

VARIOUS CHECKLISTS

FOR THE D. C. COOK EXAMINATION - NOV/DEC 2002

Facility: <u>DC Cook</u>		Date of Examination: <u>Nov 17 - Dec 9, 2002</u>
Examinations Developed by: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Facility / <input type="checkbox"/> 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)	drm
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	drm
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security & other requirements (C.2.c)	drm
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	drm
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c)]	n/a
-75	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due (C.1.e & f; C.3.d)	drm
-70	7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e)	drm
-45	8. Proposed examinations, supporting documentation, and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g & h; C.3.d)	drm
-30	9. Preliminary license applications due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	drm
-14	10. Final license applications due and assignment sheet prepared (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	drm
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f)	drm
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f & h; C.3.g)	drm
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	drm
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; assignment sheet updated; waiver letters sent (C.2.g, ES-204)	drm
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee and authorization granted to give written exams (if applicable) (C.3.k)	drm
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	drm
<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>		

1. Pre-Examination

2002

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 11-18 to 12-7 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 11-18-12-7. 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. <u>Steven W. Pettinger</u>	<u>Exam Developer</u>	<u>Steven W. Pettinger</u>	<u>6-19-02</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>12/18/02 *</u>
2. <u>THEODORE C. WICK</u>	<u>OPS TRAINING INSTRUCTORS</u>	<u>Theodore C. Wick</u>	<u>7/1/02</u>	<u>Theodore C. Wick</u>	<u>12/9/02 N/A</u>
3. <u>SHARON L. SMITH</u>	<u>OPS TRAINING CLERK</u>	<u>Sharon L. Smith</u>	<u>7-23-02</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>12/18/02 *</u>
4. <u>ROBERT E. NIEDZIELSKI</u>	<u>OPS TRAINING INSTRUCTOR</u>	<u>Robert E. Niedzielski</u>	<u>8/5/02</u>	<u>Robert E. Niedzielski</u>	<u>12/19/02 -</u>
5. <u>RONALD G. BROWN</u>	<u>OPS TRAINING MANAGER</u>	<u>R.G. Brown</u>	<u>8/5/02</u>	<u>R.G. Brown</u>	<u>12/11/02</u>
6. <u>TIM GARRISON</u>	<u>SOFTWARE ENGINEER</u>	<u>Tim Garrison</u>	<u>8/17/02</u>	<u>Tim Garrison</u>	<u>12/1/02</u>
7. <u>MYRON DALE TIDWELL</u>	<u>OPS TRNG INSTRUCTOR</u>	<u>Myron Dale Tidwell</u>	<u>8/26/02</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>12/18/02 *</u>
8. <u>Dale Jay Frie</u>	<u>OPS TRNG INSTRUCTOR</u>	<u>Dale Jay Frie</u>	<u>8/28/02</u>	<u>Dale Jay Frie</u>	<u>12-10-02 NA</u>
9. <u>GILBERT A DOTSON</u>	<u>AEO/OPS TRNGING INST.</u>	<u>Gilbert A. Dotson</u>	<u>8-28-02</u>	<u>Gilbert A. Dotson</u>	<u>12-10-02</u>
10. <u>James D Ross</u>	<u>Unit Supervisor / Validation</u>	<u>James D. Ross</u>	<u>9/13/02</u>	<u>James D. Ross</u>	<u>12/15/02</u>
11. <u>Tim Appelmann</u>	<u>Reactor Operator / Validation</u>	<u>Tim Appelmann</u>	<u>9/13/02</u>	<u>Tim Appelmann</u>	<u>12-15-02</u>
12. <u>Jayce Baker</u>	<u>Reactor Operator / Validation</u>	<u>Jayce Baker</u>	<u>9/13/02</u>	<u>Jayce Baker</u>	<u>12-15-02</u>
13. <u>David Dolby</u>	<u>Unit Supervisor / Validation</u>	<u>David Dolby</u>	<u>9-13-02</u>	<u>David Dolby</u>	<u>12-15-02</u>
14. <u>Tim Vaccaro</u>	<u>Simulator Supervisor</u>	<u>Tim Vaccaro</u>	<u>10-4-02</u>	<u>Tim Vaccaro</u>	<u>12/10/02</u>
15. <u>KARL MYERS</u>	<u>UNIT SUPERVISOR/VALIDATION</u>	<u>Karl Myers</u>	<u>10-7-02</u>	<u>Karl Myers</u>	<u>12-11-02</u>

