | F. Kenneth Grover / F. Kenneth Grover | 7/27/00 |
| c. Chief Examiner | L.S. Mellen / L.S. Mellen RSD Chief | 9/7/00 9/7/00 |
| d. NRC Supervisor | ME ERNSTES / ME Ernstes | 9/7/00 |

(*) Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations.

Facility : Surry | Date of Examination: September 18 - 22, 2000 | Operating Test Number:1

| | 1. GENERAL CRITERIA | Initials a | b | c |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| a. | The operating test conforms with the previously approved outline; changes are consistent with sampling requirements (e.g., 10 CFR 55.45, operational importance, safety function distribution). | | | |
| b. | There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination. | | | |
| c. | The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a). | | | |
| d. | Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits. | | | |
| e. | It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level. | | | |
| | **2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA** | -- | -- | -- |
| a. | Each JPM includes the following, as applicable:<br>· initial conditions<br>· initiating cues<br>· references and tools, including associated procedures<br>· validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time critical by the facility licensee<br>· specific performance criteria that include:<br>- detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature<br>- system response and other examiner cues<br>- statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant<br>- criteria for successful completion of the task<br>- identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards<br>- restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable | | | |
| b. | The prescripted questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301. | | | |
| c. | Repetition from operating tests used during the previous licensing examination is within acceptable limits (30% for the walk-through) and do not compromise test integrity. | | | |
| d. | At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified. | | | |
| | **3. SIMULATOR (CATEGORY C) CRITERIA** | -- | -- | -- |
| a. | The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached. | | | |

| | Printed Name / Signature | Date |
|---|---|---|
| a. Author | Richard S. Baldwin (Surry Chief ) | 8/24/00 |
| b. Facility Reviewer(*) | N/A | |
| c. NRC Chief Examiner (*) | ~~Ronald F. Aiello~~ ( N. Anna Chief) | 8/24/00 |
| d. NRC Supervisor (*) | Michael E. Ernstes | 9/11/00 |

(*) The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests; two independent NRC reviews are required.

Facility: Surry Date of Exam: 9/18-21/00 Scenario Numbers: 1 / 2 / Operating Test No.:1

| QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES | | Initials a | Initials b | Initials c |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | | |
| 1. | The initial conditions are realistic, in that some equipment and/or instrumentation may be out of service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events. | | | |
| 2. | The scenarios consist mostly of related events. | | | |
| 3. | Each event description consists of<br>· the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated<br>· the malfunction(s) that are entered to initiate the event<br>· the symptoms/cues that will be visible to the crew<br>· the expected operator actions (by shift position)<br>· the event termination point (if applicable) | | | |
| 4. | No more than one non-mechanistic failure (e.g., pipe break) is incorporated into the scenario without a credible preceding incident such as a seismic event. | | | |
| 5. | The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics. | | | |
| 6. | Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives. | | | |
| 7. | If time compression techniques are used, the scenario summary clearly so indicates. Operators have sufficient time to carry out expected activities without undue time constraints. Cues are given. | | | |
| 8. | The simulator modeling is not altered. | | | |
| 9. | The scenarios have been validated. Any open simulator performance deficiencies have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios. | | | |
| 10. | Every operator will be evaluated using at least one new or significantly modified scenario. All other scenarios have been altered in accordance with Section D.4 of ES-301. | | | |
| 11. | All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). | | | |
| 12. | Each applicant will be significantly involved in the minimum number of transients and events specified on Form ES-301-5 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios). | | | |
| 13. | The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. | | | |

| TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D) | | Actual Attributes | -- | -- | -- |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Total malfunctions (5-8) | 7 / 6 / | | | |
| 2. | Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) | 2 / 2 / | | | |
| 3. | Abnormal events (2-4) | 2 / 2 / | | | |
| 4. | Major transients (1-2) | 1 / 1 / | | | |
| 5. | EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2) | 2 / 2 / | | | |
| 6. | EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2) | 1 / 1 / | | | |
| 7. | Critical tasks (2-3) | 2 / 3 / | | | |

