

M. MURPHY

Operations Branch Assignment Check Sheet:
(Includes ES-201-1 & ES-501-1 Rev. 8, Supplement 1 information)

as of: 10/15/2001

Chief: M. Murphy

Facility/Task: GG IN EX

Task Start Date: 08/26/2002

ITEM DESCRIPTION		DUE DATE	INIT	DATE
0	Exam/Inspection Schedule Agreement (C.1.a;C.2.a&b)	Feb 27, 2002	ATG	10/15/2001
1	NRC Staff & Fac. Contact Assigned (C.1.c;C.2.e)	Feb 27, 2002	ATG	10/15/2001
2	Facility contact briefed on security & other issues (C.2.c)	Feb 27, 2002	nmf	2/21/02
3	Corp. Notification Letter Sent (C.2.d) (Exams only)	Feb 27, 2002	nmf	2/26/02
3a	Inspection Announcement Letter Sent (PIR & LORT if req'd)	Jul 12, 2002	N/A	N/A
4	Task Expectations, Issues, & Standards Discussed w/ BC	May 28, 2002	nmf	6/12/02
5#	[Reference Material Due (C.1.d;C.3.c)]	Apr 28, 2002	N/A	N/A
6#	Integrated Exam Outlines Due (C.1.d&e;C.3.d)	Apr 28, 2002	nmf	5/1/02
7#	Outlines reviewed by NRC & Feedback Sent (c.2.h;C.3.e)	May 12, 2002	nmf	5/10/02
8#	Preliminary Applications Due (C.1.j;C.2.g;ES202)	Jul 27, 2002	nmf	7/29/02
9#	Draft Exams w/ Doc./Ref. Due (C.1.d/e/f;C.3.d)	Jun 27, 2002	nmf	6/12/02
10#	Peer Reviewer Initials As Reviewed All Parts*	Jul 7, 2002	DM	7/7/02
11#	NRC Supervisor. Initials Approving for Fac. Rev. (C.2.h;C.3.f)*	Jul 7, 2002	AT	7/9/02
12#	Exams Reviewed w/ Fac. (C.1.h;C.2.f&h;C.3.g)	Jul 7, 2002	nmf	8/15/02
13#	Final Appl. Due & Assign. Sheet Prepared (C.1.j;C.2.h;ES202)	Aug 12, 2002	nmf	8/5/02
14#	NRC Supervisor Approved Final Exams (C.2.i;C.3.h)*	Aug 19, 2002	AT	8/19/02
15#	Final Appl. Rec'd & Waivers Sent (C.2.g)	Aug 19, 2002	nmf	8/19/02
16#	Proctor Rules Reviewed w/ Fac. & Written Authorized (C.3.k)	Aug 19, 2002	nmf	8/12/02
17	Exam/Insp Material to Team (C.3.i)	Aug 19, 2002	nmf	8/23/02
18#	Fac. graded exam & Comments Rec'd	Sep 7, 2002	nmf	8/30/02
19#	NRC Written Grading Completed	Sep 10, 2002	nmf	9/5/02
20#	Examiners Finished Grading Op. Tests	Sep 10, 2002	nmf	9/17/02
21#	NRC Ch. Ex. Review Completed	Sep 20, 2002	nmf	9/18/02
22	NRC BC Review Completed*	Sep 21, 2002	AT	9/23/02
23#	RPS/IP # Examinees Updated Before Report Issued	Sep 26, 2002	nmf	9/23/02
24	License/Denials Signed & Report Issued	Sep 26, 2002	nmf	9/24/02
25	Package Closed Out	Oct 17, 2002	nmf	10/17/02
Final Inspection Report Issued, Exam Package to OLA, Facility. Contact Notified of Results				

Not required for inspections, except as noted.

* Note Supervisor/Peer initials required.

[] Required NRC-auth. exams only.

When complete, for exams, add to pkg & fwd copy to BC, for insp, fwd orig'l to BC.

