

Facility: St. Lucie 2011-301Date of Examination: 2/21/2011

Examinations Developed by:

Facility

NRC

Written / Operating Test

Written / Operating Test

Target Date*	Task Description (Reference)	Chief Examiner's Initials
-180	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a and b)	05/14/2010
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	09/15/2011
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security and other requirements (C.2.c)	09/15/2011
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	09/15/2011
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c; Attachment 2)]	01/05/2011
{-75}	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due, including Forms ES-201-2, ES-201-3, ES-301-1, ES-301-2, ES-301-5, ES-D-1's, ES-401-1/2, ES-401-3, and ES-401-4, as applicable (C.1.e and f; C.3.d)	12/13/2010
{-70}	{7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e)}	12/20/2010
{-45}	8. Proposed examinations (including written, walk-through JPMs, and scenarios, as applicable), supporting documentation (including Forms ES-301-3, ES-301-4, ES-301-5, ES-301-6, and ES-401-6), and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g and h; C.3.d)	01/03/2011
-30	9. Preliminary license applications (NRC Form 398's) due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	01/14/2011
-14	10. Final license applications due and Form ES-201-4 prepared (C.1.i; C.2.i; ES-202)	2/7/2011
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f)	2/7/2011
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f and h; C.3.g)	2/7/2011
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	2/14/2011
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; 1 or 2 (if >10) applications audited to confirm qualifications / eligibility; and examination approval and waiver letters sent (C.2.i; Attachment 4; ES-202, C.2.e; ES-204)	2/14/2011
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee (C.3.k)	2/14/2011
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	2/14/2011

* Target dates are generally based on facility-prepared examinations and are keyed to the examination date identified in the corporate notification letter. They are for planning purposes and may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the facility licensee.

[Applies only] {Does not apply} to examinations prepared by the NRC.

For Operating TBT & General.

ES-201 Examination Outline Quality Checklist Form ES-201-2

Facility: <u>ST. LUCIE</u>		Date of Examination: <u>2-21-11</u>		
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.	N/A	N/A	N/A
	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.			
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.	LMR	OL	JS
	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.	LMR	OL	JS
	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.	LMR	OL	JS
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.	LMR	OL	JS
	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	LMR	OL	JS
	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.	LMR	OL	JS
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.	LMR	OL	JS
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	LMR	OL	JS
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	LMR	OL	JS
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	LMR	OL	JS
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	LMR	OL	JS
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	LMR	OL	JS
a. Author <u>LARRY RICH</u> Printed Name/Signature		Date <u>2-3-11</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer (*) <u>David Langer</u>		<u>2/3/11</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>GEORGE W. LASER</u>		<u>2/10/2011</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor <u>UNCOLT. WIDMANN</u>		<u>02/09/11</u>		
Note: # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required. * Not applicable for NRC-prepared examination outlines				

Written Exam

ES-201

Examination Outline Quality Checklist

Form ES-201-2

Facility: ST. LUCIE		Date of Examination: FEBRUARY 2011		
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.	M	N/A	
	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.	M	N/A	
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	M	N/A	
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	M	N/A	
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.			
	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.			
	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. 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.	N/A		
	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. 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.	M	N/A	
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	M	N/A	
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	M	N/A	
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	N/A	N/A	N/A
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	M	N/A	
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	M	N/A	
<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <div> <p>a. Author <u>MICHAEL MEEKS</u> <i>Michael Meeks</i></p> <p>b. Facility Reviewer (*) <u>N/A</u></p> <p>c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>GERARD W. LASKA</u> <i>Gerard W. Laska</i></p> <p>d. NRC Supervisor <u>LALLOUAT. WIDJAJAN</u> <i>Lallouat. Widjajan</i></p> </div> <div style="text-align: right;"> <p>03/31/2010 Date</p> <p>04/22/2010</p> <p>04/22/2010</p> <p>05/04/10</p> </div> </div>				
<p>Note: # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required. * Not applicable for NRC-prepared examination outlines</p>				



Florida Power & Light Company, 6501 S. Ocean Drive, Jensen Beach, FL 34957

April 15, 2011

10 CFR 55.5
10 CFR 55.40
L-2011-132

Mr. Malcolm Widmann
Attn. Mr. Gerard Laska
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Region II
Marquis One Tower
245 Peachtree Center Ave., NE, Suite 1200
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257

RE: St. Lucie Units 1 & 2
Docket Nos. 50-335 and 50-389
Post NRC Written Examination Facility Activities--
050000335/2011301 & 05000389/2011301
Facility License Nos. DPR-67 and NFP-16

In accordance with Operator Licensing Examination Standards for Power Reactors, NUREG-1021 Revision 9, Supplement 1, ES-403 and ES-501, Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) submitted HLC-20 NRC post examination facility activities via FPL letter L-2011-114 dated March 24, 2011. Letter stated that ES-201-3, Examination Security Agreement, would be sent under separate cover.