OPERATING TEST NO.:

| Applicant Type | Evolution Type | Minimum Number | Scenario Number | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | RO 1 | BOP | RO 2 | BOP |
| RO/BOP | Reactivity | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Normal | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1a | 1 |
| | Instrument | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| | Component | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3a |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| As RO | Reactivity | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | Normal | 0 | 1 | 1a |
| | Instrument | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | Component | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 5 |
| SRO-I | | | | |
| As SRO | Reactivity | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | Normal | 1 | 1 | 1a |
| | Instrument | 1 | 2 | 2,3 |
| | Component | 1 | 3 | 3a,4 |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SRO-U | Reactivity | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | Normal | 1 | 1 | 1a |
| | Instrument | 1 | 2 | 2,3 |
| | Component | 1 | 3 | 3a,4 |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 5 |

Instructions: (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.

(2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.

Author: Ronald F. Aiello

Chief Examiner: Richard S. Baldwin

| Competencies | RO/SRO-U | | BOP/SRO-U | | SRO-I/*SRO-U* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SCENARIO | | SCENARIO | | SCENARIO | |
| | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms | 1,2,3,6 | 1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Diagnose Events and Conditions | 2,3,6 | 3,4,5,6,7 | 5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 2,3,5,6 | 2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Understand Plant and System Response | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,5,6 | 1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Comply With and Use Procedures (1) | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Operate Control Boards (2) | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | N/A | N/A |
| Communicate and Interact With the Crew | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1,2,3,5 | 2,3,3a |

Notes:

(1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.
(2) Optional for an SRO-U.
(3) Only applicable to SROs.

Instructions:

Circle the applicant's license type and enter one or more event numbers that will allow the examiners to evaluate every applicable competency for every applicant.

Author: Ronald F. Aiello

Chief Examiner: Richard S. Baldwin

OPERATING TEST NO.:

| Applicant Type | Evolution Type | Minimum Number | Scenario Number | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | RO 1 | BOP | RO 2 | BOP |
| RO/BOP | Reactivity | 1 | 4 | 0 | 1 | 0 |
| | Normal | 1 | 1 | 0 | 1a | 1 |
| | Instrument | 2 | 2 | 5 | 3 | 2 |
| | Component | 2 | 3 | 6 | 4 | 3a |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 6 | 5 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| As RO | Reactivity | 1 | 4 | 1 |
| | Normal | 0 | 1 | 1a |
| | Instrument | 1 | 2 | 3 |
| | Component | 1 | 3 | 4 |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 5 |
| SRO-I | | | | |
| As SRO | Reactivity | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | Normal | 1 | 1 | 1a |
| | Instrument | 1 | 2 | 2,3 |
| | Component | 1 | 3 | 3a,4 |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 5 |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| SRO-U | Reactivity | 0 | 4 | 1 |
| | Normal | 1 | 1 | 1a |
| | Instrument | 1 | 2 | 2,3 |
| | Component | 1 | 3 | 3a,4 |
| | Major | 1 | 6 | 5 |

Instructions: (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.

(2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.

Author: Ronald F. Aiello

Chief Examiner: Richard S. Baldwin

| Competencies | RO/SRO-U | | BOP/SRO-U | | SRO-I/*SRO-U* | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | SCENARIO | | SCENARIO | | SCENARIO | |
| | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 | 1 | 2 |
| Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms | 1,2,3,6 | 1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Diagnose Events and Conditions | 2,3,6 | 3,4,5,6,7 | 5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 2,3,5,6 | 2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Understand Plant and System Response | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,5,6 | 1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Comply With and Use Procedures (1) | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Operate Control Boards (2) | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | N/A | N/A |
| Communicate and Interact With the Crew | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,3,4,5,6,7 | 4,5,6 | 2,3a,5,6,7 | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1,2,3,4,6 | 1a,1,2,3,3a,4,5,6 |
| Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3) | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | 1,2,3,5 | 2,3,3a |

Notes:

(1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.
(2) Optional for an SRO-U.
(3) Only applicable to SROs.