Last revised 10/15/01

S:\DRS\OB\EXAMS\GG\August 2002 Exam\exam assignment sheet.wpd

Facility: GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION		Date of Examination: August 26, 2002		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1. WRITER	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model per ES-401.	ml	df	Robert
	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.	ml	df	Robert
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	ml	df	Robert
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	ml	df	Robert
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.	ml	df	Robert
	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.	ml	df	Robert
	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.	ml	df	Robert
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.	ml	df	Robert
	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.	ml	df	Robert
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	ml	df	Robert
	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.	ml	df	Robert
4. GENERAL	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section.	ml	df	Robert
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	ml	df	Robert
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	ml	df	Robert
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	ml	df	Robert
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	ml	df	Robert
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO)	ml	df	Robert
a. Author: <u>Michael K. Rasch</u>		Printed Name / Signature		Date
b. Facility Reviewer(*): <u>Stephen Hurdles</u>		<u>Michael K. Rasch</u>		<u>4/29/2002</u>
c. NRC Chief Examiner(#): <u>M. E. Murphy</u>		<u>Stephen Hurdles</u>		<u>4/29/2002</u>
d. NRC Supervisor: <u>Anthony T. Gony</u>		<u>ATG</u>		<u>5/6/02</u>
NOTE: * Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations.				
# Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c," chief examiner concurrence required.				

Facility: GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION		Date of Examination: August 26, 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.	ml	dp	Robert
	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.	ml	dp	Robert
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	r	dp	Robert
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	ml	dp	Robert
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.	ml	dp	Robert
	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.	ml	dp	Robert
	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.	ml	dp	Robert
3. W I 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.	ml	dp	Robert
	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.	ml	dp	Robert
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	ml	dp	Robert
	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.	ml	dp	Robert
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.	ml	dp	Robert
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	ml	dp	Robert
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	ml	dp	Robert
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	ml	dp	Robert
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	ml	dp	Robert
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	ml	dp	Robert
Printed Name / Signature		Date		
a. Author: <u>Michael K. Rasch</u> <u>Michael K. Rasch</u>		<u>6/16/2002</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*): <u>Stephen Humphries</u> <u>Stephen Humphries</u>		<u>6/17/2002</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner(#): <u>W. D. Humphrey</u>		<u>6/14/02</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor: <u>Anthony Gody</u> <u>Anthony Gody</u>		<u>8/19/02</u>		
NOTE: * Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

Facility: GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION				Date of Exam: August 26, 2002 Exam Level: RO/SRO																																					
Item Description				Initial																																					
				A	b*	c#																																			
1.	Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility			ml	bf	msw																																			
2.	a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available			ml	bf	msw																																			
3.	RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401			ml	bf	msw																																			
4.	Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process.					msw																																			
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate. <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)			ml	bf	msw																																			
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	ml	bf	msw																																		
		58	9	33																																					
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		ml	bf	msw																																		
		49	51																																						
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers			ml	bf	msw																																			
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			ml	bf	msw																																			
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines			ml	bf	msw																																			
11.	The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet			ml	bf	msw																																			
<table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="4">Printed Name / Signature</td> <td colspan="3">Date</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a. Author</td> <td>MICHAEL K. RASCH</td> <td>Michael K. Rasch</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">6/6/2002</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Facility Reviewer(*)</td> <td>Stephen Humphries</td> <td>Stephen Humphries</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">6/7/2002</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. NRC Chief Examiner(#)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">7/1/2002</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. NRC Regional Supervisor</td> <td>ANTHONY GOODY</td> <td>ANTHONY GOODY</td> <td></td> <td colspan="3">8/19/02</td> </tr> </table>							Printed Name / Signature				Date			a. Author	MICHAEL K. RASCH	Michael K. Rasch		6/6/2002			b. Facility Reviewer(*)	Stephen Humphries	Stephen Humphries		6/7/2002			c. NRC Chief Examiner(#)				7/1/2002			d. NRC Regional Supervisor	ANTHONY GOODY	ANTHONY GOODY		8/19/02		
Printed Name / Signature				Date																																					
a. Author	MICHAEL K. RASCH	Michael K. Rasch		6/6/2002																																					
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	Stephen Humphries	Stephen Humphries		6/7/2002																																					
c. NRC Chief Examiner(#)				7/1/2002																																					
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	ANTHONY GOODY	ANTHONY GOODY		8/19/02																																					
Note: * The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC Reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.																																									

