October 1, 2007

NOTE TO: Tom McKernon

Chief Examiner, Operations Branch

FROM:

Tony Gody, Chief Operations Branch

Division of Reactor Safety

SUBJECT: EXAMINATION ASSIGNMENT

You have been assigned as Chief of the Arkansas Nuclear One - Unit 2 examination. The operating test has been scheduled to be completed by February 29, 2008. Thank you for contacting Arkansas Nuclear One - Unit 2 facility to finalize the details of the examination. You are reminded that the RPS/IP system must be maintained to ensure that the examiners and numbers of candidates are accurate. In addition, you are reminded that only qualified examiners are permitted to conduct any part of the examination.

Tony Gody, Chief Operations Branch Division of Reactor Safety

CHIEF:	Tom McKernon	FACILITY:	Arkansas Nuclear One -	Unit 2	D.	ATE of OP	ERATING EXAM:	2/25/2008
Due Date	Description			Date Compl	ete	Initials	Notes	
8/29/07	Exam Administr	ation Date Confir	med (C.1.a; C.2.a & b)	1/07		8m6		
10/28/07	NRC Staff & Fac	cility Contact Ass	igned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	1/07		8m &		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
10/28/07	Facility Contact	Briefed on Secur	ity & Other Req's (C.2.c)	1/07		8mV		
10/28/07	Corporate Notific	cation Letter (ES-	-201 Att-3) Sent (C.2.d)	2/14/0	7	8m6	produced by Chief	Examiner
11/27/07	Reference Mate	rial Due (if NRC a	authored) (C.1.e; C.3.c)	NA		NA		
JE/12/07	Integrated Exam	Outlines Due (C	.1.e & f; C.3.d)	12/10/0	7	Smb		
12/17/07	Outlines Review	& NRC Feedbac	k Provided (c.2.h; C.3.e)	12/15/	07	Sm6		
/11/08	Draft Exams w/F	References Due (C.1.e,f,g,h; C.3.d)	1/11/0	Ş¢	Smb		
1/26/08	*Peer Reviewer	Completes Revie	ew of Exam on ES-401-9	1/22/2	38	Mot		
1/26/08	*NRC BC Appro	ves Feedback to	Facility (C.2.h; C.3.f)	1/23/08		AMG (
1/26/08	*Exams Review	ed w/ Fac. (C.1.h	;C.2.f & h; C.3.g)	1/23/2	8	Mt		
1/2 5 /08	Preliminary App	lications Due (C.	1.l;C.2.g; ES-202)	1/24 0	ğ	Jm6		
1/31/08	Preliminary App	ed (C.1.l;C.2.g)	1/24/0	SQ.	8m6			
2/1/1/08	Final Application	ns Due (C.1.I;C.2.	i;ES-202)	2/5/0	8	Sm6		
2/11/08	On-Site Prepara	itory Week to Val	idate Operating Exam	1/31/6	8	Jm6-		
2/11/08	On-Site Audit (1	0%) of License A	pp's (ES-202 C.2.e)	1/31/0	8	fm6		
2/18/08	Final Appl. OK'e	ed & Waiver Lette	rs Sent (ES-204; C.2.e)	2/11/0	8	8m6		
2/18/08	NRC Supervisor	r Approved Final	Exams (C.2.i;C.3.h)	2/11/06	ý	8m6		
2/18/08	Exam Approval (ES-201-4) Prep		tt-4) and List of Applicants	2/12/08	}	Sm6	produced by OLA	
2/18/08	Proctor Rules R	eview w/Fac. & V	Vritten Authorized (C.3.k)	2/20/0	8	Smo		
2/18/08	Exam Material to	o Exam Team (C	.3.i)	2/18/0	8	8m6		
2/25/08	Administer Oper	rating Exam On-S	Site	2/28/0	8	SMG		
3/8/08	Facility Graded	Exam & Commer	nts Received	2/27/	98	Smr		
3/11/08	NRC Written Ex	am Grading Com	pleted	2/28/0	38	Sm6		
3/11/08	Examiners Docu	ument Exam Grad	des on ES Forms	3/3/62	?	Smb		
3/21/08	NRC Chief Exar	miner Grading Re	view Completed	3/4/02	8	8m6		
3/22/08	NRC BC Review	v Completed		3/25/0	8	8m6		
3/26/08	License/Denials	Signed & Report	Issued	3/10/0	8	Smb	Report Prep	med
3/26/08	RPS/IP Number	of Examinees U	pdated	3/10/0	8	8m6	print Report-21	
4/10/08	Examination Re	port Issued		3/22/0		Sm 6	produced by Chief	Examiner
4/17/08	Package Closed	d Out		4/1109	Ż	8m6		
4/17/08	Chief QA of ADA	AMS and SISP re	view complete	4/1/0	8	8m6-		
* Indicates	the due dates are	more conservati	ve than the ES-201-1 requires.					

