

**TURKEY POINT RETAKE EXAM**  
**50-250, 50-251/2001-301**

**MAY 2001**

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

- [ ✓ ] ES-201-1 - Exam Preparation Checklist
- [ ✓ ] ES-201-2 - Exam Outline Quality Checklist
- [ ✓ ] ES-201-3 - Exam Security Agreements
- [ ✓ ] ES-301-1 - Admin Topics Outline
- [ ✓ ] ES-301-3 - Operating Test Quality Checklist
- [ ✓ ] ES-501-1 - Post Exam Check Sheet
- ✓ COMMENTS

Facility: <u>Turkey Point Nuclear Plant</u>		Date of Exam: <u>May 4, 2001</u>
Examinations Developed by: Written: N/A Operating: Facility		
Target Date*	Task Description / Reference	Chief Examiner's Initials
-180	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a & b)	<i>rsb</i>
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	<i>rsb</i>
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security & other requirements (C.2.c)	<i>rfa</i>
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	<i>rsb</i>
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c)]	<i>rsb</i>
-75	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due (C.1.e & f; C.3.d)	N/A
-70	7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e)	<i>rfa</i>
-45	8. Proposed examinations, supporting documentation, and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g & h; C.3.d)	<i>rfa</i>
-30	9. Preliminary license applications due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	<i>gth</i>
-14	10. Final license applications due and assignment sheet prepared (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	<i>rsb,gth</i>
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f)	<i>rfa</i>
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f & h; C.3.g)	<i>rfa</i>
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	N/A
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; assignment sheet updated; waiver letters sent (C.2.g, ES-204)	<i>rsb</i>
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee and authorization granted to give written exams (if applicable) (C.3.k)	N/A
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	N/A
<p>* 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.</p> <p>[ ] Applies only to examinations prepared by the NRC.</p>		

Facility: <u>TURKEY POINT</u>		Date of Examination: <u>MAY 1, 2001</u>		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c
W R I T T E N	1. a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401.	N/A	NA	NA
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically prepared and whether all knowledge and ability categories are appropriately sampled.	N/A	↓	↓
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	N/A	↓	↓
	d. Assess whether the repetition from previous examination outlines is excessive.	N/A	↓	↓
S I M	2. 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	NA	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.	N/A	↓	↓
W / T	3. a. Verify that: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks, (2) no more than 30% of the test material is repeated from the last NRC examination, (3)* no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s), and (4) no more than 80% of any operating test is taken directly from the licensee's exam banks.	N/A	NA	NA
	b. Verify that: (1) the tasks are distributed among the safety function groupings as specified in ES-301, (2) one task is conducted in a low-power or shutdown condition, (3) 40% of the tasks require the applicant to implement an alternate path procedure, (4) one in-plant task tests the applicant's response to an emergency or abnormal condition, and (5) the in-plant walk-through requires the applicant to enter the RCA.	N/A	NA	N/A
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	N/A	NA	NA
	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.	N/A	NA	NA
G E N E R A L	4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section.	N/A	NA	NA
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	N/A	NA	NA
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	N/A	NA	NA
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	N/A	NA	NA
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	N/A	NA	NA
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	N/A	NA	NA
a. Author	<u>Kenneth D. White</u> / <u>Kenneth D. White</u>	Date		<u>4/3/01</u>
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>GREGORY A. LAUGHLIN</u> / <u>GA Laughlin</u>			<u>4/3/01</u>
c. Chief Examiner	<u>ROBERT F. ARITTO</u> / <u>Bob Aritto</u>			<u>5/2/01</u>
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>MIKE EARLIER</u> / <u>Mike Earlier</u>			<u>4/2/01</u>

(\*) Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations.

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of May 4 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 May 4. 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. G.M. BLINDE	DEVELOPER / REVIEWER		2/13/01		07/24/01
2. Ken White	DEVELOPER		2/13/01		5/7/01
3. D. SPENCE	REVIEWER NPS		2/13/01		5/7/01
4. G.A. LAUGHLIN	SUPERVISOR / CONTACT		2/13/01		5/4/01
5. W.C. MILLER	REVIEWER		3/13/01		5/4/01
6. R.N. JACOB	SUPERVISOR / SIMULATOR		3/14/01		5/7/01
7. R.E. GUICE	RCO / REVIEWER		3/20/01		5/9/01
8. J.R. RUSSELL	SRCO / REVIEWER		3/20/01		5/4/01
9. E. DOBSON	SIMULATOR ENGR		5/20/01		5/7/01
10. W. PREWITT	WFO Ops Supv		4/26/01		5/7/01
11. David Taylor	Sim op		5/2/01		5/7/01
12.					
13.					
14.					
15.					