Facility: GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION				Date of Exam: August 26, 2002 Exam Level: RO (SRO)																																						
Item Description				Initial																																						
				A	b*	c#																																				
1.	Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility			ML	HP	PSB																																				
2.	a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available			ML	HP	PSB																																				
3.	RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401			ML	HP	PSB																																				
4.	Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process.					PSB																																				
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate. <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)			ML	HP	PSB																																				
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	ML	HP	PSB																																			
		57	9	34																																						
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		ML	HP	PSB																																			
		46	54																																							
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers			ML	HP	PSB																																				
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			ML	HP	PSB																																				
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines			ML	HP	PSB																																				
11.	The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet			ML	HP	PSB																																				
<table border="0"> <tr> <td colspan="6">Printed Name / Signature</td> <td>Date</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a. Author</td> <td colspan="5"><u>MICHAEL K. RASCH</u> <i>Michael Rasch</i></td> <td><u>6/6/2002</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Facility Reviewer(*)</td> <td colspan="5"><u>Stephen Humphries</u> <i>Stephen Humphries</i></td> <td><u>6/7/2002</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. NRC Chief Examiner(#)</td> <td colspan="5"><u>[Signature]</u></td> <td><u>7/18/02</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. NRC Regional Supervisor</td> <td colspan="5"><u>ANTHONY GODY / [Signature]</u></td> <td><u>8/19/02</u></td> </tr> </table>								Printed Name / Signature						Date	a. Author	<u>MICHAEL K. RASCH</u> <i>Michael Rasch</i>					<u>6/6/2002</u>	b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Stephen Humphries</u> <i>Stephen Humphries</i>					<u>6/7/2002</u>	c. NRC Chief Examiner(#)	<u>[Signature]</u>					<u>7/18/02</u>	d. NRC Regional Supervisor	<u>ANTHONY GODY / [Signature]</u>					<u>8/19/02</u>
Printed Name / Signature						Date																																				
a. Author	<u>MICHAEL K. RASCH</u> <i>Michael Rasch</i>					<u>6/6/2002</u>																																				
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Stephen Humphries</u> <i>Stephen Humphries</i>					<u>6/7/2002</u>																																				
c. NRC Chief Examiner(#)	<u>[Signature]</u>					<u>7/18/02</u>																																				
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	<u>ANTHONY GODY / [Signature]</u>					<u>8/19/02</u>																																				
Note: * The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC Reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.																																										

Facility: GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION		Date of Examination: 08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002		
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).	ML	HP	JMS
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	ML	HP	JMS
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s) (see Section D.1.a).	ML	HP	JMS
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	ML	HP	JMS
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	ML	HP	JMS
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 	ML	HP	JMS
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	ML	HP	JMS
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.	ML	HP	JMS
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	ML	HP	JMS
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.	ML	HP	JMS
Printed Name / Signature		Date		
a. Author	Michael K. Rasch <i>Michael K. Rasch</i>	6/6/2002		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	Stephen Humphries <i>Stephen Humphries</i>	6/7/2002		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<i>W. R. Humphrey</i>	7/17/02		
d. NRC Supervisor	ANTHONY GODY <i>1 QT Gody</i>	8/19/02		
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

Facility: **GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION** Date of Exam: **08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002**Scenario Numbers: **1 / 2**

