

EXAM ASSIGNMENT TICKLER

Chief:	Brian T. Larson	Facility:	STP	Date of Written Exam:	12/4/2009	
Start of Op Test:			12/7/2009	End of Op Test:		12/11/2009
Written Exam Developed By: NRC / Facility			Operating Test Developed By: NRC / Facility			
Due Date	Description	Date Complete	Initials	Notes		
6/5/2009	Written Exam & Op Test Dates Confirmed	1-20-09	BTZ			
7/31/2009	NRC Examiners & Facility Contact Assigned	1-20-09	BTZ			
7/31/2009	Facility Contact Briefed on Security & Other Req's	1-20-09	BTZ			
7/31/2009	Corporate Notification Letter sent	8-7-09	BTZ	ES-201 Att-4 produced by CE <i>Secretary on leave</i>		
9/4/2009	Reference material due (if NRC authored)	7-20-09	BTZ	ES-201 Att-3		
9/18/2009	Integrated exam outlines due	8-6-09	BTZ			
9/25/2009	Outlines reviewed by CE; feedback approved by BC	8-7-09	BTZ	ES-201-2 signed by CE & BC		
9/25/2009	Feedback on integrated outlines provided to facility	8-7-09	BTZ	NRC generated		
10/16/2009	DRAFT exam / docs / support reference material due	10-12-09	BTZ			
10/30/2009	Peer review of written exam complete	10-21-09	BTZ	Document review on ES-401-9		
10/30/2009	Preliminary license applications due	10-26-09	BTZ	NRC Forms 398/396		
11/6/2009	Preliminary license applications and waivers reviewed	10-29-09	BTZ	no waivers		
11/6/2009	DRAFT exam reviewed by CE; feedback approved by BC	11-10-09	BTZ			
11/6/2009	Feedback on DRAFT exam provided to facility	11-10-09	BTZ			
11-16-09 11/17/2009	On-site validation & 10% audit of license applications	11-19-09	BTZ			
11/20/2009	Final applications due & List of Applicants prepared	12-1-09 11-20-09	BTZ	ES-201-4 prepared by LA		
11/27/2009	Final applications approved & waiver letters sent	12-1-09	BTZ			
11/27/2009	Branch Chief approves FINAL exam (Written & Op Test)	12-1-09	BTZ	LA produces / BC signs Exam Approval Letter (ES-201 Att-5)		
11/27/2009	Proctoring/written exam admin guidelines reviewed w/ facility	12-1-09	BTZ			
11/30/2009	Exam material to exam team	12-1-09	BTZ			
12/7/2009	Administer Operating Test	12-11-09	BTZ			
12/18/2009	Facility post-exam documentation due	12-14-09	BTZ			
12/18/2009	NRC written exam grading completed	12-17-09	BTZ	ES-403-1 to BC		
12/18/2009	Examiner's document op test results on ES 303's	12-17-09	BTZ			
12/25/2009	Chief Examiner review of written exam & op test completed	12-17-09	BTZ	Signed ES 303's to BC		
1/1/2010	Branch Chief review of exam results completed	12-17-09	BTZ			
1/8/2010	Waivers/deferrals reviewed for impact on licensing decision	N/A	BTZ			
1/8/2010	License/Denial letters mailed; Facility notified of results	12-17-09	BTZ			
1/8/2010	RPS/IP number of examinees updated	1-9-10	BTZ	print Report-21		
1/22/2010	Examination Report Issued	1-27-10	BTZ	produced by CE		
1/29/2010	SUNSI checklist complete and exam docs to ADAMS	7-2-10	BTZ	SUNSI checklist to LA		
2/5/2010	Ref Mat'l Returned after Final Resolution of Appeals	N/A	BTZ			

Facility: South Texas Project		Date of Examination: 12/09		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1. W R I T T E N	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401.	*		BR
	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.	*		BR
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	*		BR
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	*		BR
2. S I M U L A T O R	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.	N/A ①		BR
	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 that scenarios will not be repeated on subsequent days.	BR		BR
	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.	BR		BR
3. W / T	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 alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form.	*		BR
	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	*		BR
	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.	*		BR
4. G E N E R A L	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam sections.	BR		BR
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate. JM's/scenarios	BR		BR
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	*		BR
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections. JM's/scenarios	BR		BR
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	*		BR
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO). for scenarios only	BR		BR
a. Author	Ken Struble		Printed Name/Signature	Date
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	[Signature]			7-30-09
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	BRIAN LARSON			8/5/2009
d. NRC Supervisor	Kelly Clayton for Mark Hance			8/7/2009 7/2/2010
Note:	# Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required. * Not applicable for NRC-prepared examination outlines			

* Submittal for scenario outlines only
 ① Scenario set has not been determined by the Chief Examiner

Facility:		Date of Examination:		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1. W R I T T E N	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401.	TP		NR
	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.	TP		NR
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	TP		NR
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	TP		NR
2. S I M U L A T O R	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.	TP		NR
	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 that scenarios will not be repeated on subsequent days.	TP		NR
	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.	TP		NR
3. W / T	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 alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form.	TP		NR
	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	TP		NR
	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.	TP		NR
4. G E N E R A L	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam sections.	TP		NR
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	TP		NR
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	TP		NR
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	TP		NR
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	TP		NR
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	TP		NR
a. Author	Anthony L. Pate / Pate		Date	
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	N/A		5-11-2000	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	BRIAN T. LARSON / Brian Larson		5-26-09	
d. NRC Supervisor	Stephen Garchow / Steve Garchow		12/01/09	
Note:	# Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required. * Not applicable for NRC-prepared examination outlines			

* Utility generated audit





① Scenario sets not completed by NRC → written by utility

② JPM authored by NRC and Utility jointly

Facility: <u>South Texas Project</u>		Date of Exam: <u>12/7/09</u>		Exam Level: RO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	SRO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Item Description	Initial				
	a	b*	c#		
1. Questions and answers are technically accurate and applicable to the facility.	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
2. a. NRC K/As are referenced for all questions. b. Facility learning objectives are referenced as available.	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
3. SRO questions are appropriate in accordance with Section D.2.d of ES-401	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
4. The sampling process was random and systematic (If more than 4 RO or 2 SRO questions were repeated from the last 2 NRC licensing exams, consult the NRR OL program office).	*	—	<i>MR</i>		
5. Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: ___ the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or ___ the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or ___ the examinations were developed independently; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or ___ other (explain)	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
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	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>
	11 / 2	0 / 0	64 / 23		
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	CIA		<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>
	34 / 8	41 / 17			
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers or aid in the elimination of distractors.	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
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.	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet the guidelines in ES Appendix B.	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
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. **	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>[Signature]</i>	<i>MR</i>		
a. Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Regional Supervisor		Printed Name / Signature <u>Ken Struble</u> <u>Mike DeFrees</u> <u>BRIAN T. LARSON</u> <u>Stephen Garchow</u>		Date <u>10-12-09</u> <u>10/12/09</u> <u>12-1-09</u> <u>12/01/09</u>	
Note: * The facility reviewer's initials/signature are not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.					

* NRC generated outline

** Cover sheet not provided, submittal is in "worksheet" format

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).			JS	MS	MR
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.			JS	MS	MR
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s). (see Section D.1.a.)			JS	MS	MR
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.			JS	MS	MR
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.			JS	MS	MR
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 			JS	MS	MR
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.			JS	MS	MR
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.				JS	MS	MR
	Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a.	Author	Ken Struble		10-7-09		
b.	Facility Reviewer(*)	Mike DeFrees		10/12/09		
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#)	BRIAN T. LARSON		12-1-09		
d.	NRC Supervisor	Stephen Gorchow		12/01/09		
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.						

Facility: <u>South Texas Project</u>		Date of Exam: <u>12/1/09</u>		Scenario Numbers: <u>1 (2) 3 (4)</u>		Operating Test No.: <u>1</u>	
QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES		Initials					
		a	b*	c#			
1.	The initial conditions are realistic, in that some equipment and/or instrumentation may be out of service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
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) 	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
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.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
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.	<u>N/A</u>	<u>→</u>				
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
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.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
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.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	<u>* N/A</u>	<u>→</u>	<u>NR</u>			
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).	<u>* N/A</u>	<u>→</u>	<u>NR</u>			
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>[Signature]</u>	<u>NR</u>			
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes					
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	<u>6</u>	<u>16</u>	<u>17</u>			
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	<u>2</u>	<u>11</u>	<u>12</u>			
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	<u>3</u>	<u>13</u>	<u>14</u>			
4.	Major transients (1-2)	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>			
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>	<u>1</u>			
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	<u>0</u>	<u>1</u>	<u>1</u>			
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	<u>2</u>	<u>3</u>	<u>2</u>			

* Scenario set has not yet been determined by the Chief Examiner
 ① ES-301-5,6 completed by NRC

Facility: <u>South Texas Project</u> Date of Exam: <u>12/3/09</u> Exam Level: RO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			
Item Description	Initials		
	a	b	c
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	W	A	AR
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	W	A	AR
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	W	A	AR
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 ±2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	W	A	AR
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	W	A	AR
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	W	A	AR
	Printed Name/Signature	Date	
a. Grader	<u>K. Struble</u>	<u>12-8-09</u>	
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Jon Pierce</u>	<u>12/8/09</u>	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>BRIAN T. LARSON</u>	<u>12/15/09</u>	
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>Steve Garchow</u>	<u>12/17/09</u>	
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.			

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009

Page 1 of 4
 01/09/2010 16:07:42
 Report 21
 Region: 4 Phase Code: 5

Exam Week	Site/Docket No./Insp Rpt #	# Candidates	Type	Exam Author	Chief Examiner	Examiners Assigned
11/16/2009	South Texas Project / 05000498 / 2009301 TAC #: X02429		Prep	NNN	LARSON, BRIAN T.	BIELBY, MICHAEL E. LARSON, BRIAN T.
11/16/2009	South Texas Project / 05000499 / 2009301 TAC #: X02430		Prep	NNN	LARSON, BRIAN T.	BIELBY, MICHAEL E. LARSON, BRIAN T.
12/07/2009	South Texas Project / 05000498 / 2009301 TAC #: X02429	RO - 4 SROU - 2	Admin	NNN	LARSON, BRIAN T.	BIELBY, MICHAEL E. CLAYTON, KELLY D. LARSON, BRIAN T. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C.
12/07/2009	South Texas Project / 05000499 / 2009301 TAC #: X02430	RO - 3 SROU - 2	Admin	NNN	LARSON, BRIAN T.	BIELBY, MICHAEL E. CLAYTON, KELLY D. LARSON, BRIAN T. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C.
12/14/2009	South Texas Project / 05000498 / 2009301 TAC #: X02429		Doc	NNN	LARSON, BRIAN T.	BIELBY, MICHAEL E. CLAYTON, KELLY D. LARSON, BRIAN T. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C.
12/14/2009	South Texas Project / 05000499 / 2009301 TAC #: X02430		Doc	NNN	LARSON, BRIAN T.	BIELBY, MICHAEL E. CLAYTON, KELLY D. LARSON, BRIAN T. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C.

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009

01/09/2010 16:07:42

Report 21

Region: 4 Phase Code: 5

Summary By Date

11/2009	STP - South Texas Project	RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO - 0	Total for South Texas Project: 0
11/2009		RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO - 0	Total for 11/2009: 0
12/2009	STP - South Texas Project	RO - 7	SROI - 1	SROU - 4	LSRO - 0	Total for South Texas Project: 12

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009

Region: 4 Phase Code: 5

Summary By Site

STP - South Texas Project	RO - 7	SROI - 1	SROU - 4	LSRO - 0	Total for South Texas Project: 12
---------------------------	--------	----------	----------	----------	-----------------------------------

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 10/01/2009 To 12/31/2009

16:07:42

Region: 4 Phase Code: 5

Summary By Region

Region 4	RO - 7	SROI - 1	SROU - 4	LSRO - 0	Total for Region 4: 12

Development

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 12-7-09 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 12/7/09. 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
Ken Struble	LOT SUPV	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/16/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/16/09	
Bernard F. Neunohr	Lot Training Inst	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/16/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/14/09	
DANIEL M. GOODWIN	SIMULATOR SOFTWARE SPEC	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/29/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/16/09	
Michael Scott	Simulator Software Spc	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/29/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/17/09	
Joseph A Brosky	Simulator Supervisor	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/29/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/18/09	
ROBERT RAB	SIMULATOR	<i>[Signature]</i>	5/5/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/14/09	
MIKE DEFREES	OPSTRNG SUPV.	<i>[Signature]</i>	7/7/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/11/09	
David Rubin	Procedures	<i>[Signature]</i>	8/16/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	11/5/10	
Jim Cabret	TRNG MGR	<i>[Signature]</i>	8/20/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	12/10/09	
MARK WALKER	ECO CENTER	<i>[Signature]</i>	2005/09	<i>[Signature]</i>	1-5-10	

NOTES:

Validation

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 12-7-09 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 12/7/09. 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. <u>Dawn Saldiva</u>	RO	<u>[Signature]</u>	9/7/09	<u>[Signature]</u>	1/12/10	
2. <u>Arlene Gorman</u>	US	<u>[Signature]</u>	9/7/09	<u>[Signature]</u>	1/12/10	
3. <u>Gary Lambert</u>	RO	<u>[Signature]</u>	9/22/09	<u>[Signature]</u>	1-12-10	
4. <u>LAWRENCE BOND</u>	US	<u>[Signature]</u>	9/22/09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12-11-09	
5. <u>JAMES R. HERRICK</u>	RO	<u>[Signature]</u>	9-22-09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12-11-09	
6. <u>James Redas</u>	US	<u>[Signature]</u>	9/22/09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12/12/09	
7. <u>Keith M. York</u>	RO	<u>[Signature]</u>	9-22-09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12-1-09	
8. <u>RICHARD SCHULTZ</u>	RO	<u>[Signature]</u>	11/16/09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12-1-09	
9. <u>JOHN McLEMMING</u>	RO	<u>[Signature]</u>	11-16-09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12-14-09	①
10. <u>JAY D. POWELL</u>	SKO/US	<u>[Signature]</u>	11/16/09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12/1/09	
11. <u>David Homer</u>	RP Tech	<u>[Signature]</u>	11-18-09	<u>[Signature]</u>	12/14/09	
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

NOTES:

① Burt H. Nash (Bernard F. Neusch) for Richard Schultz 01/12/2010 by Telecon at 1053.

