

VARIOUS CHECKLISTS

FOR THE PALISADES INITIAL EXAMINATION - MAY 2005

**FORMS FROM
ADMINISTRATIVE SUBMITTAL:**

Facility: <u>Palisades</u>		Date of Examination: <u>May 2005</u>
Examinations Developed by: Facility / <u>(NRC)</u> (circle one)		
Target Date*	Task Description (Reference)	Chief Examiner's Initials
-180	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a and b)	BP
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	BP
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security and other requirements (C.2.c)	BP
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	BP
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c; Attachment 2)]	BP
-75	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due, including Forms ES-201-2, ES-201-3, ES-301-1, ES-301-2, ES-301-5, ES-D-1's, ES-401-1/2, ES-401-3, and ES-401-4, as applicable (C.1.e and f; C.3.d)	BP
-70	7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e)	NA
-45	8. Proposed examinations (including written, walk-through JPMs, and scenarios, as applicable), supporting documentation (including Forms ES-301-3, ES-301-4, ES-301-5, ES-301-6, and ES-401-6), and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g and h; C.3.d)	BP
-30	9. Preliminary license applications (NRC Form 398's) due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	BP
-14	10. Final license applications due and Form ES-201-4 prepared (C.1.i; C.2.i; ES-202)	BP
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f)	BP
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f and h; C.3.g)	BP
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	BP
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; examination approval and waiver letters sent (C.2.i; Attachment 4; ES-204)	BP
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee (C.3.k)	BP
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	BP
<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 Palisades Initial Licensing Exam

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of May 23, 2005 and May 30, 2005 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 May 23, 2005 and May 30, 2005. 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. Darrell Hensley	Sr. Nuc. Instr. / Facility Contact	<i>Darrell Hensley</i>	3/15/05	<i>Darrell Hensley</i>	7/27/05	
* 2. Floyd Lawrence	SRO / Val date	<i>Floyd Lawrence</i>	3/15/05	No longer with company	8/11/05	
3. MIKE BAILEY	NCO / VALIDATOR	<i>Mike Bailey</i>	3-15-05	<i>Mike Bailey</i>	5/11/05	
4. Daniel Bell	Sr Analyst / Simulator Support	<i>Daniel Bell</i>	4/14/05	<i>Daniel Bell</i>	7/27/05	
5. RALPH STARLAND	Sr Analyst / Simulator Support	<i>Ralph Starland</i>	4/21/05	<i>Ralph Starland</i>	7/27/05	
6. JORD MURPHY	SRO / VALIDATOR	<i>Jord Murphy</i>	4/21/05	<i>Jord Murphy</i>	8-1-05	
* 7. GEORGE STIENER	NCO / VALIDATOR	<i>George Stiener</i>	4/28/05	<i>George Stiener</i>	8/10/05	
* 8. John Slinkard	Senior Engineer	<i>John Slinkard</i>	4/27/05	Per phoncon @ Hensley	8/9/05	
9. Richard K. Mocerri	Senior Engineer	<i>Richard K. Mocerri</i>	4/27/05	Per phoncon - Hensley	8/9/05	
10. KEYEAGER	Assistant Ops Manager	<i>Keyeager</i>	4/28/05	<i>Keyeager</i>	8/10/05	
* 11. David Vandewalle	Operational Support Manager	<i>David Vandewalle</i>	5/3/05	No longer with company - NRC	8/10/05	
12. VIRGINIA L. MOCERI	SHIFT MANAGER / SNE	<i>Virginia Mocerri</i>	5/5/05	<i>Virginia Mocerri</i>	7/27/05	
13. Jess Suggs	SRO / PROCTOR SUPPORT	<i>Jess Suggs</i>	5/23/05	<i>Jess Suggs</i>	7/27/05	
14. STEPHEN MCCOSWELL	RO / PROCTOR SUPPORT	<i>Stephen McCoswell</i>	5-25-05	<i>Stephen McCoswell</i>	7-27-05	
15. SCOTT E. PITCHER	SRO / VAL / INSTR / SM / SA	<i>Scott E. Pitcher</i>	5-26-05	<i>Scott E. Pitcher</i>	7/27/05	
NOTES:						
16. Pat Pitcher	SRO / Surrogate CRS	<i>Pat Pitcher</i>	5/26/05	<i>Pat Pitcher</i>	8/9/05	
17. Gregg Smith	JCT Supervisor	<i>Gregg Smith</i>	5/26/05	<i>Gregg Smith</i>	7/26/05	
18. Stephen Botimer	ILT Inst. / Surrogate SM/SE	<i>Stephen Botimer</i>	5/27/05	<i>Stephen Botimer</i>	7/27/05	

** - Individual is no longer with NRC. ~~NRC~~

Richard K. Mocerri
 5-10-2005

Tier / Group	Randomly Selected K/A	Reason for Rejection
RO		
1/1	K2	Group K2 for SGTR importance ratings were all less than 2.5
1/1	K1	There were no entries for this K/A (Loss of Vital AC Elect. Inst. Bus)
1/1	K2	Group K2 for Loss of DC Power importance ratings were all less than 2.5
1/2	K1	There were no entries for this K/A (Loss of Condenser Vacuum)
2/1	K5	Group K5 for Emergency Diesel Generators importance ratings were all less than 2.5
2/1	A2	Group A2 for Instrument Air importance ratings were all less than 2.5
2/1	K5	There were no entries for this K/A (Containment)
2/2	K2	Group K2 for Fuel Handling importance ratings were all less than 2.5
1/1	A1	Several attempts were made to write an adequate question but one could not be written for this K/A.
2/1	K6	Several attempts were made to write an adequate question but one could not be written for this K/A.
SRO		
1/1	AA2.01	Several attempts were made to write an adequate question but one could not be written for this K/A.
1/1	AA2.05	Several attempts were made to write an adequate question but one could not be written for this K/A.
3	G 2.1.7	Several attempts were made to write an adequate question but one could not be written for this K/A.