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.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
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) 	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
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.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
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.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
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.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
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.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
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).	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>	<i>msm</i>
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		1	2	
		Actual Attributes		
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / 6	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2 / 2	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3 / 3	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 1	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2 / 2	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	2 / 0	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	5 / 2	<i>ml</i>	<i>AP</i>

Facility: **GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION** Date of Exam: **08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002**Scenario Numbers: **3 Backup**

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.	HP	HP	HP
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	HP	HP	HP
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) 	HP	HP	HP
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.	HP	HP	HP
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	HP	HP	HP
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	HP	HP	HP
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.	HP	HP	HP
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	HP	HP	HP
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.	HP	HP	HP
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.	HP	HP	HP
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	HP	HP	HP
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).	HP	HP	HP
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	HP	HP	HP
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		3		
		Actual Attributes		
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	7 / /	HP	HP
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	3 / /	HP	HP
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	2 / /	HP	HP
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / /	HP	HP
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2 / /	HP	HP
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1 / /	HP	HP
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	2 / /	HP	HP

GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION BACKUP SCENARIO DATES: 08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			SS 3	ATC 3	BOP 3	TOTAL
ATC RO	Reactivity			1		1
	Normal			1		1
	Instrument/ Component			2		2
	Major			1		1
BOP As RO SRO-I As SRO	Reactivity				0	0
	Normal				0	0
	Instrument/ Component				3	3
	Major				1	1
	Reactivity					
	Normal					
	Instrument/ Component					
	Major					
SS SRO-U	Reactivity		0			0
	Normal		1			1
	Instrument/ Component		4			4
	Major		1			1

- 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 minimum requirement.

Author:

NRC Reviewer:

GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION

DATES: 08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			SS 1			TOTAL
RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument/Component	4				
	Major	1				
As RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	0				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				
As SRO	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-U	Reactivity	0	0			0
	Normal	1	1			1
	Instrument/Component	2	5			5
	Major	1	1			1

- 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 minimum requirement.

Author:

NRC Reviewer:

Revision 0

NUREG 1021, REVISION 8 SUPPLEMENT 1

GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION

DATES: 08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			ATC 1	BOP 2		TOTAL
RO 1,3,5,7	Reactivity	1	1	0		1
	Normal	1	0	1		1
	Instrument/Component	4	2	4		6
	Major	1	1	1		2

As RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	0				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I						
As SRO	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				

SRO-U	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				

- 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 minimum requirement.

Author:

Michael R. Rask

NRC Reviewer:

W. M. Murphy

Revision 0

NUREG 1021, REVISION 8 SUPPLEMENT 1

GRAND GULF NUCLEAR STATION

DATES: 08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			BOP 1	ATC 2		TOTAL
RO 2,4,6	Reactivity	1	0	1		1
	Normal	1	1	0		1
	Instrument/Component	4	3	3		6
	Major	1	1	1		2

As RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	0				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I						
As SRO	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				

SRO-U	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument/Component	2				
	Major	1				

- 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 minimum requirement.

Author:

NRC Reviewer:

Revision 0

NUREG 1021, REVISION 8 SUPPLEMENT 1

Grand Gulf Nuclear Station

Dates 08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002

BACKUP SCENARIOS Competencies	Applicant #1 RO/SRO-I/SRO-U		Applicant #2 RO/SRO-I/SRO-U		Applicant #3 RO/SRO-I/SRO-U	
	SCENARIO		SCENARIO		SCENARIO	
	ATC 3		BOP 3		SS 3	
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6		3, 4, 5		2, 3, 4, 5	
Diagnose Events and Conditions	3, 5		3, 4, 5		3, 4, 5	
Understand Plant and System Response	1, 2, 3, 5		3, 4, 5		3, 4, 5	
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	ALL		ALL		ALL	
Operate Control Boards (2)	1, 3, 5, 6		3, 4, 5		N/A	
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	ALL		ALL		ALL	
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	N/A		N/A		ALL	
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	N/A		N/A		3	
Notes: (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO. (2) Optional for an SRO-U. (3) Only applicable to SROs. (4) Only applicable to RO positions at GGNS.						

