

OCONEE EXAM

50-269, 270, 287/2002-301
February 11 - 15, 2002

Administrative Documents

(Yellow Paper)

- ✓1. Exam Preparation Checklist ES-201-1
- ✓2. Exam Outline Quality Checklist ES-201-2
- ✓3. Exam Security Agreement ES-201-3
- ✓4. Operating Test Quality Check sheet ES-301-3
- ✓5. Simulator Scenario Quality Check sheet ES-301-4
- ✓6. Transient and Event Checklist ES-301-5
- ✓7. Competencies Checklist ES-301-6
- ✓8. Written Exam Quality Check sheet ES-401-7
- ✓9. Written Exam Grading Quality Checklist ES-403-1
- ✓10. Post Exam Check sheet ES-501-1

Facility: OCONOR Date of Examination: 2/11-18/02
 Examinations Developed by: ^{operating exam} Facility / ^{written} NRC (circle one)

Target Date*	Task Description / Reference	Chief Examiner's Initials
-180	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a & b)	<i>ATK</i>
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	<i>ATK</i>
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security & other requirements (C.2.c)	<i>ATK</i>
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	<i>ATK</i>
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c)]	<i>ATK</i>
-75	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due (C.1.e & f; C.3.d)	<i>ATK</i>
-70	7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e) <i>11/6/01</i>	<i>ATK</i>
-45	8. Proposed examinations, supporting documentation, and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g & h; C.3.d)	<i>ATK</i>
-30	9. Preliminary license applications due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	<i>ATK</i>
-14	10. Final license applications due and assignment sheet prepared (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	<i>ATK</i>
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f) <i>written</i>	<i>ATK</i>
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f & h; C.3.g)	<i>ATK</i>
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	<i>ATK</i>
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; assignment sheet updated; waiver letters sent (C.2.g, ES-204)	<i>ATK</i>
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee and authorization granted to give written exams (if applicable) (C.3.k)	<i>ATK</i>
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	<i>ATK</i>

* 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.

Facility: Oconee		Date of Examination: February 4, 2002		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1. W R I T T E N	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401.			
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.			
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.			
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.			
2. S I M	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.	See	pmo	ATK
	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.	See	pmo	ATK
	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.	See	pmo	ATK
3. W / T	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, 20% (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.	See	pmo	ATK
	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.	See	pmo	ATK
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	See	pmo	ATK
	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.	See	pmo	ATK
4. G E N E R A L	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section.	See	pmo	ATK
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	See	pmo	ATK
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	See	pmo	ATK
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	See	pmo	ATK
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	See	pmo	ATK
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	See	pmo	ATK
a. Author	<u>Gabriel C. WASHBURN</u> / <u>Gabriel C. Washburn</u>			Date <u>11-5-01</u>
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>PAUL M. STOVALL</u> / <u>Paul M. Stovall</u>			<u>11-5-01</u>
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>George T. Hopp</u> / <u>George T. Hopp</u>			<u>1-24-02</u>
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>MICHAEL E. ERNSTES</u> / <u>Michael E. Ernstes</u>			<u>2/15/02</u>
Note:	* Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.			

Facility: Oconee Nuclear Station		Date of Examination:		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1. W R I T T E N	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401.	N/A	N/A	AT
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.	N/A		AT
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	N/A		AT
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	N/A	↓	N/A
2. S I M	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: (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.			
	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.			
	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. G E N E R A L	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section.	N/A	N/A	AT
	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.	N/A	N/A	AT
	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).	N/A	N/A	AT
a. Author <u>Ronald F. Aiello</u> Printed Name / Signature		Date <u>12/23/01</u>		
1. RFA signed for written only				
2. Two questions did not but were supported by an EO				
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>George T. Hopper / George J. Applegate</u>	<u>1/24/02</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>MICHAEL E. ERNSTEJ / Michael E. Ernst</u>	<u>2/5/02</u>		
Note: * Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