NOTES: * (LINES 1, 3 AND 7) STEVEN PETTINGER, SHARON SMITH AND MYRON TIDWELL ARE NO LONGER EMPLOYED AT D.C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT. THESE PERSONS WERE RELEASED PRIOR TO THE EXAMINATION (DATED: 11/18/02 - 12/9/02). Wick 12-18-02

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 11/18-12/7 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 11/18-12/7, 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. FRITZ HEIMBIGNER	WCC RO / VALIDATION	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/17/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/17/02
2. TERRY STAFFELD	R.O. / VALIDATION	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/17/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/17/02
3. Keith Salvati	Simulator Maint	<i>[Signature]</i>	0/7/02	Keith Salvati	12-10-02
4. Shane Russo	Software Developer	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/27/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12-10-02
5. Paul Meistrop	RO / Validation	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/8/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12-15-02
6. K. G. R. KENDRALL	US	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/8/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/11/02
7. Tanya Ott	Simulator Cleric	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/9/02	Tanya Ott	12/10/02
8. JASON PROEBSTEL	AUX EQUIPMENT OPERATOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/10/02	Jason Proebstel	12/15/02
9. Evonne McDannell	Sr. Clerk - UDM	<i>[Signature]</i>	11-13-02	Evonne McDannell	12-11-02
10. JOHN T. CONRAD	ILT Training Instructor	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/18/2002	John T. Conrad	12/9/2002
11. MARK A. RUSSELL	US/ILT INSTRUCTOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/18/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/11/02
12. IVAN D. FLEETWOOD	ILT LEAD INSTRUCTOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/18-02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12-9-02
13. Jeffrey R. Shipe	Sr. INSTRUCTOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/28/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/9/02
14. RON SIEBER	OPS. MANAGER	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/14/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/11/02
15. Min Ke	Simulator staff	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/2/02	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/20/02

NOTES: NONE

PAGE 2 OF 2

Facility: <u>I. C. Cook 411/02</u>		Date of Examination: <u>Nov 17 - Dec 7 2002</u>		Operating Test Number: <u>2002301</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).	inf	inf	inf	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	inf	inf	inf	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a).	inf	inf	inf	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	inf	inf	inf	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	inf	inf	inf	
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 	inf	inf	inf	
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	N/A	N/A	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.	inf	inf	inf	
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	inf	inf	inf	
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.	inf	inf	inf	
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a. Author	<u>Steve W. Arthur</u>	<u>9/9/02</u>			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>RG Brown</u>	<u>3/9/02</u>			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>Dev R. McNeil / Supp. McNeil</u>	<u>11/13/02</u>			
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>RD Lanksbury / RD Lanksbury</u>	<u>11/15/02</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: DC Cook Nuclear Station Date of Exam: 11/18/2002 Scenario Numbers: 02 / 03/ Operating Test No.: Set 1					
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.	Suf	Rof	sm	
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	Suf	Rof	sm	
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) 	Suf	Rof	sm	
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.	Suf	Rof	sm	
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	Suf	Rof	sm	
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	Suf	Rof	sm	
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.	N/A Suf	N/A Rof	N/A sm	
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	Suf	Rof	sm	
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.	Suf	Rof	sm	
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.	Suf	Rof	sm	
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	Suf	Rof	sm	
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).	Suf	Rof	sm	
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	Suf	Rof	sm	
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		Actual Attributes			
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / 8 /	Suf	Rof	sm
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2 / 3 /	Suf	Rof	sm
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3 / 4 /	Suf	Rof	sm
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 1 /	Suf	Rof	sm
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2 / 2 /	Suf	Rof	sm
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	2 / 0 /	Suf	Rof	sm
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3 / 2 /	Suf	Rof	sm

Facility: DC Cook Nuclear Station Date of Exam: 11/18/2002 Scenario Numbers: 04 / 05/ 06 Operating Test No.: Set 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.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
3.	Each event description consists of . 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)	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
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.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
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.	Smp N/A	Rcb N/A	N/A Jm	
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
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.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
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.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
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).	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	Smp	Rcb	Jm	
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		Actual Attributes			
		--	--	--	
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	8 / 7 / 8	Smp	Rcb	Jm
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2 / 2 / 4	Smp	Rcb	Jm
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	4 / 4 / 3	Smp	Rcb	Jm
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 1 / 1	Smp	Rcb	Jm
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	1 / 2 / 1	Smp	Rcb	Jm
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	0 / 0 / 1	Smp	Rcb	Jm
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3 / 2 / 2	Smp	Rcb	Jm

OPERATING TEST NO.: DC Cook 2002 Set 1

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			Cook 02-02	Cook 02-03	-	-
RO	Reactivity	1	1	1		
	Normal	1	1	1		
	Instrument / Component	4	5	7		
	Major	1	1	1		

As RO	Reactivity	1	1	1		
	Normal	0				
	Instrument / Component	2	2	3		
	Major	1	1	1		
SRO-I	Reactivity	0	1	1		
	Normal	1	1	1		
	Instrument / Component	2	5	7		
	Major	1	1	1		

SRO-U	Reactivity	0	1	1		
	Normal	1	1	1		
	Instrument / Component	2	5	7		
	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 the minimum requirement.

Author:

NRC Reviewer:

Steven W. O'Brien
Bill R. McNeil

OPERATING TEST NO.:DC Cook 2002 Set 2

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			Cook 02-04	Cook 02-05	Cook 02-06	-
RO	Reactivity	1	1	1	1	
	Normal	1	1	1	1	
	Instrument / Component	4	7	6	7	
	Major	1	1	1	1	

As RO	Reactivity	1	1	1	1	
	Normal	0	0	0	0	
	Instrument / Component	2	3	3	3	
	Major	1	1	1	1	
SRO-I	Reactivity	0	1	1	1	
	Normal	1	1	1	1	
	Instrument / Component	2	7	6	7	
	Major	1	1	1	1	

SRO-U	Reactivity	0	1	1	1	
	Normal	1	1	1	1	
	Instrument / Component	2	7	6	7	
	Major	1	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 the minimum requirement.

Author:

NRC Reviewer:

Steven W. Bethune
David R. McNeil

DC Cook 2002 Simulator Exams Set 1(a)

Crews 1,2,3 Competencies Position Scenario Cook02-	Applicant #1 SRO-U				Applicant #2 RO				Applicant #3 RO			
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	SRO 02	SRO 03			RO 02	BOP 03			BOP 02	RO 03		
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	1,2,3	4,5,7			1,3	3,5,7			2,3	4,6,7		
Diagnose Events and Conditions	1,2,6	4,5,7,8			1,3,8	3,5,7,8			2,3,7	4,6,7,9		
Understand Plant and System Response	3,6	3,4,6,7,8			1,3,6,8	3,5,7,8			2,3,6,7	2,4,6,7,9		
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,2,6	4,5,7			1,3,4	1,3,5			2,3,5	2,4,6		
Operate Control Boards (2)					1,4,6,8	1,3,5,7,8			2,3,6,7	2,4,6,7,9		
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	3,6	3,4,6,7,8			1,4,6,8	3,5,7,8			2,3,6,7	2,4,7,9		
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	3,6,8	6,7,8										
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	1,2	3,4,5,6										

Notes:

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

Instructions:

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

Author:

Steven W. Pittman

NRC Reviewer:

Lee R. Mitchell

DC Cook 2002 Simulator Exams Set 1(b)

Crews 8,9 Competencies Position Scenario Cook02-	Applicant #1 SRO-I				Applicant #2 SRO-I				Applicant #3			
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	SRO 02	RO 03			RO 02	SRO 03						
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	1,2,3	4,6,7			1,3	4,5,7						
Diagnose Events and Conditions	1,2,6	4,6,7 ,9			1,3,8	4,5,7 ,8						
Understand Plant and System Response	3,6	2,4,6 ,7,9			1,3,6 ,8	3,4,6 ,7,8						
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,2,6	2,4,6			1,3,4	4,5,7						
Operate Control Boards (2)		2,4,6 ,7,9			1,4,6 ,8							
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	3,6	2,4,7 ,9			1,4,6 ,8	3,4,6 ,7,8						
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	3,6,8					6,7,8						
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	1,2					3,4,5 ,6						

Notes:

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

Instructions:

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

Author:

Steven W. Bellizzi

NRC Reviewer:

Lee R. McNeil

DC Cook 2002 Simulator Exams Set 2

Crews 4,5,6,7 Competencies Position Scenario Cook02-	Applicant #1 SRO-I			Applicant #2 SRO-I			Applicant #3 RO		
	SCENARIO			SCENARIO			SCENARIO		
	SRO 04	RO 05	SRO 06	BOP 04	SRO 05	RO 06	RO 04	BOP 05	BOP 06
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	4,6,7,9	5,6,7	3,4,5,6,10	5,6,7,9	3,4,6,7	3,4,6,10	3,4,7,9	3,4,7,9	5,9,10
Diagnose Events and Conditions	4,6,7,9	5,6,7,8	3,4,5,6,10	5,6,7,10	3,4,6,7,8	3,4,6,10	3,4,7,8	3,4,7,9	5,6,8,9,10
Understand Plant and System Response	3,4,5,6,7,9	5,6,7,8	3,4,5,6,10	5,6,7,9,10	3,6,7,8	3,4,6,7,10	3,4,7,8,9	3,4,7	5,8,9,10
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	3,5,9	5,6,7	3,4,7,8,10	1,5,6,9,10	4,5,6,7	3,4,7,10	2,3,4,8,9	3,4,7	5,8,10
Operate Control Boards (2)		2,5,6,7,8		5,6,9,10		2,3,4,7,10	3,4,8,9	3,4,7,9	5,8,10
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	3,4,5,6,9	2,5,6,7,8	3,4,6,7,8,10	5,6,9,10	3,4,5,6,7,8	3,4,7,10	3,4,8,9	1,3,4,7,9	5,8,9,10
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	6,7,8,9		3,4,5,10		3,4,5,6,7,8				
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	3,4,5,6		3		4,5,6				

Notes:

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

Instructions:

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

Author: Steven W. Bethune

NRC Reviewer: James R. McNeil

Facility: <u>DC COOK NUCLEAR STATION</u> Date of Exam: <u>11/18/2002</u> Exam Level: <u>RO/SRO</u>																		
Item Description	Initial																	
	a	b*	c*															
1. Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility	✓	ROB	du															
2. a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available	✓	ROB	du															
3. RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401	✓	ROB	du															
4. Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process			du															
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)	✓	ROB	du															
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 39	Modified 37	New 24	✓ ROB du														
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 47	C/A 53		✓ ROB du														
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers	✓	ROB	du															
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	✓	ROB	du															
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines	✓	ROB	du															
11. The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet	✓	ROB	du															
<table border="0"> <thead> <tr> <th></th> <th>Printed Name / Signature</th> <th>Date</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>a. Author</td> <td><u>THEODORE C. WERK / Theodore C. Werk</u></td> <td><u>9/23/02</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Facility Reviewer (*)</td> <td><u>RONALD G. BROWN / Ronald G. Brown</u></td> <td><u>9/23/02</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)</td> <td><u>DELLA R. McNeil / Della R. McNeil</u></td> <td><u>1/14/02</u></td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. NRC Regional Supervisor</td> <td><u>RD Lankford / RD Lankford</u></td> <td><u>11/15/02</u></td> </tr> </tbody> </table>					Printed Name / Signature	Date	a. Author	<u>THEODORE C. WERK / Theodore C. Werk</u>	<u>9/23/02</u>	b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>RONALD G. BROWN / Ronald G. Brown</u>	<u>9/23/02</u>	c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>DELLA R. McNeil / Della R. McNeil</u>	<u>1/14/02</u>	d. NRC Regional Supervisor	<u>RD Lankford / RD Lankford</u>	<u>11/15/02</u>
	Printed Name / Signature	Date																
a. Author	<u>THEODORE C. WERK / Theodore C. Werk</u>	<u>9/23/02</u>																
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>RONALD G. BROWN / Ronald G. Brown</u>	<u>9/23/02</u>																
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>DELLA R. McNeil / Della R. McNeil</u>	<u>1/14/02</u>																
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	<u>RD Lankford / RD Lankford</u>	<u>11/15/02</u>																
<p>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.</p>																		

Facility: <u>DC COOK NUCLEAR STATION</u>		Date of Exam: <u>11/18/2002</u>		Exam Level: <u>RO/SRO</u>		
Item Description	Initial			a	b*	c*
	a	b*	c*			
1. Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
2. a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
3. RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
4. Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process			<u>sm</u>			
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>
	35	30	35			
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>
	44		56			
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
11. The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<u>ref</u>	<u>sm</u>			
Printed Name / Signature				Date		
a. Author	<u>THEODORE C. WERK / Theodore C. Werk</u>			<u>9/23/02</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>RONALD G. BRONN / Ronald G. Bronn</u>			<u>9/23/02</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>Dell R. McNeil / Dell R. McNeil</u>			<u>11/14/02</u>		
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	<u>RO Linksbury / RO Linksbury</u>			<u>11/14/02</u>		
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: <u>D.C. COOK Unit 2</u>		Date of Exam: <u>12/9/02</u>		Exam Level: <u>RO/SRO</u>	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	<u>JTC</u>	<u>JD</u>	<u>SM</u>		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	<u>JTC</u>	<u>JD</u>	<u>SM</u>		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail	<u>JTC</u>	<u>JD</u>	<u>SM</u>		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	<u>JTC</u>	<u>JD</u>	<u>SM</u>		
Printed Name / Signature			Date		
a. Grader	<u>JOHN T. Conrad / JTC</u>		<u>12/9/2002</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>THEODORE WERK / TW</u>		<u>12/9/02</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>Deil R. McNeil / DRM</u>		<u>12/9/02</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>Bob Danksby / RD</u>		<u>12/20/02</u>		
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Facility: <u>D.C. Cook U11 & 2</u> Date of Exam: <u>12/9/02</u> Exam Level: RO <u>(SRO)</u>			
Item Description	Initials		
	a	b	c
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	<u>JR</u>	<u>J</u>	<u>BR</u>
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	<u>JR</u>	<u>J</u>	<u>BR</u>
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail	<u>JR</u>	<u>J</u>	<u>BR</u>
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>N/A</u>
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	<u>JR</u>	<u>J</u>	<u>BR</u>
Printed Name / Signature		Date	
a. Grader	<u>JOHN KONRAD / [Signature]</u>	<u>12/9/2002</u>	
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>THEODORE WERK / [Signature]</u>	<u>12/9/02</u>	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>DELL R. McNEIL / [Signature]</u>	<u>12/9/02</u>	
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>RJ D. Lankford / [Signature]</u>	<u>12/20/02</u>	
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.			