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:

NRC Reviewer:

Michael Hark
[Signature]

Grand Gulf Nuclear Station

Dates 08/26/2002 – 08/30/2002

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

Notes:

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

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:

NRC Reviewer:

Michael H. Hersh
[Signature]

Facility: <u>GRAND GULF NUCLEAR</u>		Date of Exam: <u>8/23/2002</u>		Exam Level: <u>RO/SRO</u>	
STATION Item Description		Initials			
		a	b	c	
1.	Clean answer sheets copied before grading	ML	SDR	Thom	
2.	Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented NONE	ML	SDR	Thom	
3.	Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	ML	SDR	Thom	
4.	Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail NONE	ML	SDR	Thom	
5.	All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified NONE	ML	SDR	Thom	
6.	Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	ML	SDR	Thom	
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a. Grader	<u>Michael K. Rasch</u> <i>Michael Rasch</i>	<u>8/23/2002</u>			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Steven D Reeves</u> <i>Steve Ram</i>	<u>8/23/2002</u>			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>M. E. Murphy</u> <i>M. E. Murphy</i>	<u>9/4/02</u>			
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>T. F. Stetha</u> <i>T. F. Stetha</i>	<u>9/5/02</u>			
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Facility: <u>GRAND GULF NUCLEAR</u>		Date of Exam: <u>8/23/2002</u>		Exam Level: RO <u>SRO</u>	
STATION Item Description		Initials			
		a	b	c	
1.	Clean answer sheets copied before grading	ML	SOR	Robert	
2.	Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented NONE	ML	SOR	Robert	
3.	Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	ML	SOR	Robert	
4.	Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail NONE	ML	SOR	Robert	
5.	All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified NONE	ML	SOR	Robert	
6.	Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	ML	SOR	Robert	
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a. Grader	<u>Michael K. Rasch</u> <u>Michael Rasch</u>	<u>8/23/2002</u>			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Steven D Reeves</u> <u>Steve Reem</u>	<u>8/23/2002</u>			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>M.E. Murphy</u> <u>M.E. Murphy</u>	<u>9/4/02</u>			
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>T.F. Stecke</u> <u>T.F. Stecke</u>	<u>9/5/02</u>			
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

10/10/2002

08:20:43

Report 21

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 08/01/2002 To 09/30/2003

Region: 4

Phase Code: 5 Operational

Exam Week	Site/Docket No./Insp Rpt #	# Candidates		Type	Exam Author	Chief Examiner	Examiners Assigned
08/12/2002	Grand Gulf / 05000416 / 2002301 TAC #: X02231			Prep		MURPHY, MICHAEL E.	MURPHY, MICHAEL E.
08/26/2002	Grand Gulf / 05000416 / 2002301 TAC #: X02231	RO - 7	SROI - 1	Admin		MURPHY, MICHAEL E.	MURPHY, MICHAEL E. SANCHEZ, ALFRED
09/08/2003	Grand Gulf / 05000416 / TAC #: X02237			Prep		MURPHY, MICHAEL E.	MURPHY, MICHAEL E.
09/29/2003	Grand Gulf / 05000416 / TAC #: X02237	SROU - 7	SROI - 2	Admin	FFF	MURPHY, MICHAEL E.	DRAKE, JAMES F. GAGE, PAUL C. MURPHY, MICHAEL E. STETKA, THOMAS F.