Facility: Oconee		Date of Examination: March 21, 2002		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1. W R I T T E N	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401.	N/A	N/A	N/A
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.			
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.			
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.			
2. S I M	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: (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.	See	Good	AK
	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.	See	Good	AK
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	See	Good	AK
	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.	See	Good	AK
4. G E N E R A L	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section.	See	Good	AK
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	See	Good	AK
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	See	Good	AK
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	See	Good	AK
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	See	Good	AK
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	See	Good	AK
a. Author <u>Gabriel WASTHORN / Gabriel Wasthorn</u> b. Facility Reviewer (*) <u>PAUL M. STOVALL / Paul M. Stovall</u> c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>George T. Hoppa / George T. Hoppa</u> d. NRC Supervisor <u>MIKE ERNSTE / Mike Ernst</u>		Printed Name / Signature		Date 3-18-02 3-20-02 3-20-02 3-20-02
Note: * Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/4, 2/11-2002 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 2/4, 2/11-2002. 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. Gabriel WASHBURN	Instructor / Exam Developer	Gabriel Washburn	9-10-01	Gabriel Washburn	2-19-02
2. KEITH WELCH	Sim. Supv. Eng.	Keith P. Welch	9-12-01	Keith P. Welch	2-19-02
3. Greg BAUMGARDNER	Training Liaison / HLP Super / ^{EXAM} Developer	Greg Baumgardner	10-17-01	Greg Baumgardner	2/19/02
4. John R. Stealy	Trng Supervisor	John R. Stealy	10-18-01 (100)	John R. Stealy	2-19-02
5. Paul M. Spivak	OPS TRNG MGR	Paul M. Spivak	10-31-01	Paul M. Spivak	2-19-02
6. JANDRA S. LOSKOSKI	Reactor Operator / Validator	Jandra S. Loskoski	12/17/01	Jandra S. Loskoski	02-20-02
7. Eddie L. Anderson	Sr. Reactor Operator / Validator	Eddie L. Anderson	12/17/01	Eddie L. Anderson	2/23/02
8. JOHN W. COLEMAN	REACTOR OPERATOR / VALIDATOR	John W. Coleman	12/17/01	John W. Coleman	2-20-02
9. Allen G. Collins	Sim. Support / ET PRACSR	Allen G. Collins	1-7-02	Allen G. Collins	2/19/02
10. Kathleen Saunders	Admin Specialist	Kathleen Saunders	1/7/02	Kathleen Saunders	2/19/02
11. Marilyn D. Husky	Admin Specialist	Marilyn D. Husky	1/27/02	Marilyn D. Husky	02/19/02
12. Jeff G. Potvin	Sim Support / Eng.	Jeff G. Potvin	01/09/02	Jeff G. Potvin	2-19-02
13. THOMAS W. REE	Sim Support	Thomas W. Ree	1/9/02	Thomas W. Ree	2-19-02
14. TAM VAN VO	Sim Support	Tam Van Vo	1/9/02	Tam Van Vo	2-19-02
15. Joseph F. WARD	Operations Shift Supervisor	Joseph F. Ward	1/15/02	Joseph F. Ward	2/20/02

NOTES:

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/4, 2/11-2002 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 2/4, 2/11-2002. 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.	<u>TRACY ROLAND</u>	<u>Reactor Operator / Validation</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>1-15-02</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-20-02</u>
2.	<u>Rick Robinson</u>	<u>SUM ASSISTANT / OPS REP</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>1-22-02</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-25-02</u>
3.	<u>Tony Grant</u>	<u>Reactor Operator / Validation</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>1-31-02</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-20-02</u>
4.	<u>MICHAEL R. SMITH</u>	<u>REACTOR OPERATOR / VALIDATION</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>1-31-02</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-25-02</u>
5.	<u>Tony B. Lee</u>	<u>Operations Regual- Trg. Liaison</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-10-02</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2/20/02</u>
6.	<u>Bobby Ayres</u>	<u>OPERATIONS TRAINING</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-11-02</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2/19/02</u>
7.	<u>TP GILLESPIE / T. PRESTON GILLESPIE</u>	<u>SHIFT OPERATIONS MANAGER</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-12-02</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>2-20-02</u>
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

NOTES:

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 3-21-02 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 3-21-02. 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.	Gabriel Washburn	Instructor / Exam Developer	Gabriel Washburn	2-20-02	Gabriel Washburn	3/21/02
2.	Bobby Ayers	INSTRUCTOR	Bobby Ayers	2-20-02	Bobby Ayers	3/21/02
3.	John R. Stealy	Initialing Spic / Injmt oversight	John R. Stealy	2-20-02	John R. Stealy	3/21/02
4.	Paul M. Stoddall	NGR OPER TRNG	Paul M. Stoddall	2-20-02	Paul M. Stoddall	3/21/02
5.	Greg Baumgartner	Ops Initialing Liaison	Greg Baumgartner	2-25-02	Greg Baumgartner	3/21/02
6.	DAVID RATHBONE	NUCLEAR CONTROL OPERATOR	David A. Rathbone	3-5-02	David A. Rathbone	3-21-02
7.	Maiken D. Hawley	Admin Specialist	Maiken D. Hawley	3/1/02	Maiken D. Hawley	3/21/02
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

NOTES:

Facility: Oconee		Date of Examination: February 11, 2002 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).	Gen	JMS	AK
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	Gen	JMS	AK
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a).	Gen	JMS	AK
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	Gen	JMS	AK
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	Gen	JMS	AK
2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA		--	--	--
a.	Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · initial conditions · initiating cues · references and tools, including associated procedures · reasonable and validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time critical by the facility licensee · specific performance criteria that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature - system response and other examiner cues - statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant - criteria for successful completion of the task - identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards - restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable 	Gen	JMS	AK
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	Gen	JMS	AK
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.	Gen	JMS	AK
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	Gen	JMS	AK
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.	Gen	JMS	AK
Printed Name / Signature		Date		
a. Author	<u>Gabriel WASHBURN / Gabriel Washburn</u>	<u>1-24-02</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>PAUL M. STOVALL / Paul M. Stovall</u>	<u>1-24-02</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>George T. Hopper / George T. Hopper</u>	<u>1-24-02</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>MICHAEL E. ERNSTE / Michael E. Ernste</u>	<u>2-5-02</u>		
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

Facility: Oconee		Date of Examination: February 11, 2002 Operating Test Number: _____		
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).	NEW	PASS	ATX
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	NEW	PASS	ATX
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s) (see Section D.1.a).	NEW	PASS	ATX
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	NEW	PASS	ATX
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	NEW	PASS	ATX
2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA		--	--	--
a.	Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - initial conditions - initiating cues - references and tools, including associated procedures - reasonable and validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time critical by the facility licensee - specific performance criteria that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature - system response and other examiner cues - statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant - criteria for successful completion of the task - identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards - restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable 	NEW	PASS	ATX
b.	The ^{JPMs} prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	NEW	PASS	ATX
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.	NEW	PASS	ATX
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	NEW	PASS	ATX
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.	NEW	PASS	ATX
	Printed Name / Signature	Date		
a.	Author <u>GABRIEL WASHBURN / Gabriel Washburn</u>	<u>1-11-02</u>		
b.	Facility Reviewer(*) <u>PAUL M. STOVALL / Paul M Stovall</u>	<u>1-11-02</u>		
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>George T. Hopper / George T. Hopper</u>	<u>1-16-02</u>		
d.	NRC Supervisor _____	_____		
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

revised due to change in outline effective 2.6

Handerson MAKEUP TEST

Facility: Oconee		Date of Examination: March 21, 2002 Operating Test Number:		
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).	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a).	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA		<i>?</i>	<i>--</i>	<i>--</i>
a.	Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · initial conditions · initiating cues · references and tools, including associated procedures · reasonable and validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time critical by the facility licensee · specific performance criteria that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature - system response and other examiner cues - statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant - criteria for successful completion of the task - identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards - restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable 	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301. <i>Previously Performed</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
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.	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	<i>Ben</i>	<i>pro</i>	<i>AK</i>
3. SIMULATOR (CATEGORY C) CRITERIA		<i>--</i>	<i>--</i>	<i>--</i>
a.	The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached. <i>Previously Performed</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>	<i>N/A</i>
Printed Name / Signature		Date		
a. Author	<i>Gabriel Washburn / Gabriel Washburn</i>	<i>3-18-02</i>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<i>PAUL M. STORACE / Paul M. Storace</i>	<i>3-20-02</i>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<i>George T. Hopper / George T. Hopper</i>	<i>3-20-02</i>		
d. NRC Supervisor	<i>MIKE ERNSTES / Mike Ernstes</i>	<i>3-20-02</i>		
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

Facility: Oconee		Date of Exam: February 11, 2002		Scenario Numbers: 1 / 2 /		Operating Test No.:		
QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES						Initials		
						a	b*	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.	SCW	pmo	AK				
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	SCW	pmo	AK				
3.	Each event description consists of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated the malfunction(s) that are entered to initiate the event the symptoms/cues that will be visible to the crew the expected operator actions (by shift position) the event termination point (if applicable) 	SCW	pmo	AK				
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.	SCW	pmo	AK				
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	SCW	pmo	AK				
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	SCW	pmo	AK				
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.	SCW	pmo	AK				
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	SCW	pmo	AK				
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.	SCW	pmo	AK				
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.	SCW	pmo	AK				
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	SCW	pmo	AK				
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).	SCW	pmo	AK				
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	SCW	pmo	AK				
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		Actual Attributes		--	--	--		
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / 6 /	SCW	pmo	AK			
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	1 / 1 /	SCW	pmo	AK			
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3 / 3 /	SCW	pmo	AK			
4.	Major transients (1-2)	2 / 1 /	SCW	pmo	AK			
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2 / 2 /	SCW	pmo	AK			
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	2 / 1 /	SCW	pmo	AK			
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3 / 4 /	SCW	pmo	AK			

OPERATING TEST NO.:

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1	2	3	4
RO (1-3)	Reactivity	1	3			
	Normal	1		1		
	Instrument / Component	4	2, 5, 7	1, 4, 5		
	Major	1	6, 8	7		

As RO	Reactivity	1		6		
	Normal	0				
	Instrument / Component	2		2, 3, 5		
	Major	1		7		
SRO-I (1-3)	Reactivity	0	3			
	Normal	1	1			
	Instrument / Component	2	2, 4, 5, 7			
	Major	1	6, 8			

SRO-U (1-4)	Reactivity	0	N/A			
	Normal	1	N/A	1		
	Instrument / Component	2	N/A	1, 2, 3, 4, 5		
	Major	1	N/A	7		

- 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.
 - (3) Whenever practical, both instrument and component malfunctions should be included; only those that require verifiable actions that provide insight to the applicant's competence count toward the minimum requirement.

Author: Gabriel Workman

NRC Reviewer: George D. Hopper

Facility: Oconee Nuclear Station		Date of Exam: 2/18/02		Exam Level: RO		
Item Description	Initial					
	a	b*	c*			
1. Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility	rfa	N/A	ADA			
2. a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available	rfa		ADA			
3. RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401	rfa		ADA			
4. Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process			ADA			
5. Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: ___ the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or ___ the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or X the examinations were developed independently; or ___ the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or ___ other (explain)	rfa		ADA			
6. Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right	Bank	Modified	New	rfa		ADA
	88 32	+ 3	66 65			
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	C/A		rfa		ADA
	49 45	51 55				
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers	rfa					ADA
9. Question content conforms with specific K/A statements in the previously approved examination outline and is appropriate for the Tier to which they are assigned; deviations are justified	rfa					ADA
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines	rfa					ADA
11. The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet	rfa				↓	ADA
Printed Name / Signature						Date
a. Author	Ronald F. Aiello					12/28/01
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	N/A					N/A
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	George T. Hopper					1/29/02
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	MICHAEL E. ERMITEJ					2/16/02
Note: * The facility reviewer's initials/signature are not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.						

Facility: Oconee Nuclear Station		Date of Exam: 2/18/02			Exam Level: SRO		
Item Description				Initial			
				a	b*	c*	
1.	Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility			rfa	N/A	ATK	
2.	a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available			rfa		ATK	
3.	RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401			rfa		ATK	
4.	Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process					ATK	
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: ___ the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or ___ the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or X_ the examinations were developed independently; or ___ the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or ___ other (explain)			rfa		ATK	
6.	Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right	Bank	Modified	New	rfa	ATK	
		39 35	+ 3	60 62			
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	C/A		rfa	ATK	
		48 43	52 57				
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers			rfa		ATK	
9.	Question content conforms with specific K/A statements in the previously approved examination outline and is appropriate for the Tier to which they are assigned; deviations are justified			rfa		ATK	
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines			rfa		ATK	
11.	The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet			rfa		ATK	
				Printed Name / Signature		Date	
a. Author	Ronald F. Aiello					12/28/01	
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	N/A					N/A	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	George T. Hopper					1/29/02	
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	MICHAEL E. ERNSTEJ					2/15/02	
Note: * The facility reviewer's initials/signature are not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.							

Facility:		Date of Exam:		Exam Level: RO/SRO		
Item Description				Initials		
				a	b	c
1.	Clean answer sheets copied before grading			AYY	N/A	W
2.	Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented			AYY		B
3.	Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)			AYY		B
4.	Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail			AYY		B
5.	All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified <i>NOTE: NO FAILING EXAMINATIONS</i>			AYY		B
6.	Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants			AYY	↓	B
				Printed Name / Signature		Date
a.	Grader			<u>George T. Hopper / <i>[Signature]</i></u>		<u>2/25/02</u>
b.	Facility Reviewer(*)			<u>N/A</u>		
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (*)			<u>REYNOLD F. ARNOLD</u>		<u>2/26/02</u>
d.	NRC Supervisor (*)			<u>MIKE ERNSTES / <i>[Signature]</i></u>		<u>3/5/02</u>
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.						

Task Description	Date Complete
1. Facility written exam comments or graded exams received and verified complete	2/21/02
2. Facility written exam comments reviewed and incorporated and NRC grading completed, if necessary	2/26/02
3. Operating tests graded by NRC examiners	3/18/02
4. NRC Chief examiner review of written exam and operating test grading completed	3/19/02
5. Responsible supervisor review completed	3/20/02 5/27/02
6. Management (licensing official) review completed	3/20/02 3/27/02
7. License and denial letters mailed	3/22/02
8. Facility notified of results	3/20/02
9. Examination report issued (refer to NRC MC 0610)	4/4/02
10. Reference material returned after final resolution of any appeals	N/A