Facility:		Date of Exam:		Exam Level: RO/SRO		
Item Description				Initials		
				a	b	c
1.	Clean answer sheets copied before grading			CDM		BP
2.	Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented			CDM		BP
3.	Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)			CDM		BP
4.	Grading for all borderline cases (80 ±2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail			CDM		BP
5.	All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified			CDM		BP
6.	Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants			CDM		BP
				Printed Name/Signature		Date
a. Grader	<u>Carl Wood</u>					<u>7/6/05</u>
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>NA</u>					
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>George Palagis</u>					<u>7-6-05</u>
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>[Signature]</u>					<u>7/6/05</u>
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.						

**FORMS FROM
PROPOSED EXAMINATION SUBMITTAL:**

Facility:	Date of Examination:	Operating Test Number:			
1. General Criteria			Initials		
		a	b#	c#	
a.	The operating test conforms with the previously approved outline; changes are consistent with sampling requirements (e.g., 10 CFR 55.45, operational importance, safety function distribution).	Con	Naw	BP	4/22/05
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	Con	Naw	BP	↓
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s). (see Section D.1.a.)	Con	Naw	BP	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	Con	Naw	BP	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	Con	Naw	BP	
2. Walk-Through 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 • operationally important 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 	Con	Naw	BP	5/17/05
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.	Con	Naw	BP	4/22/05
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.	Con	Naw	BP	4/22/05
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a.	Author <u>CARL MOORE / Carl Moore</u>	<u>5/17/05</u>			
b.	^{NRC} Facility Reviewer* <u>Nicholas A. Valos / Nicholas A Valos</u>	<u>5/17/05</u>			
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>Bruce Palagi / Bryce Palagi</u>	<u>5/17/05</u>			
d.	NRC Supervisor <u>Arthurson Peterson / Arthurson Peterson</u>	<u>5/14/05</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:		Date of Exam:		Scenario Numbers: / /		Operating Test No.:		
QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES						Initials		
						a	#	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.	Am	nav	BP				
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	Am	nav	BP				
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) 	Am	nav	BP				
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.	Am	nav	BP				
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	Am	nav	BP				
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	Am	nav	BP				
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.	Am	nav	BP				
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	Am	nav	BP				
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.	Am	nav	BP				
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.	Am	nav	BP				
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	Am	nav	BP				
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).	Am	nav	BP				
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	Am	nav	BP				
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes		--	--	--		
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	8	6	7/6	Am	nav	BP	
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2	1	2/1	Am	nav	BP	
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	4	4	4/4	Am	nav	BP	
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1	1	1/1	Am	nav	BP	
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2	2	2/2	Am	nav	BP	
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	0	0	1/1	Am	nav	BP	
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	2	2	2/2	Am	nav	BP	

4/22/05

5/17/05

4/22/05

Facility: <i>Palisades</i>	Date of Examination: <i>2005</i>								Operating Test No.:							
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 6,8	2,4 5,7	2,5 7	2,4 8	3,4 5,6 7,8	2,3 4,7 6,8	2,3 4,5 7	1,2 4,6 7,8	3,7 8	3,4 6	3,4 7	4,1,6 7				
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	2,4 5,6 8	1,2 4,5 7	1,2 7	2,4 8	2,3 4,5 6,7,8	1,2 3,4 5,7,8	1,2 3,4	1,2 6,7 8,9	2,3 7,8	3,4 6,8	1,3 4,7	1,6 7,9				
Operate Control Boards (2)	2,6 9,10 11	1,2 5,7	1,2 3,8	2,4 8	2,6 7,10 11	1,2 5,7	1,2 3,8	2,4 8	2,3 7,8	3,6 8	3,4 7	1,6 8,9				
Communicate and Interact	2,4 5,6 8	1,2 4,5 7	2,5 7	2,4 8	2,3 4,5 6,7 8	1,2 3,4 5,6 7	2,3 4,5 7	1,2 4,6 7,8,9	3,7 8	3,4 6,8	3,4 7	1,6 8,9				
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)					2,5 8	4,5 6,7	2,3 4,5 7	2,3 5,6 8,9								
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)					3,4	2	4,5	5,6 7,8								
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:

Carl Mose

NRC Reviewer:

Gene Palay 4/22/05

Facility:		Date of Exam:			Exam Level: RO/SRO		
Item Description					Initial		
					a	b#	c*
1.	Questions and answers are technically accurate and applicable to the facility.				Can	NAV	BP
2.	a. NRC K/As are referenced for all questions. b. Facility learning objectives are referenced as available.				Can	NAV	BP
3.	SRO questions are appropriate in accordance with Section D.2.d of ES-401				Can	NAV	BP
4.	If 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.						BP
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)				Can	NAV	BP
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	Can	NAV	BP
		4 1	0 0	7 124			
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		Can	NAV	BP
		31 11	44 14				
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers or aid in the elimination of distractors.				Can	NAV	BP
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.				Can	NAV	BP
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet the guidelines in ES Appendix B.				Can	NAV	BP
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.				Can	NAV	BP
a. Author		Printed Name / Signature			Date		
b. Facility Reviewer #		CARL MOORE / Carl Moore			4/22/05		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)		Nicholas A. Valos / Nicholas A. Valos			4/22/05		
d. NRC Regional Supervisor		Bruce Palagi / Bruce Palagi			4/22/05		
		AP Hinman Peterson / AP Hinman Peterson			3/17/05		
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.							