Instructions:

Circle the applicant's license type and enter one or more event numbers that will allow the examiners to evaluate every applicable competency for every applicant.

Author: Ronald F. Aiello

Chief Examiner: Richard S. Baldwin

| Facility: | Date of Exam: | Exam Level: RO/SRO |
|---|---|---|

RO EXAM

| | Item Description | Initial a | b* | c* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility | JHW | A | fsm |
| 2. | a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions<br>b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available | JHW | A | fsm |
| 3. | RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401 | JHW | A | fsm |
| 4. | No more than 25 questions are duplicated from [practice exams, quizzes, and] the last two NRC licensing exams; enter the actual number of duplicated questions at right: NRC = 0, Other = 0 | JHW | A | fsm |
| 5. | [No (Less than 5 percent) question duplication from the license screening/audit exam (if independently written)] | JHW | A | fsm |
| 6. | Bank use meets limits (no more than 50 percent from the bank, at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right: Bank = 0, Modified = 0, New = 100 | JHW | A | fsm |
| 7. | Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the exam (including 10 new questions) are written at the comprehension/analysis level; enter the actual question distribution at right: Memory = 49, C/A = 51 | JHW | A | fsm |
| 8. | References/handouts provided do not give away answers | JHW | A | fsm |
| 9. | Question distribution meets previously approved examination outline; deviations are justified | JHW | A | fsm |
| 10. | Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines | JHW | A | fsm |
| 11. | The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet | JHW | A | fsm |

| | Printed Name / Signature | Date |
|---|---|---|
| a. Author | James H. Warren, JR / James H. Warren, JR | 7/28/00 |
| b. Facility Reviewer(*) | F. Kenneth Graves / F. Kenneth Graves | 7/28/00 |
| c. NRC Chief Examiner(*) | LARRY S. MELLEN / Larry S. Mellen | 8/2/00 |
| d. NRC Regional Supervisor(*) | MICHAEL E. ERNSTES / Michael E. Ernstes | 8/24/00 |

Note: * The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for NRC-developed examinations; two independent NRC reviews are required.
# See special instructions (Section E.2.c) for Items 1, 4, 5, and 6.
[ ] The items in brackets do not apply to NRC-prepared examinations.

| Facility: | Date of Exam: | Exam Level: RO/SRO |
|---|---|---|

| | Item Description | Initial a | b* | c* |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility | | | |
| 2. | a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions<br>b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available | | | |
| 3. | RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401 | | | |
| 4. | No more than 25 questions are duplicated from [practice exams, quizzes, and] the last two NRC licensing exams; enter the actual number of duplicated questions at right: NRC = 0, Other = 0 | | | |
| 5. | [No (Less than 5 percent) question duplication from the license screening/audit exam (if independently written)] | | | |
| 6. | Bank use meets limits (no more than 50 percent from the bank, at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right: Bank = 0, Modified = 0, New = 100 | | | |
| 7. | Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the exam (including 10 new questions) are written at the comprehension/analysis level; enter the actual question distribution at right: Memory = 41, C/A = 59 | | | |
| 8. | References/handouts provided do not give away answers | | | |
| 9. | Question distribution meets previously approved examination outline; deviations are justified | | | |
| 10. | Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines | | | |
| 11. | The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet | | | |

| | Printed Name / Signature | Date |
|---|---|---|
| a. Author | James H. Warren, JR. / James H. Warren, JR | 7/28/00 |
| b. Facility Reviewer(*) | F. Kenneth Grover / F. K. Grover | 7/28/00 |
| c. NRC Chief Examiner(*) | L.S. Mellen / L.S. Mell | 8/24/00 |
| d. NRC Regional Supervisor(*) | MICHAEL E. ERNSTES / Michael E. Ernstes | 8/24/00 |

Note: * The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for NRC-developed examinations; two independent NRC reviews are required.
# See special instructions (Section E.2.c) for Items 1, 4, 5, and 6.
[ ] The items in brackets do not apply to NRC-prepared examinations.