Sites: GG

Orgs: 4620

Exam Author: ALL

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 8/23-30/2002 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 8/23-30/2002. 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. Michael K. Rasch	Sr. Ops. Inst. Exam Developer	<i>Michael K. Rasch</i>	3/18/2002	<i>Michael K. Rasch</i>	8/30/2002
2. Stephen Humphries	Ops Coord. Facility Rep	<i>Stephen Humphries</i>	11/17/2002	<i>Stephen Humphries</i>	9/5/2002
3. Robert Goldman	Simulator Eng. Software	<i>Robert Goldman</i>	5/14/2002	<i>Robert Goldman</i>	8/30/2002
4. Ernest Mathes	Shift Manager / Validation	<i>Ernest Mathes</i>	5/20/2002	<i>Ernest Mathes</i>	8/30/2002
5. Handy Parris	Control Room Super SRO	<i>Handy Parris</i>	5/20/2002	<i>Handy Parris</i>	8/30/02
6. SA Elliott	RO VALIDATION	<i>SA Elliott</i>	5/20/2002	<i>SA Elliott</i>	8/30/02
7. Michael Staines	RO VALIDATION	<i>Michael Staines</i>	5-20-2002	<i>Michael Staines</i>	8-30-02
8. Timothy D. Baland	SRO/Shift Supv. VALIDATION	<i>Timothy D. Baland</i>	5-23-02	<i>Timothy D. Baland</i>	9/5/02
9. Dennis M. Sweeney	SRO Validation	<i>Dennis M. Sweeney</i>	5/28/02	<i>Dennis M. Sweeney</i>	9/12/02
10. Phillip K. Huff	RO Validation	<i>Phillip K. Huff</i>	5-28-02	<i>Phillip K. Huff</i>	9-3-02
11. Steven Angel	RO Validation	<i>Steven Angel</i>	5-28-02	<i>Steven Angel</i>	9-5-02
12. Carl W. McMillan	RO Validation	<i>Carl W. McMillan</i>	5/28/02	<i>Carl W. McMillan</i>	9/3/02
13. JOHN P. WATKINS	RO VALIDATION	<i>John P. Watkins</i>	5/28/02	<i>John P. Watkins</i>	9/3/02
14. Jesse Turnage	RO Validation	<i>Jesse Turnage</i>	7-19-02	<i>Jesse Turnage</i>	9-5-02
15. ALAN HOLBROW	SRO/Shift Supv. VALIDATION	<i>Alan Holbrow</i>	7-19-02	<i>Alan Holbrow</i>	9-5-02

NOTES:

John P. Watkins 9-12-02

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 8/23-30/2002 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 8/23-30/2002. 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)	DATENOTE
1. FRANK WEATHERS	Shift Mgr / Validate	[Signature]	7-23-02	[Signature]	7-12-02
2. CARLOS DAWSON II	RO / VALIDATE	[Signature]	7-23-02	[Signature]	7-3-02
3. Larry Buffin	RO / Validate	[Signature]	7-23-02	[Signature]	7-3-02
4. JAMES C. O'NEIL	RO / VALIDATE	[Signature]	7-23-02	[Signature]	8-30-02
5. H. T. POWELL	Control Room Supv.	[Signature]	7-23-02	[Signature]	9-12-02
6. Russell Burdett	RO / Validate	[Signature]	7/23/02	[Signature]	9/4/02
7. Rick Ingram	Shift Supv. / Validate	[Signature]	7/23/02	[Signature]	8/30/02
8. SAM RUSS	RO / VALIDATION	[Signature]	8-13-02	[Signature]	8/30/02
9. Jeff Struckey	RO Validation	[Signature]	8-13-02	[Signature]	9-3-02
10. Chris Miller	RO Validation	[Signature]	8-13-02	[Signature]	9-3-02
11. Ricky Ciddell	SRD Validation	[Signature]	8-14-02	[Signature]	8-30-02
12. Steve Reeves	Sr. Ops Instructor Exam Administration	[Signature]	8-26-02	[Signature]	8/30/02
13. Kyle Grillis	Ops Instr.	[Signature]	8-29-02	[Signature]	8-30-02
14. Tommy Harrison	OPS INSTR.	[Signature]	8-29-02	[Signature]	9-3-02
15. CURTIS BUFORD	OPS INSTR	[Signature]	8/29/02	[Signature]	8/30/02

NOTES: