

**VARIOUS CHECKLISTS**

**FOR THE PERRY INITIAL EXAMINATION - NOV/DEC 2004**

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 11/29 to 12/6, <sup>2004</sup> 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 (e.g., acting as a simulator booth operator or communicator is acceptable if the individual does not select the training content or provide direct or indirect feedback). 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 11/29 to 12/6 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. DALE RICHMOND	INITIAL LICENSE TRAINING	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/21/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/20/04
2. Joseph D. Pierson	Regual Instructor	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/29/04	Joseph D. Pierson	2-2-05
3. Terry J. Reed	Instructor	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/1/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	2-2-05
4. BRIAN K Connors	CREW UNIT Supervisor	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/1/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	1-13-05
5. Jim CASE	CREW SHIFT MANAGER	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/1/04	Jim Case	1-25-05
6. DAN CONIGLIA	PEL-COORDINATION	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/11/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	2/10/05
7. RAY COLLIER	OUTAGE PERS RD	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/2/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	1-25-5
8. Anthony Winston	CREW'S BOOTH OPERATOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/2/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	2/2/05
9. JEFFREY, Henry J	CREW 5, RO	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/4/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	1/25/05
10. Faber A Kearney	Manager POS	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/15/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	1/25/05
11. Jim McHugh	OPTU SCREW	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/30/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	1/14/05
12. James A. Gerber	H/W Tech DTU	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/3/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	2/17/05
13. MICHAEL D. COLBSON	INSTRUCTOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/3/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/20/04
14. JAMES B KELLY	INSTRUCTOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/9/04	J. B Kelly	2/2/05
15.					

NOTES:

## Outline Submittal

Contains the following:






ES-201-2 Examination Outline Quality Checklist  
ES-301-5 Transient and Event Checklist

The Following were provided on magnetic media:

ES-301-1 Administrative Topics Outline (RO) (SRO)  
ES-301-2 Control Room and Facility Walk-Through Test Outline (RO) (SRO-I) (SRO-U)  
D-1 Dynamic Simulator Scenario Outline for 2 scenarios  
ES-401-1 BWR RO/SRO Examination Outline  
ES-401-3 Generic Knowledge and Abilities Outline (Tier-3)

Facility: Perry U1		Date of Examination: 11/29/2004		
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.	✓	MEB	SM
	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.	✓	MEB	SM
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	✓	MEB	SM
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	✓	MEB	SM
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.	✓	MEB	SM
	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 on subsequent days.	✓	MEB	SM
	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.	✓	MEB	SM
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.	NR	X MEB	X SM
	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) 4 - 6 (2 - 3 for SRO-U) 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.	NR	MEB	SM
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered.	✓	MEB	SM
	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 subsequent days.	✓	MEB	SM
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.	✓	MEB	SM
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	✓	MEB	SM
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	✓	MEB	SM
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	✓	MEB	SM
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	✓	MEB	SM
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	✓	MEB	SM
a. Author	David W. Reeson <i>David W. Reeson</i>		Printed Name / Signature	Date 11/28/04
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	Michael E. Bielby Sr. / <i>Michael E. Bielby Sr.</i>			6/25/04
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Dell R. McNeil / <i>Dell R. McNeil</i>			6/29/04
d. NRC Supervisor	KNS Linksburg / <i>KNS Linksburg</i>			7/1/04
Note:	* Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.			

\* Independently written at site

Facility: PERRY U1		Date of Exam: November 30, 2004			Operating Test No.: 2004301										
A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T  T Y P E	Scenarios												T O T A L	M I N I M U M
		1			2			3			4				
		CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION				
		S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P		
 SRO-I   SRO-U	RX		1			1			2						1*
	NOR			3			3			1					1*
	I/C		4,5	2,7		2,5	4,7		3,4						4*
	MAJ		8	8		6	6			5,6	9				2
	TS														2
 RO   SRO-U	RX	1	1		1	1		2	2						1*
	NOR	3		3	3		3	1		1					1*
	I/C	2,4 5,7	4,5	2,7	0,2 4,5 7	0,2 5	4,7	3,4 5,6 9	3,4 9	5,6 9					4*
	MAJ	8	8	8	6	6	6	2	2	2					2
	TS	2,4			0,2 4			3,4 5,6							2
RO   SRO-I	RX	1			1			2	2						1*
	NOR	3			3			1		1					1*
	I/C	2,4 5,7			0,2 4,5 7			3,4 5,6 9							4*
	MAJ	8			6			2							2
	TS	2,4			0,2 4			3,4 5,6							2

Instructions:

- Circle the applicant level and enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each event type; TS are not applicable for RO applicants. ROs must serve in both the "at-the-controls (ATC)" and "balance-of-plant (BOP)" positions; Instant SROs must do one scenario, including at least two instrument or component (I/C) malfunctions and one major transient, in the ATC position.
- Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.5.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D. \* Reactivity and normal evolutions may be replaced with additional instrument or component malfunctions on a 1-for-1 basis.
- 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:

*Dave W. [Signature] / Nicholas A. Valos*

NRC Reviewer:

*Steve R. McNeil*

## Proposed Operating Test and Written Examination

Contains the following:

ES-301-3	Operating Test Quality Checklist
ES-301-4	Simulator Scenario Quality Checklist (Op Test 1)
ES-301-6	Competencies Checklist (test 1)(copy)
ES-401-6	Written Examination Quality Checklist

The following were provided on magnetic media:

- One (1) RO administrative job performance measures
- Three (3) RO&SRO administrative job performance measures
- Two (2) SRO administrative job performance measures
- Ten (10) RO&SRO operating job performance measures
- One (1) RO operating job performance measures
- Three (3) dynamic simulator scenario guides (ES-D-1 & ES-D-2 equivalent for each scenario)
- Written examination (100 questions are independently marked as RO or SRO)
- Written examination question comments. Form ES-401-9 used to document facility comments.
- Operating Test Comments

Facility: PERRY U1		Date of Examination: November 30, 2004		Operating Test Number: 2004301	
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).	✓	NU	✓	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	✓	NU	✓	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s). (see Section D.1.a.)			✓	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	✓	NU	✓	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	✓	NU	✓	
2. Walk-Through Criteria		--	--	--	
a.	Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• initial conditions</li> <li>• initiating cues</li> <li>• references and tools, including associated procedures</li> <li>• reasonable and validated time limits (average time allowed for completion) and specific designation if deemed to be time-critical by the facility licensee</li> <li>• operationally important specific performance criteria that include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- detailed expected actions with exact criteria and nomenclature</li> <li>- system response and other examiner cues</li> <li>- statements describing important observations to be made by the applicant</li> <li>- criteria for successful completion of the task</li> <li>- identification of critical steps and their associated performance standards</li> <li>- restrictions on the sequence of steps, if applicable</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	✓	NU	✓	
b.	Ensure that any changes from the previously approved systems and administrative walk-through outlines (Forms ES-301-1 and 2) have not caused the test to deviate from any of the acceptance criteria (e.g., item distribution, bank use, repetition from the last 2 NRC examinations) specified on those forms and Form ES-201-2.	✓	NU	✓	
3. Simulator Criteria		--	--	--	
The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.		✓	NU	✓	
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a.	Author <u>David W. Reeser / David W. Reeser</u>	<u>10/27/04</u>			
b.	<del>Facility</del> Reviewer(*) <u>Nicholas A. Valas / Nicholas A. Valas</u>	<u>10/27/04</u>			
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>Dell McNeil / Dell R. McNeil</u>	<u>10/27/04</u>			
d.	NRC Supervisor <u>RD Linksburg / RD Linksburg</u>	<u>11/24/04</u>			
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.					

Q Audit exam to be reviewed during validation trip. - Audit complete ✓

Facility: PERRY U1		Date of Exam: 11/30/04		Scenario Numbers: 1 / 2 / 3		Operating Test No.: 2004301	
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.	JL	NU	DM			
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	JL	NU	DM			
3.	Each event description consists of <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated</li> <li>the malfunction(s) that are entered to initiate the event</li> <li>the symptoms/cues that will be visible to the crew</li> <li>the expected operator actions (by shift position)</li> <li>the event termination point (if applicable)</li> </ul>	JL	NU	DM			
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.	JL	NU	DM			
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	JL	NU	DM			
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	JL	NU	DM			
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	NU	DM			
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	JL	NU	DM			
9.	The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10 CFR 55.46(d), any open simulator performance deficiencies or deviations from the referenced plant have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios.			DM *			
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.5 of ES-301.	JL	NU	DM			
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	JL	NU	DM			
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).	JL	NU	DM			
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	JL	NU	DM			
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes		--	--	--	
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / 5 / 7	JL	NU	DM		
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	0 / 1 / 2	JL	NU	DM		
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3 / 2 / 2	JL	NU	DM		
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 1 / 2	JL	NU	DM		
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2 / 2 / 1	JL	NU	DM		
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1 / 2 / 1	JL	NU	DM		
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3 / 2 / 2	JL	NU	DM		

\* Validation to occur during week of Nov 1-5.



Facility: PERRY U1      Date of Examination: 10/30/2004      Operating Test No.: 2004301																
Competencies	APPLICANTS															
	RO/SRO-I/ SRO-U				RO/SRO-I/ SRO-U				RO/SRO-I/ SRO-U				RO/SRO-I/ SRO-U			
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	4 5	2 5	3 4		5 6	5 6	5 9		5 6	5 6	5 9					
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	4 6	2 6	3 4		5 6	5 6	7 9		5 6	5 6	7 9					
Operate Control Boards (2)	1 4 5	1 5 6	2 3 4						1 4 5	1 5 6	3 4 7					
Communicate and Interact	6	6	7 9		5 6	5 6	7 9		5 6	5 6	7 9					
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)					A L L	A L L	A L L		A L L	A L L	A L L					
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)					2 4	2 4	3 4		2 4	2 4	3 4					
Notes: (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO. (2) Optional for an SRO-U. (3) Only applicable to SROs.																

Instructions:













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

Author:

David W. Wiese / Nicholas A. Valer

NRC Reviewer:

William R. McNeil

Facility: PERRY U2		Date of Exam: December 9, 2004		Exam Level: RO/SRO																	
Item Description				Initial																	
				a	b*	c#															
1. Questions and answers are technically accurate and applicable to the facility.		JL		MGB	DM																
2. a. NRC K/As are referenced for all questions. b. Facility learning objectives are referenced as available.		JL		MGB	DM																
3. SRO questions are appropriate in accordance with Section D.2.d of ES-401		JL		MGB	DM																
4. If no more than four RO and two SRO questions are repeated from the last two NRC licensing exams, the facility licensee's sampling process was random and systematic.		n/a		n/a	n/a																
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 <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)		JL		MGB	DM																
6. Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank, at least 10 percent new, and the rest new or modified); enter the actual RO / SRO-only question distribution(s) at right.	Bank	Modified	New	JL	MGB	DM															
	18 / 0	14 / 6	43 / 19																		
7. Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the RO exam are written at the comprehension/ analysis level; the SRO exam may exceed 60 percent if the randomly selected K/As support the higher cognitive levels; enter the actual RO / SRO question distribution(s) at right.	Memory		C/A	JL	MGB	DM															
	37 / 7		38 / 18																		
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers or aid in the elimination of distractors.		JL		MGB	DM																
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.		JL		MGB	DM																
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet the guidelines in ES Appendix B.		JL		MGB	DM																
11. The exam contains the required number of one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with the value on the cover sheet.		JL		MGB	DM																
<table border="0"> <tr> <td></td> <td>Printed Name / Signature</td> <td>Date</td> </tr> <tr> <td>a. Author</td> <td>David W. Reeser / </td> <td>10/27/04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>b. Facility Reviewer (*)</td> <td>Michael E. Bielby / </td> <td>10/27/04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)</td> <td>Dell R. McNeil / </td> <td>10/27/04</td> </tr> <tr> <td>d. NRC Regional Supervisor</td> <td>Roger D. Lanksbury / </td> <td>11/24/04</td> </tr> </table>								Printed Name / Signature	Date	a. Author	David W. Reeser / 	10/27/04	b. Facility Reviewer (*)	Michael E. Bielby / 	10/27/04	c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Dell R. McNeil / 	10/27/04	d. NRC Regional Supervisor	Roger D. Lanksbury / 	11/24/04
	Printed Name / Signature	Date																			
a. Author	David W. Reeser / 	10/27/04																			
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	Michael E. Bielby / 	10/27/04																			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Dell R. McNeil / 	10/27/04																			
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	Roger D. Lanksbury / 	11/24/04																			
<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: Perry Nuclear Power Plant		Date of Exam: 12/9/04		Exam Level: RO	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	BP	N/A	sm		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	BP		sm		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	BP		sm		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 ±2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	BP		sm		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	BP		sm		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	BP		sm		
Printed Name/Signature		Date			
a. Grader	Bruce B. Palagi / <i>Bruce Palagi</i>	1-18-05			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	n/a	N/A			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	Dell R. McNeil / <i>Dell R. McNeil</i>	1/18/05			
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	Roger D. Lanksbury / <i>R D Lanksbury</i>	1/31/05			
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Facility: Perry Nuclear Power Plant		Date of Exam: 12/9/04		Exam Level: SRO	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	BP	n/a	DM		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	BP		DM		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	BP		DM		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 ±2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	BP		DM		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	BP		DM		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	BP	↓	DM		
Printed Name/Signature		Date			
a. Grader	Bruce B. Palagi / <i>Bruce Palagi</i>	1-18-05			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	n/a	n/a			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	Dell R. McNeil / <i>Dell R. McNeil</i>	1/18/05			
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	Roger D. Lanksbury / <i>R D Lanksbury</i>	1/18/05			
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					