1/11/08

1/28

Wrt 2/22/08 Oprog 2/25-29/08 VDER Weell 1/28/08

a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that 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. c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D. 3. a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form (2) at least one task is repeated from the applicants' audit test(s) c. 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. 4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. B. A. Same and the control of the provide of the provide and the propriate exam section. C. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. D. A.	Facility	: Arka	nsas Nuclear One Unit 2 Date of Examination: 02/22 -02/29	2008					
a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all KA categories are appropriately sampled. C. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics. d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate. a. Using Form ES-301-5, werify that the proposed scenario sels cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sels (and spares) to test the projected number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sels (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected creve composition and rotation schedule without compromising oxam integrity, and ensure that each applicant can be tasted using at least one new or significantly modified scenario, that no scenarios are duplicated from the applicants and testifications and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the last two NIXC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (2) task repetition from the last two NIXC examinations is within the limits specified on the form the form the form the form the spic and the step applicant of the criteria on the form (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) (4) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA t	Item		Task Description						
b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled. c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics. d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate. a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that each applicant can be tested using at teast 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. c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form 2) task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form 2. the tasks are distributed among the startly individual among the startly audit test(s). 4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Verify that the administrative outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as	1.	а.	Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401.	Ba	D' D	C#			
C. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics. d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate. a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that each applicant can be tested using at least one new or significantly modified scenarios that the projected number and mix of applicants' audit test(s), and scenarios will not be repeated on subsequent days. c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D. a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) he required number of control room and in-plant tasks and substituted among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) in a basks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s). The number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (2) in testers are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s). Example of the lower of a proper state of the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified testes meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (2) at least one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations. c. 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. c. 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 da	W .			m.	/CK.	Car			
C. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics. d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate. a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that 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. c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D. 3. a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) 4. Werify that the administrative outline meets the criteria specified on the form (5) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified (3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations c. Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure than to litens are duplicated on subsequent days. 4. a. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. B. C. Ensure that K/A	1		Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.	PH	frem	me			
d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate. a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that 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. c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) confirm(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D. a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the laphicants' audit test(s) (4) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified (3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations c. 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. 4. a. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.414(3) and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. B. A. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. C. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. C. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job	Т	c.	Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	an	Ram	SMB			
of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications, and major transients. b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that 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. c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the tast two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) We will the summer of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (3) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (4) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (6) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (9) at least one task is new or significantly modified (3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations c. 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. 4. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. B. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. C. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (e		d.	Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	Bu	Rocu	8m t			
b. Assess whether there are enough scenario sets (and spares) to test the projected number and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected drew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that 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. c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conform(s) with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D. 3. a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) (4) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (5) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (6) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form (7) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (9) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are dusk is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations c. 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. 4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specif		a.	of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, technical specifications,	M	Per	8m 6			
a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) (4) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (5) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified (3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations c. 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. 4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). Betally a supplied that the appropriate is a supplied to the control of	I M U L A	b.	and mix of applicants in accordance with the expected crew composition and rotation schedule without compromising exam integrity, and ensure that each applicant can be tested using at least one new or significantly modified scenario, that no scenarios are duplicated	M	RK	Sm6			
(1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form (2) task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) (4) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form (6) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified (3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations c. 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. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. C. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. D. R. Sm. C. Enck the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). D. Facility Reviewer (*) C. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor	R	C.		W	ex	Sm f			
b. Verify that the administrative outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified (3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations c. 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. 4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). Date On Park Sm Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor Date 2 2 2/7/06 2 111/08	w /	a.	 the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks distributed among the safety functions as specified on the form task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria 	n/s	PK	Smf			
of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on subsequent days. 4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). Brill Copy Structure Stru		b.	Verify that the administrative outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-1: (1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form (2) at least one task is new or significantly modified	W	Pra	8m6			
4. a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam section. b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). Brinted Name / Signature fighted Name / Signature plant Simple Signature plant Signatur		c.	Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix	44	Re.	Smil			
b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). Brinted Name / Signature Carolina	4.	a.	Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered	Bu	PK~	8m6			
c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). By Cru Sm Cru Sm Cru Sm Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor C. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5. By Cru Sm Cru Sm Car Sm Ca		b.		an	Pan	8m 6			
d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). By Cru Sm Cause Sm Cau	N	c.	Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	Bru	PKW	8m b			
e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage. f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). By Cru Sm Cru Sm a. Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor P. LANT? Printed Name / Signature Carchow Sm Jacob Car		d.	Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	Bu	Prin	816			
a. Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). Date 02/06/08 2-6-08 2-6-08 2-17/06 2-11/08		e.	Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	BN	Poku	Smb			
a. Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor SI (Cob/e) STANT Chief Michael		f.	Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	Bre	RKU	8m6			
IL MOVIE. # Independent NDC Deviaure initial thems in Column #-# -blot executions are accounted.	b. Fa	acility f RC Ch RC Su	Reviewer (*) S. Garchow Sm Sand	2-1	te/08 6/08 5-08 - 2/ 1/08	, 7/08 2			

Facilit	y: Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 2	Date of Exam: 02	2/22/2008		Exam Lev	el: RO	⊠ SRC	□		
		Initial								
	а	b*	C#							
1.	Questions and answers are techn	ically accurate and appl	icable to the	facility.		Bu	Row	8m b		
2.	a. NRC K/As are referenced for a b. Facility learning objectives are	·				Bu	0	C.I		
3.	SRO questions are appropriate in			2 404		Bu	CKW	Con 1		
4.		MANA			guariana	an	Kenn	שוש		
4.	The sampling process was rando were repeated from the last 2 NR							Sm G		
5.	Question duplication from the lice as indicated below (check the iter the audit exam was systemati the audit exam was complete the examinations were develow the licensee certifies that there other (explain)	Bn	Rosin	Sm 6						
6.	Bank use meets limits (no more t		Bank	Modifie	d New					
	from the bank, at least 10 percen new or modified); enter the actual question distribution(s) at right.	t new, and the rest I RO / SRO-only	41.3/28	20.0/28	38.7/44	Bu	PK~	Smls		
7.	Between 50 and 60 percent of the		Memor	y	C/A					
	exam are written at the comprehe the SRO exam may exceed 60 pe selected KAs support the higher of the actual RO / SRO question dis	ercent if the randomly cognitive levels; enter	44 / 32	2	56 / 68	Bu	Row	Smb		
8.	References/handouts provided do or aid in the elimination of distract					Bu	Pau	Smr		
9.	Question content conforms with s examination outline and is approp deviations are justified				ed	Bu	Rkm	Sm b		
10.	Question psychometric quality an	d format meet the guide	lines in ES A	ppendix B		BU	PKun	6mb		
11.	The exam contains the required r the total is correct and agrees with		Itiple choice i	tems;		BN	RKW	8mb		
		Print	ted Name / S	ignature			D	ate		
a. Auth	•	6					d/)	4/08		
	-	dal Martin Y	Ma	*			1-6	1-08		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) S. Garchow Sm Sarch										
d. NRC	d. NRC Regional Supervisor R. LANT?									
Note:	* The facility reviewer's initials/s									

Fac	cility: Arkansas Nuclear One Unit 2 Date of Examination: 2/25-2/29 2008 Operating Test N	umber:	2008-	1		
1. GENERAL CRITERIA						
	OLILIAL SATERIA	а	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).	M	Ria	SME		
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	M	RKun	Sn F		
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s)(see Section D.1.a).	NA	Pan	8m6		
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	11/3	Ram	8m b		
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	48	Pan	Smb		
	2. WALK-THROUGH CRITERIA					
a.	 Each JPM includes the following, as applicable: initial conditions initialing 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: 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 	nji	Fran	Smb		
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.	N	PKun	Smf		
	3. SIMULATOR CRITERIA					
	e associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with m ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.	Nb	Prim	Smb		
a. b. c. d.	Author Author Facility Reviewer (*) NRC Chief Examiner (#) NRC Supervisor TE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests		Date 4/20 5-2 -7-0	800		
.,0	# Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence is required.					

2. The scenarios consist mostly of related events. 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) 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. 5. The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics. 6. Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives. 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. 8. The simulator modeling is not altered. 9. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Total malfunctions (5-8) 15. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 16. J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J	Initials			
service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events. 7. The scenarios consist mostly of related events. 7. Each event description consists of 8. the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated 9. the symptomis/cues that will be visible to the crew 9. the expected operator actions (by shift position) 9. the event termination point (if applicable) 1. 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. 7. The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics. 8. Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives. 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. 8. The simulator modeling is not altered. 9. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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. 8. 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. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Total m	b*	c#		
2. The scenarios consist mostly of related events. 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) 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. 5. The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics. 6. Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives. 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. 8. The simulator modeling is not altered. 9. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Total malfunctions (5-8) 15. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 16. J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J 1 J	كلاسر	Smb		
3. Each event description consists of • the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated • the mailtruction(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) 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. 5. The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics. 6. Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives. 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. 8. The simulator modeling is not altered. 9. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Total malfunctions (5-8) 2. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4. Major transients (1-2) 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2) 6. (1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1		Smt		
without a credible preceding incident such as a seismic event. The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics. Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives. 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. The simulator modeling is not altered. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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 scenario. All other scenarios have been altered in accordance with Section D.5 of ES-301. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d) Actual Attributes Total malfunctions (5-8) Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) Malfunctions (5-8)	فحس	Sme		
6. Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives. 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. 8. The simulator modeling is not altered. 9. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Total malfunctions (5-8) 15. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 16. Abnormal events (2-4) 17. Abnormal events (2-4) 18. Major transients (1-2) 19. Abnormal events (1-2) 19. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios). 19. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form effective using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form e	RKM	Smi		
The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(d), any open simulator performance deficiencies or deviations from the referenced plant have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained with Section D.5 of ES-301. 10. Every operator will be evaluated using at least one new or significantly modified scenario. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d) 15. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 16. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 17. I / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 / 1 /	Prim			
Operators have sufficient time to carry out expected activities without undue time constraints. Cues are given. 8. The simulator modeling is not altered. 9. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d) Actual Attributes 1. Total malfunctions (5-8) 2. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4. Major transients (1-2) 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2) 1. I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I	PKIN	Sm b		
9. The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10CFR55.46(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. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Total malfunctions (5-8) 15. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 16. Abnormal events (2-4) 17. Abnormal events (2-4) 18. Major transients (1-2) 19. Abnormal events (1-2) 19. Abnormal events (1-2) 19. Apnormal events (1-2) 19. Apnormal events (1-2) 20. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	PKM	NA 8m6		
performance deficiencies or deviations from the referenced plant have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios. 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. 11. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. 14. Total malfunctions (5-8) 15. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 16. Abnormal events (2-4) 17. Abnormal events (2-4) 18. Major transients (1-2) 19. Abnormal events (1-2) 19. Applicantly involved in the minimum number of transients and events specified on Form ES-301-6 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios). 19. Abnormal events (2-4) 10. Major transients (1-2) 11. All individual operator will be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit points). 10. Actual Attributes 11. Total malfunctions (5-8) 12. Abnormal events (2-4) 13. Abnormal events (2-4) 14. Major transients (1-2) 15. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	Ptm	8MX		
All other scenarios have been altered in accordance with Section D.5 of ES-301. All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d) Actual Attributes Total malfunctions (5-8) Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) Abnormal events (2-4) Major transients (1-2) EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	ekn	fm6		
(submit the form along with the simulator scenarios). 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). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d) 1. Total malfunctions (5-8) 2. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4. Major transients (1-2) 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	Prin	Sm 6		
specified on Form ES-301-5 (submit the form with the simulator scenarios). 13. The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position. Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d) 1. Total malfunctions (5-8) 2. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4. Major transients (1-2) 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	e Kun	Sm 6		
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d) 1. Total malfunctions (5-8) 2. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4. Major transients (1-2) 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2) Actual Attributes M. Actual Attributes M. Actual Attributes M. If I i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i i	Ra	Sm l		
1. Total malfunctions (5-8) 6 / 7 / 7 nh 2. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 1 / 2 / 2 nh 3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4 / 3 / 3 nh 4. Major transients (1-2) 1 / 1 / 1 nh 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2) 1 / 1 / 1 nh	RKM	SM (
2. Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2) 3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4. Major transients (1-2) 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)				
3. Abnormal events (2-4) 4 / 3 / 3 / 3 W 4. Major transients (1-2) 1 / 1 / 1 III 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2) 1 / 1 / 1 III	PKm	Sm		
4. Major transients (1-2) 5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	PKIN	Sm		
5. EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	Row	Sm		
	Rem	8m		
	لالاس	Sm		
6. EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	Pan	Sm		

Facility: A	ANO-2	Da	ate of Exam: 0	2/25/20	008		Operating 1	Test No: 1				
Ap	Eve		1			2		TOTAL	1 1 4			
	라	CF	REW POSITION		CF	REW P	OSITION	1				
Applicant	Event Type	SRO	ATC	вор	SRO	АТС	вор					
	RX	NA	5	NA	NA	NA	0	1	1			
	NOR	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	1,5	2	1			
RO-1	I/C	NA	2,3,7	NA	NA	NA	2,8	5	4			
	MAJ	NA	6	NA	NA	NA	6	2	2			
	TS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA NA	0 .	0			

- 1. 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility: A	 NO-2	Da	ate of	Exam:02/25/20	08	Oper	ating ⁻	ting Test No: 1				
Ąŗ	Eve	1				2		TOTAL	MINIMUM			
Applicant	nt.	CF	REW P	OSITION	CF	REW POSITION		<u> </u>	M			
ant	Event Type	SRO	ATC	ВОР	SRO	ATC	ВОР					
	RX	NA	NA	0	NA	5	NA	1	1			
	NOR	NA	NA	1	NA	0	NA	1	1			
RO-2	I/C	NA	NA	8,9	NA	3,7,9	NA	5	4			
	MAJ	NA	NA	6	NA	6	NA	2	2			
	TS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0			

- 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michae	el Blanchard	
NRC Reviewer:	5.	Garchow	

Facility: A	NO-2	Da	ate of Exam: 0	2/25/20	008		Operating 1	Test No: 1				
App	Even	CE	1 EEW POSITION		CE	2 DEM/ D	OSITION .	TOTAL	MINIMUM 1			
Applicant	Event Type	SRO	ATC	вор	SRO	ATC	ВОР		Α .			
	RX	NA	5	NA	NA	NA	0	1	1			
	NOR	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	1,5	2	1			
RO-3	I/C	NA	2,3,7	NA	NA	NA	2,8	. 5	4			
	MAJ	NA	6	NA	NA	NA	6	2	2			
	TS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0			

- 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility: A	NO-2	Da	ate of	Exam:02/25/20	08	Oper	ating ⁻	Test No	1 1 1 5 4 2 2		
Applicant	Event Type					2		TOTAL	MINIM		
dic	7	CF	REW P	OSITION	CI	REW POSITION			Z		
ant	Гуре	SRO	АТС	ВОР	SRO	ATC	ВОР				
	RX	NA	NA	0	NA	5	NA	1	1		
	NOR	NA	NA	1	NA	0	NA	. 1	1		
RO-4	I/C	NA	NA	8,9	NA	3,7,9	NA	5	4		
	MAJ	NA	NA	6	NA	6	NA	2	2		
	TS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0		

- 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michael Blanchard				
NRC Reviewer:	<u>S.</u>	Garchow			

Facility: A	NO-2	Date of Exam: 02/25/2008 Operating Test No: 1						: 1	
Ap	Eve	1			2			TOTAL	MINIMUM
Plic	a.	CF	REW POSITION		CF	REW P	OSITION	[M
Applicant	Event Type	SRO	АТС	вор	SRO	ATC	вор		
	RX	NA	5	NA	NA	NA	0	1	1
			•			3			
	NOR	NA	0	NA	NA	NA	1,5	2	1
Z.									
RO-5	I/C	NA	2,3,7	NA	NA	NA	2,8	5	4

	MAJ	NA	6	NA	NA	NA	6	2	2
	TS	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
				18.6			14/14		