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. | 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | U/E/S | Explanation |
| 1 | H | 2 | | X | | | | | | | | S | New Place mode or temperature in stem. Remove reference to RRZR from stem. Ok |
| 2 | F | 1 | X | | | | | | | | | S | New - None of theses are immediate action. They are procedural steps. Perhaps, what is the first action required by .... OK are immediate action steps |
| 3 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 4 | F | 2 | X | | | | | | | | | S | New . Replace immediately stop the RCP with stop the affected RCP. This action is not an immediate action. OK corrected |
| 5 | F | 2 | | | | X | | | | | | S | New Distractor A - entry into ES-0.0 is never "required" The wording in the stem eliminates this as a possibility. Corrected - replaced distractors |
| 6 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 7 | F* | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 8 | F* | 1 | | | | | X | | | | | S | New Is D an incorrect answer. If an operator attempted to insert the rod, would that action be incorrect? OK question stays as is |
| 9 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 10 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 11 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 12 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 13 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 14 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 15 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 16 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 17 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 18 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New New - This question assumes there was no significant activity in the secondary side, since it was not included in the stem, that assumption seems valid. OK |
| 19 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. | 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | U/E/S | Explanation |
| 20 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 21 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 22 | H | 3 | | | | | X | | | | | S | New Temperature increase is due to RCPs running, under the conditions listed in the stem, will they always be running? If not the temperature may decrease because of the RHR flow. Decay heat is the primary heat source - different from NA. Question is OK |
| 23 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 24 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 25 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 26 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 27 | K | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | This question was not evaluated. The material supplied does not support the answer because the procedure has no immediate actions. _ Question is valid as written |
| 28 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 29 | H | 2 | | | | | X | | | | | S | New Documents provided by North Anna for the same question stated that distractor D is a correct answer. - Feed and bleed is not intended to provide long term core cooling. It is only an interim measure until secondary heat sink can be restored **OR** RHR can be placed in service. There seem to be two correct answers Update reviewed - did not resolve question. Please verify this is not correct at Surry This is a valid question |
| 30 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 31 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 32 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New. While the procedure says "when the reactor is tripped" I expect that it means when the first four steps of E-0 are complete. I believe the turbine must also be tripped, before this action is complete. If this is the case, then the answer is technically not correct. There may be no correct answers. The applicant will not have the procedure in front of him and will have to reason the intent of the procedure. This is in accordance with Surry directions. OK |
| 33 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 34 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 35 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 36 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 37 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 38 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. | 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | U/E/S | Explanation |
| 39 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 40 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 41 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 42 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 43 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 44 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 45 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 46 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New (bank #1188 at NA) |
| 47 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 48 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 49 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 50 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New (Modified bank 1286 at NA) - add enough information in the stem to set up adverse containment. Lower pressure in A to 350. A remains the correct answer. Changes question to a Higher Level and LOD to 3. Update reviewed - S Review proposed changes to alter LOD - Leave question as ia. OK |
| 51 | H* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 52 | K | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 53 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 54 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 55 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 56 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 57 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 58 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 59 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 60 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 61 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 62 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 63 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. | 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | U/E/S | Explanation |
| 64 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 65 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 66 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 67 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 68 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 69 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - this question was revised at N/A to provide reference. - comment from NA after revision - Update reviewed - If 1-PT-24.1 page 3 is the reference provided to the applicant, this makes this fundamental question a direct look-up. Solution - provide entire procedure or provide not reference> Surry reviewer- do not provide reference. OK |
| 70 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 71 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 72 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 73 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 74 | F | 3 | X | | | | | | | | | S | This makes the assumption that the upper or lower bearing temperatures have not exceeded 200 degrees before the 2 minute mark. There is nothing in the stem that states that this has not happened. It is possible there are no correct answers. Added to stem - (Assume all bearing temperatures remain below 200 degrees F) OK |
| 75 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - Reference must be provided for this question- OK |
| 76 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 77 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - Add assume no operator action to stem OK |
| 78 | | | | | | | | | | | | | New - The curve for subcooling equal to zero includes loop uncertanty. The correct answer is the negative sign indicates the plant is below this line and may still be subcooled or it may be saturated or superheated. There appear to be no correct answers as the question is written. - The question was reworded to correct answer- will be resubmitted. |
| 79 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - E-0, Reactor Trip or Safety Injection, could be moved to the stem - OK |
| 80 | F | 3 | | | | | x | | | | | S | New - Distractor A may be worded better " to prevent excessive cooldown" The procedural step will actually prevent the entry into FR-P.1. - OK no change needed |
| 81 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - What is the purpose of "is noted to be" in the stem? Will modify stem OK |
| 82 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 83 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. | 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | U/E/S | Explanation |
| 84 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 85 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - This level of detail is not normally information an operator is expected to memorize. OK no change needed |
| 86 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 87 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 88 | F | | | | | X | | | | | | | New Distractors A and C are not plausible - suggest replacing them with 4200.00 rem/hr and 42000 rem/hr respectively . Revision made. OK |
| 89 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - This question does not require the synthesis of facts to arrive at the answer. OK |
| 90 | H | 5 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 91 | K | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - rearrange distractors B and C so the answers are in descending order. OK change made |
| 92 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 93 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 94 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - to be consistent with the stem, distractor A should be worded - The normal cross-tie with the Station Instrument Air system.. OK changed |
| 95 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 96 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 97 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - OPAP-0006 Revision 2 states"At the Discretion of the Shift Supervisor, thermal overload devices may be reset once. - The answer states"After determining the cause, the SRO may approve one reset of the thermal overload device" This answer is not correct. There are no correct answers for this question. Comment is invalid. OK |
| 98 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - Distractor B does not make sense. It indicates the pump was secured when it was started. Change the answers as follows:<br>A. 2300 today, 1 hour<br>B. 0600 tomorrow, 2 hours,<br>C. 1200 tomorrow, 3 hours<br>D. 1500 tomorrow, 3 hours.<br><br>According to TS 3.10-3 04-11-91 the correct answer will be A . Question was reworded. OK |
| 99 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. | 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | U/E/S | Explanation |
| 100 | H | 5 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - there are no correct answers. C is not a correct answer. Manual insertion of control rods is the RNO of the previous step. It MUST be attempted prior to going to step 2, trip the turbine. Correct answer is Verify automatic control rod insertion (if not, begin manually inserting rods), then trip the turbine. The standard EOP usage guidance will provide this as an acceptable alternative. The guidance provided by OPAP-0002 states that the Immediate action steps of FR-S.1 shall be performed in sequence. Question is valid. OK |
| 101 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - This question has no discriminatory value. Not stopping SI will always prevent the reduction in SI flow, regardless of the reason for the step. Valid - Question is acceptable. |
| 102 | H | 3 | | X | | | | | | | | | New - TS 3.3 probably does not apply once you have the TSC manned. This occurs in step 18. And the TSC is consulted during this step. There is probably a mechanical basis for this step and not an admin basis. The material comes from the lesson plan, but does not make sense. - question will remain unmodified after further review. |
| 103 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 104 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 105 | F | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 106 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 107 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 108 | | | X | X | | X | | | | | | | New - Distractor A is not plausible, the stem states the LHSI pumps did not start. PRZR level is needed in stem. Answer is incorrect. The conditions for RCS depressurization do not exist. ECA 1.1 step 22 c RCS subcooling is between 85 and 95, so depressurization is not required. Will revise question.. Discussed modified question with Groover, will be resubmitted. |
| 109 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | | New - Distractor C is not plausible. Replace with P-6 permissive resets..<br>A. High flux RX Trip<br>B. High Flux Rod Stop<br>D. P-6> 10 E-10 amps Rx Trip..Leave the question as is. OK |
| 110 | F* | 1 | | | | | | | | | | S | New - Question has low LOD |
| 111 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 112 | F | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 113 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 114 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New _ add per VPAP-2203 to stem. Revised stem |
| 115 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New Normally we don't write questions that state which of the following is wrong. Details are in NUREG 1021 Appendix B 2.e. Ok question not revised |

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. | 6. |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | U/E/S | Explanation |
| 116 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 117 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 118 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | Vogtle 1999 |
| 119 | F* | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 120 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 121 | F | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 122 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 123 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 124 | H | 3 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| 125 | H | 2 | | | | | | | | | | S | New |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Instructions

[Refer to Appendix B for additional information regarding each of the following concepts.]

1. Enter the level of knowledge (LOK) of each question as either (F)undamental or (H)igher cognitive level.

2. Enter the level of difficulty (LOD) of each question using a 1 - 5 (easy - difficult) rating scale (questions in the 2 - 4 range are acceptable).

3. Check the appropriate box if a psychometric flaw is identified:
   - The stem lacks sufficient focus to elicit the correct answer (e.g., unclear intent, more information is needed, or too much needless information).
   - The stem or distractors contain cues (i.e., clues, specific determiners, phrasing, length, etc).
   - The answer choices are a collection of unrelated true/false statements.
   - More than one distractor is not credible.
   - One or more distractors is (are) partially correct (e.g., if the applicant can make unstated assumptions that are not contradicted by stem).

4. Check the appropriate box if a job content error is identified:
   - The question is not linked to the job requirements (i.e., the question has a valid K/A but, as written, is not operational in content).
   - The question requires the recall of knowledge that is too specific for the closed reference test mode (i.e., it is not required to be known from memory).
   - The question contains data with an unrealistic level of accuracy or inconsistent units (e.g., panel meter in percent with question in gallons).
   - The question requires reverse logic or application compared to the job requirements.

5. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the question as written (U)nacceptable (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?

6. For any "U" ratings, at a minimum, explain how the Appendix B psychometric attributes are not being met.

| Q# | 1. LOK (F/H) | 2. LOD (1-5) | 3. Psychometric Flaws | | | | | 4. Job Content Flaws | | | | 5. U/E/S | 6. Explanation |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | | Stem Focus | Cues | T/F | Cred. Dist. | Partial | Job-Link | Minutia | #/ units | Back-ward | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

| Facility: | Date of Exam: | Exam Level: RO/SRO |
|---|---|---|

| Item Description | | Initials a | Initials b | Initials c |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented | | | |
| 2. | Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations) | | | |
| 3. | Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail | | | |
| 4. | All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified | | | |
| 5. | Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants | | | |

| | Printed Name / Signature | Date |
|---|---|---|
| a. Grader | Ken Grover / RICHARD S. BALDWIN | 9/21/00 10/02/00 |
| b. Facility Reviewer(*) | Ray Simmons | 9/21/00 |
| c. NRC Chief Examiner (*) | RICHARD S. BALDWIN | 10/02/00 |
| d. NRC Supervisor (*) | MICHAEL E. ERNSTES | 10/16/00 |

(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 9/18/00 as of the date of my signature. I agree that I will not knowingly divulge any information about these examinations to any persons who have not been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any indications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised.

2. Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered during the week(s) of 9/18/00. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

| | PRINTED NAME | JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY | SIGNATURE (1) | DATE | SIGNATURE (2) | DATE | NOTE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | F.K. Grover | Senior Instructor (Nuclear) / Lead | | 4/11/00 | | 10/4/00 | |
| 2. | James H. Warren, JR | Senior Instructor (Nuclear) / LORT (Retired) | | 4/11/00 | | 10-4-00 | |
| 3. | AMY EPPS | PROCESS ANALYST (Admin) | | 5-24-00 | | 10-04-00 | |
| 4. | DAVID L. BOWDEN | Assistant Shift Supv / OPS (Valid) | | 7-18-00 | | 10-18-00 | |
| 5. | David K. Souza | Shift Supervisor (Valid) | | 7-18-00 | | 10-18-00 | |
| 6. | Doug Cobb | Asst Shift Supv / OPS (Valid) | | 7-18-00 | | 10-18-00 | |
| 7. | Bill Parker | Asst Shift Supv / OPS (Valid) | | 7-26-00 | | 10-18-00 | |
| 8. | STEVEN DAVIS | Rx Operator / OPS (Valid) | | 7-25-00 | | 10-17-00 | |
| 9. | Henry Johnson | RO / OPS (Valid) | | 7/25/00 | | 10/17/00 | |
| 10. | Russ Hampton | RO / OPS (Valid) | | 7/25/00 | | 10/19/00 | |
| 11. | Steven K. Crawford | Sr. Inst. (Nuc) / Exam Author. NAPS (Retired) | | 7-27-00 | | 10-31-00 | |
| 12. | Kevin M. Spencer | Senior Inst. (Nuc) / LORT (Retired) | | 8/9/00 | | 10/6/00 | |
| 13. | CHRISTOPHER G. HUTH | SIMULATOR SOFTWARE | | 8/11/00 | | 10/5/00 | |
| 14. | Lawrence C Tynes Jr | Simulator Software | | 8/11/00 | | 10/5/00 | |
| 15. | Robert W Sodenholm | Simulation Coord / Train OPS | | 8/21/00 | | 10/6/00 | |

NOTES:



OCT.31.2000 10:47AM N ANNA NUC TRNG 540:894:XXXX NO.110 P.2

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 9/18/00 as of the date of my signature. I agree that I will not knowingly divulge any information about these examinations to any persons who have not been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any indications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised.

2. Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered during the week(s) of 9/18/00. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

| | PRINTED NAME | JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY | SIGNATURE (1) | DATE | SIGNATURE (2) | DATE NOTE |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | PHAT TRAN-LAM | SIMULATOR SUPPORT COORDINATOR | | 8/21/00 | | OCT 4 2000 |
| 2. | William G Henry | Supervisor Shift Ops (Lic) | | 8/21/00 | | 10/6/00 |
| 3. | JE LABTHUCHIN | RO (Valid) | | 8-22-2000 | | 10-18-2000 |
| 4. | Daniel Mozo | RO (Valid) | | 8-22-00 | | 10-19-00 |
| 5. | James H. Helm | STA (Valid) | | 8-22-2000 | | 10-18-2000 |
| 6. | REBECCA F. LANE | Senior Health Physics Tech (SME) | | 8/24/00 | | 10/18/00 |
| 7. | Jeff T. Spence | Supervisor - TRNG Support | | 8/24/00 | | 10/6/00 |
| 8. | Curtis L. Darden III | Admin Support | | 9/13/00 | | 10-6-00 |
| 9. | Ray L Simmons | Supervisor OPS Training | | 9/13/00 | | 10/6/00 |
| 10. | Jeff T. Allen | Sequencer/Op | | 9/18/00 | | 10/4/00 |
| 11. | Ed Shore | STAFF/STA | | 9/19/00 | | 10/6/00 |
| 12. | Randy Johnson | Spt OPS/ operations | | 9/19/00 | | 10/18/00 |
| 13. | Kevin J. Labat | Instructor | | 9/19/00 | | 10/4/00 |
| 14. | BILL MARSHALL | INSTRUCTOR - LICENSE CLASS | | 9/19/00 | | 10/18/00 |
| 15. | Paul ORRISON | Simulator - License class | | 9/20/00 | | 10/4/00 |

NOTES:



OCT.31.2000 10:48AM IN HNNH NUC IRNG 540-894-XXXX NO.110 P.3

| Surry Nuclear Plant | | |
|---|---|---|
| | Task Description | Date Complete |
| 1. | Facility written exam comments or graded exams received and verified complete | 9/25/00 |
| 2. | Facility written exam comments reviewed and incorporated and NRC grading completed, if necessary | 10/02/00 |
| 3. | Operating tests graded by NRC examiners | 10/13/00 |
| 4. | NRC Chief examiner review of written exam and operating test grading completed | 10/13/00 |
| 5. | Responsible supervisor review completed | 10/17/00 |
| 6. | Management (licensing official) review completed | 10/16/00 |
| 7. | License and denial letters mailed | 10/19/00 |
| 8. | Facility notified of results | 10/18/00 |
| 9. | Examination report issued (refer to NRC MC 0610) | 10/19/00 ← |
| 10. | Reference material returned after final resolution of any appeals | N/A |