NOTES:

Facility: <u>TURKEY POINT 3/4</u>		Date of Examination: <u>01MAY2001</u>
Examination Level (circle one): RO / SRO		Operating Test Number: <u>2001-1</u>
Administrative Topic/Subject Description		Describe method of evaluation: 1. ONE Administrative JPM, OR 2. TWO Administrative Questions
A.1	Conduct of Operations	Determine Boron Change to go to Mode 5 GEN 2.1.25 (RO 2.8)
	Conduct of Operations	Perform Operability Check of AFD Alarm GEN 2.1.19 (RO 3.0)
A.2	Equipment Control	Determine Contingency Actions GEN 2.2.26 (RO 2.5)
A.3	Radiation Control	Determine RWP Requirements for OSP Performance GEN 2.3.4 (RO 2.5)
A.4	Emergency Plan	Make Emergency Notifications GEN 2.4.39 (RO 3.3)

- A.1.1 Given boron concentration and MWD, determine boron concentration required for Mode 5 and amount of boron addition required.
- A.1.2 Use plant computer to perform 0-OSP-059.9, Computer Axial Flux Monitor Verification.
- A.2 Perform contingency actions for failed level detectors with the head off and the vessel not flooded.
- A.3 Given a RWP and survey map, determine requirements for SNPO to perform a surveillance test.
- A.4 Given a filled out notification form, make the state notification.

Facility: <u>TURKEY POINT</u>		Date of Examination: <u>5/1/01</u>		Operating Test Number: <u>2001-1</u>	
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).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	* SEE BELOW	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	N/A	NA	N/A	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	N/A	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA			-	-	-
a.	Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initial conditions</li> <li>• initiating cues</li> <li>• references and tools, including associated procedures</li> <li>• validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time critical by the facility licensee</li> <li>• specific performance criteria that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature</li> <li>- system response and other examiner cues</li> <li>- statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant</li> <li>- criteria for successful completion of the task</li> <li>- identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards</li> <li>- restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	N/A	NA	N/A	
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.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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.	N/A	NA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
a. Author	<u>Kenneth D White / Kenneth D White</u>			<u>4/3/01</u>	Date
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>GREGORY A. LAUGHLIN / Greg Laughlin</u>			<u>4/3/01</u>	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>RONALD F. HARTLEY</u>			<u>4/25/01</u>	
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>MICHAEL ERNSTEIN / Mike E</u>			<u>4/26/01</u>	
(*) The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

OUTLINE IS ENCLOSED - NOT PREVIOUSLY APPROVED - CONTENT DISCUSSED BY PHONE.

Harris Nuclear Plant	
Task Description	Date Complete
1. Facility written exam comments or graded exams received and verified complete	N/A
2. Facility written exam comments reviewed and incorporated and NRC grading completed, if necessary	N/A
3. Operating tests graded by NRC examiners	5/04/01
4. NRC Chief examiner review of written exam and operating test grading completed	5/04/01
5. Responsible supervisor review completed	5/04/01
6. Management (licensing official) review completed	5/04/01
7. License and denial letters mailed	5/11/01
8. Facility notified of results	5/04/01
9. Examination report issued (refer to NRC MC 0610)	5/22/01
10. Reference material returned after final resolution of any appeals	N/A

Turkey Point Retake Exam  
May 2001  
Comments

JPM Number	Title	Comment	Resolution
<b>Administration Examination</b>			
JPM A.1.1	Calculate Boron Addition for Mode 5	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. In the initiating cue there is a statement "BE CONSERVATIVE WHERE APPROPRIATE" This statement is not necessary to provide to the applicant. Please remove it from the applicants IC sheet and the evaluators sheet.</li> <li>2. There is NO K/A listed on the JPM cover sheet. Add the appropriate K/A to the JPM. On the Outline form.</li> <li>3. Do not agree with tolerance. The graph on Figure 5, is above 1400. How could anyone determine that it be below the 1400 line? This needs to be changed to reflect this.</li> <li>4. Need to reevaluate the range that is used in JPM step 2 for the final answer.</li> <li>5. Is there a procedure that describes how this is to be done?</li> <li>6. Student Initiating cues are too wordy. Pull the generic stuff out of the student handout. This unnecessarily clutters up the JPM.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreed</li> <li>2. OK, do not need to add. Already on the outline.</li> <li>3. Acknowledged</li> <li>4. Acknowledged</li> <li>5. Acknowledged</li> <li>6. Agreed</li> </ol>
JPM A.1.2	Perform Operability Check	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Is this to be done in the simulator or the control room? If in simulator can it be performed? Would rather see this performed rather than simulated.</li> <li>2. Why are elements 5 and 6 critical? They will come in if performed correctly, correct? If they are not in what happens?</li> <li>3. Need to add to the JPM that procedure Steps 7.1.5 and 7.1.6 are N/Aed in element 6.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Simulator</li> <li>2. Acknowledged</li> <li>3. Acknowledged</li> </ol>
JPM A.2	Determine Contingency Actions	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Why aren't Elements 2 and 3 critical?</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will investigate</li> </ol>
JPM A.3	Read A Survey Map and Apply RWP Reqs	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Which items in Element 1 are critical?</li> <li>2. How is the waiting area determined?</li> <li>3. Maybe build in a stay time calculation.</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Will determine</li> <li>2. Acknowledged</li> <li>3. Agreed</li> </ol>
JPM A-4	Perform State Warning Point Notification	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. JPM has no discriminatory value</li> <li>2. Sug: Phone doesn't work...</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Acknowledged</li> <li>2. Comment accepted</li> </ol>