- 1. 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility: ANO-2 Date of Exam: 02/25/2008 Operating Test No: 1						o: 1			
Ap	Eve		1		2			TOTAL	MINIMUM
Applicant	int J	CREW P	OSITION		CREW	POSITIO	N	i	M
ant	Event Type	SRO	ATC	вор	SRO	ATC	вор		
	D./					_			_
	RX	NA.	NA	NA	NA	5	NA	1	1
	NOR	1	NA	NA	NA	0	NA	1	1
SRO-I1	I/C	2,3,4, 7,8,9	NA	NA	NA	3,7,9	NA	9	4
	MAJ	6	NA	NA	NA	6	NA	2	2
	TS	4,5,7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	2

- 1. 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.
- 2. 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility: Al	NO-2	Date of Exam: 02/25/2008 Operating					g Test No	: 1	
Ąţ	Εve		1		2			TOTAL	MINIMUM
Applicant	ent .	CREW P	OSITION		CREW P	ositioi	V	ŕ-	M
ant	Event Type	SRO	АТС	вор	SRO	АТС	вор		
			: :	4 13			: -		
	RX	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
							2.34		
	NOR	1	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1
		·						:	. (
လ္ဆ		· ·		11			7 7 C		
SRO-U1	I/C	2,3,4, 7,8,9	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6	2
<u></u>		1,0,0							
			,			. 1			
	MAJ	6	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	1	1
						·		٠	
	TS	4,5,7	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	3	2

- 1. 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility: Al	NO-2	Date of Exam: 02/25/2008 Operating Test N						g Test No	: 1
Ap	Event Type	1			2			TOTAL	MUMINIM
Applicant	류	CREW P	OSITION		CREW P	···		1	M
ant	ype	SRO	ATC	ВОР	SRO	ATC	ВОР		
	RX	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	0	0
	NOR	NA	NA	NA	1	NA	NA	1	1
SRO-U2	I/C	NA	NA	NA	2,3, 7,8,9	NA	NA	5	2
	MAJ	NA	NA	NA	6	NA	NA	1	1
	TS	NA	NA	NA	3,5,7	NA	NA	3	2

- 1. 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.
- 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 requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns.

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
NRC Reviewer	5. Garehow	

Facility: ANO-2	Date of Ex	Date of Examination: 02/25/2008 C						
	APPLICANTS							
		R0 –	2, 4					
Competencies		SCENA	ARIO					
	1	2	3	4				
Interpret / Diagnose Events and Conditions	4,5,6,8,9	3,5,6,7,9	NA	NA				
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,4,6	5,6	NA NA	NA				
Operate Control Boards (2)	1,4,5,6,8,9	3,5,6,7,9	NA	NA				
Communicate and Interact	1,4,5,6,8,9	3,5,6,7,9	NA .	NA .				
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	NA	NA	NA NA	NA NA				
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	NA	NA NA	NA	NA				

Notes:

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

Instructions:

Author:	Michael Blanchard				
	<u> </u>				
NRC Reviewer:	<i>S</i> .	Garchow			

Facility: ANO-2	Date of Examination: 02/25/2008 Operating Test No.:								
	APPLICANTS								
		RO – 1,	3, 5						
Competencies	SCENARIO								
	1	2	3	4					
Interpret / Diagnose Events and Conditions	2,3,5,6,7	2,6,8	NA	NA					
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	5,6	1,5,8	NA	NA					
Operate Control Boards (2)	2,3,5,6,7	1,2,6,8	NA	NA					
Communicate and Interact	2,3,5,6,7	1,2,5,6,8	NA	NA					
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	NA	NA	NA	NA					
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	NA	**************************************	NA .	NA NA					
Notes:									

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

Author: _	Michael Blanchard	
	S Co. I	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility: ANO-2	Date of Examination: 02/25/2008 Operating Test							
	APPLICANTS							
		SRO-	<u> 11 </u>					
Competencies		SCENA	RIO					
	1	2	3	4				
Interpret / Diagnose Events and Conditions	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	3,5,6,7,9	NA	NA				
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	2,3,4,5,6,7	5,6	NA	NA				
Operate Control Boards (2)	N/A	3,5,6,7,9	NA S	NA				
Communicate and Interact	1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	3,5,6,7,9	NA	NA				
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9		NA	NA .				
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	4,5,7		NA	NA				

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

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
		•
NRC Reviewer: _	S. Garchow	

Date of Examination: 02/25/2008 Operating Test No.: 1							
	SRO -	U1					
SCENARIO							
1	2	3	4				
2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	NA	NA	NA				
2,3,4,5,6,7	NA	NA	NA NA				
N/A	NA	NA	NA				
1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	NA	NA	NA				
2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	NA	NA	NA				
4,5,7	NA	NA	NA .				
	1 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	APPLICA SRO - SCENA 1 2 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 NA 2,3,4,5,6,7 NA N/A NA 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 NA 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 NA	APPLICANTS SRO - U1 SCENARIO 1 2 3 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 NA NA 2,3,4,5,6,7 NA NA N/A NA NA 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 NA NA 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9 NA NA				

Notes:

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

Instructions:

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
	5 0 1	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility: ANO-2	Date of Examination: 07/17/2006 Operating Test No.:								
		APPLICANTS							
		SRO -	- U2						
Competencies	SCENARIO								
	1	2	3	4					
Interpret / Diagnose Events and Conditions	NA	2,3,5,6,7,8,9	NA	NA.					
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	NA	2,3,5,6,7,8	NA	NA					
Operate Control Boards (2)	NA	N/A	NA	NA NA					
Communicate and Interact	NA	1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9	NA	NA					
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	NA	1,2,3,5,6,7,8,9	NA	NA					
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	NA	3,5,7	NA	NA					
Notes:									

Notes:

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

Instructions:

Author:	Michael Blanchard	
	S C 1	
NRC Reviewer:	S. Garchow	

Facility	v: ANO Unit 2	Date of Exam: <u>02/22/2008</u>	Exam Level:	RO 🗵	SRC	
					nitials	3
		Item Description		а	b	,c
1.	Clean answer shee	ets copied before grading		Bre	PK-	Mb
2.	Answer key change and documented	es and question deletions justified		NA	PK-	NA
3.		checked for addition errors eck >25% of examinations)		Bu	PKm	Smo
4.		derline cases (80% ± 2% overall and % on the SRO-only) reviewed in deta		NA	RK	NA
5.	All other failing exa	aminations checked to ensure that gr	rades	MA	Prim	NA
6.	deficiencies and w	nissed questions checked for training fording problems; evaluate validity and by half or more of the applicants		Bu	Pam	Int
		Printed Name / Signature	e		D	ate
c. NRC	or lity Reviewer(*) Chief Examiner(*) CSupervisor(*)	Bill Coble/Brill Rangal Martin/RANG SM Harch R.E.L	e antz		2/3 2-21 3/3 3/6	06/08 -08 08 08 08
(*)		's signature is not applicable for examina C reviews are required.	ations graded b	y the N	RC;	

Pre-Examination

acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of February 18th and 25th scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted training content or provide direct or indirect feedback). Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented 2008 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 in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants 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 and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any ndications or suggestions that examination security may have been compromised

Post-Examination

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examinations administered administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, during the week(s) of February 18th and 25th 2005. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

DATE NOTE 2/2/08 2-4-08	80/82/c	2/28/08	2/28/08 2/28/08 2/28/08	3-3-28 3-3-8 3-3-8
NATE SIGNATURE(2)	208 Jan C. Marcon	12108 (1000) 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 1000 10	1-3-08 Wall Ar. 1-3-08	-28-08 (Jano Muller) -25-08 my Gris
SIGNATURE (1) DE MILIONI DE MILIO	Markow Thama	Mouth Magell	West Suries	Molly 377
JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY Instructor/Exam Developer Instructor/Exam Developer Facility Percent	KOD KUSSEL ENGRISHISUPPRET INARON ARAUS Admin. Specialist AMES Lyther UZSM/VALIDATION	UZ RO/VALIDATION UZRO/VALDAHON UZCRS/VALIDATION	Simulater Support SIMULATOR SUPPOINT REACTOR ENS.	Unit & Ops Instructor US RO MALIDATION UZ CRS/VOLIDATION
PRINTED NAME 1. Bill Coble 2. Mike Blanchard 3. Randal Martin	4. KOD KUSSEZ L ENGRESIM SUPPLET 5. STAROU ERAUS ADMIN. SPECIFIES 4. JAMES LyHER UZSM/VALIDATION	7. SHANTE HOOPER UZRO/VALIDATI 8. William Dush Kens UZRO/VALIDATION 9. Pavid OFFING UZERS/VALIDATION	2000	13 Chris Miller 14. MICHAGE FOSTER 15. Mavrus Schackt

%

Pre-Examination

acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of February 18th and 25th scheduled to be administered these licensing examinations from this date until completion of examination administration, except as specifically noted training content or provide direct or indirect feedback). Furthermore, I am aware of the physical security measures and requirements (as documented 2008 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 in the facility licensee's procedures) and understand that violation of the conditions of this agreement may result in cancellation of the examinations been authorized by the NRC chief examiner. I understand that I am not to instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants and/or an enforcement action against me or the facility licensee. I will immediately report to facility management or the NRC chief examiner any 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 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 <u>February 18th and 25th 2005</u>. 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.

					B	7.									
DATE NOTE	200 2/28/68	2/28/68	2/28/08	2/28/08	K Alley II.V.										
SIGNATURE (2)	(1) 12 H3 (C)	In Much	ha Cat 144	18/1/21	r Teledon VITON THE	.0 ,									
DATE	1-29-08	2-35-08	2/25/08	2/25/18	2/26/08										
SIGNATURE (1)	Ali Le Howell	The Malle	Rocat	73 / // m	Anthony R. Shend										
JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY Sinclots School Say	che//	Simulator Support	Cos. Asst. Mer	Simulator Fustucker	Shift Manayer	,									
PRINTED NAME 16. Soot Care	17. Charles O'Deil	18. Thouse Il Walker	19. Rodwey CArter	20. BriAN Howley	21. Anthony R. Sherill	.22	.3.	24.	25.	.16.	77.	.82	.6.	.0.	

NOTES:

14:10:25

Page 1 of 4 03/10/2008 Report 21 Phase Code: 5

Region: 4

Exam Week	Exam Week Site/Docket No./Insp Rpt #	# Ca	# Candidates	Type	Exam Author Chief Examiner	Examiners Assigned	100.70
01/28/2008	01/28/2008 Arkansas Nuclear One / 05000368 / 2008301 TAC #: X02373			Prep	GARCHOW, STEPHEN M.	APGER, GABRIEL W. GARCHOW, STEPHEN M. MCKERNON, THOMAS O.	
02/25/2008	Arkansas Nuclear One / 05000368 / 2008301 TAC #: X02373	RO - 5 SROU - 2	SROI - 1	Admin	GARCHOW, STEPHEN M.	APGER, GABRIEL W. GARCHOW, STEPHEN M. MCKERNON, THOMAS O.	
03/03/2008	Arkansas Nuclear One / 05000368 / 2008301 TAC #: X02373			Doc	GARCHOW, STEPHEN M.	APGER, GABRIEL W. GARCHOW, STEPHEN M. MCKERNON, THOMAS O.	

14:10:25 03/10/2008

Report 21

Page 2 of 4

Region: 4

Phase Code: 5

r	3550
	ate
	ByD
-	ımary
	Sum

	11/2008 ANO - Arkansas Nuclear One	Nuclear One			
	RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU-0	LSRO - 0	Total for Arkansas Nuclear One: 0
0	11/2008				
	- RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO-0	Total for 01/2008: 0
02/2008 A	ANO - Arkansas Nuclear One	Nuclear One			
	RO - 5	SROI - 1	SROU - 2	LSRO - 0	Total for Arkansas Nuclear One: 8
0	12/2008				
	RO - 5	SROI - 1	SROU - 2	LSRO-0	Total for 02/2008: 8
03/2008 A	ANO - Arkansas Nuclear One	Nuclear One			
	RO-0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO-0	Total for Arkansas Nuclear One: 0

14:10:25

03/10/2008 Report 21

Page 3 of 4

Region: 4

Phase Code: 5

ANO - Arkansas Nuclear One RO - 5 SROI - 1 Summary By Site

SROU-2

LSRO-0

Total for Arkansas Nuclear One: 8

14:10:25

03/10/2008

Page 4 of 4

Report 21

Region: 4

Phase Code: 5

Summary By Region

Region 4 RO - 5

SROI - 1

LSRO-0

SROU-2

Total for Region 4: 8