Enclosed for your review is ES-201-3, Examination Security Agreement.

Questions or comments should be directed to Terry Benton at (772) 539-2597, or Dave Lanyi at (772) 532-0106.

Very truly yours,

Richard L. Anderson
Site Vice President
St. Lucie Plant

RLA/tlt

Enclosure

APR 19 2011

Enclosure
L-2011-132

ES-201

**Examination Security Agreement
(46 pages)**

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2-21-11 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 2-21-11. 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. LARRY RICH	EXAM DEVELOPER	<i>Larry Rich</i>	5-4-10	<i>Larry Rich</i>	3-18-11
2. Paul Farnsworth	Exam Developer	<i>Paul Farnsworth</i>	5/4/10	<i>Paul Farnsworth</i>	3/18/11
3. Chuck Sizemore	MGR FLEET OPS TRAINING	<i>Chuck Sizemore</i>	5/4/10	<i>Chuck Sizemore</i>	3/18/11
4. Terry Benton	Exam Project Mgr	<i>Terry Benton</i>	5/4/10	<i>Terry Benton</i>	3/18/11
5. Dennis Borgmann	Exam Developer	<i>Dennis Borgmann</i>	5/4/10	<i>Dennis Borgmann</i>	3/18/11
6. Mike Bladick	ADM	<i>Mike Bladick</i>	7/13/10	<i>Mike Bladick</i>	3/21/11
7. David Long	SRO - Security rep	<i>David Long</i>	8/18/10	<i>David Long</i>	3/22/11
8. MARK SKELCHAK	FLEET IGT COORDINATOR	<i>Mark Skelchak</i>	8/25/10	<i>Mark Skelchak</i>	3/22/11
9. Reid Watson	Simulator Engineer	<i>Reid Watson</i>	9/16/10	<i>Reid Watson</i>	3/18/2010
10. CLYDE PREECE	RCO Validation	<i>Clyde Preece</i>	9/9/10	<i>Clyde Preece</i>	
11. Brad Bishop	Validation	<i>Brad Bishop</i>	9/9/10	<i>Brad Bishop</i>	
12. Christy Nicholas	Validation	<i>Christy Nicholas</i>	9/9/10	<i>Christy Nicholas</i>	
13. Stephen E. Mohr	Simulator Engineer	<i>Stephen E. Mohr</i>	10/18/10	<i>Stephen E. Mohr</i>	
14. CALVIN D. WALRATH	EXAM DEVELOPER	<i>Calvin Walrath</i>	10/21/10	<i>Calvin Walrath</i>	3-21-11
15. JOSEPH SORRENTINO	SEG SUPPORT TECH	<i>Joseph Sorrentino</i>	10/22/10	<i>Joseph Sorrentino</i>	3/18/11

NOTES:

* email response attached

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 5/4/10 - 3/15/11 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 5/4/10 - 3/15/11. 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. Nick Radatz	Simulator Support Supt	Nick Radatz	10/22/10	Nick Radatz	3-18-11	
2. Margaret Horchar	Adm. Support	Margaret Horchar	10/25/10	Margaret Horchar	3-18-11	
3. LANISET M	WRITTEN EXAM	Line not used	see next line			
4. ROGER SHERWOOD	VALIDATOR	ROGER SHERWOOD	10/26/10	ROGER SHERWOOD	3/21/11	
5. ROGER SHERWOOD	WRITTEN EXAM VALIDATOR	ROGER SHERWOOD	10/26/10	ROGER SHERWOOD	*	
6. Keith P. Brayer	RLO Exam Validation	Keith P. Brayer	10-26-10	Keith P. Brayer	3-21-11	
7. Joe Herring	WRITTEN EXAM Validation	Joe Herring	10-26-10	Joe Herring	3-21-11	
8. Dennis Emborsky	JM	Dennis Emborsky	11/27/10	Dennis Emborsky	3/18/11	
9. Maria Wolmar	Adm. Support	Maria Wolmar	10/27/10	Maria Wolmar	3/18/11	
10. KEITH H. HILYER	VALIDATION	KEITH H. HILYER	11/3/10	KEITH H. HILYER	*	
11. ERIC Bushman	RLO	ERIC Bushman	11-4-10	ERIC Bushman	*	
12. G. Cook	RLO	G. Cook	11/4/10	G. Cook	*	
13. RON GORDINSKI	RLO	RON GORDINSKI	11-4-10	RON GORDINSKI	*	
14. Rob Weber	SEO	Rob Weber	11-11-10	Rob Weber	*	
15. WADE BERNIER	UNIT SUP	WADE BERNIER	11/4/10	WADE BERNIER	*	

NOTES:

① REMOVED FROM VALIDATION C.C.E.W PRIOR TO EXAM KNOWLEDGE.
* E-MAIL RESPONSE ATTACHED

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2-21-11 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 2-21-11. 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. James R. Guist	Reactor Control Oper.	James R. Guist	11-18-10	*		
2. SETH DUSTON	TRAINING MANAGER	Seth Duston	11/11/10	Seth Duston	3/18/11	
3. DENNIS A. PHILLIPS	REACTOR CONTROL OPERATOR	Dennis A. Phillips	12/2/10	Dennis A. Phillips	3/2/11	
4. Emerson R. Brulley	UNIT SUPERVISOR / SRO	Emerson R. Brulley	12/2/10	*		
5. SEAN WYLIE	PVNGS EXAM AUTHORIZED	Sean Wylie	12-8-10	*		
6. Warren Potter	PVNGS Simulator Support SL	Warren Potter	12/9/10	*		
7. George Loudakis	UNIT SUPERVISOR	George Loudakis	12/13/10	*		
8. Holzmacher	RCO	Holzmacher	12/13/10	H	3-31-11	
9. Jason West	SRO	Jason West	12/15/10	*		
10. Ron PENNINGA	RCO	Ron Penninga	12/15/10	*		
11. Reese Kilian	SRO	Reese Kilian	12/29/10	*		
12. John Island	SRO	John Island	12-29-10	*		
13. Fred Dennis	ILT SUPERVISOR	Fred Dennis	1/3/11	Fred Dennis	3/17/11	
14. RD PITS	Unit Supervisor	RD PITS	1-24-11	*		
15. Jeff Abernethy	SRO	Jeff Abernethy	1/24/11	*		

NOTES:

* E-MAIL RESPONSE
ATTACHED

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2-21-11 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 2-21-11. 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>JAMES R. GUST</u>	<u>Reactor Control Oper.</u>	<u>James R. Gust</u>	<u>11-18-10</u>			<u>①</u>
2.	<u>SETH DUSTON</u>	<u>TRAINING MANAGER</u>	<u>Seth Duston</u>	<u>11/1/10</u>			<u>①</u>
3.	<u>DENNIS A. PHILLIPS</u>	<u>REACTOR CONTROL OPERATOR</u>	<u>Dennis A. Phillips</u>	<u>12/2/10</u>			<u>①</u>
4.	<u>FRANCISCO R. BOVILLA</u>	<u>UNIT SUPERVISOR / SRO</u>	<u>Francisco R. Bovilla</u>	<u>12/2/10</u>			<u>①</u>
5.	<u>LARRY L. HARTLEY</u>	<u>REACTOR CONTROL OPERATOR</u>	<u>Larry L. Hartley</u>	<u>12/9/10</u>	<u>Larry L. Hartley</u>	<u>3/1/11</u>	
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							

NOTES: ① sign off tracked on separate copy that is included in this package.

Page 5 of 8

~~PAGE 3 OF 8~~ 3/31/11

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2-21-11 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 2-21-11. 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. James R. Guist	Reactor Control Oper.	James R. Guist	11-18-10			①
2. SETH DUSTON	TRAINING MANAGER	Seth Duston	04/1/10			①
3. DENNIS A. PHILLIPS	REACTION CONTROL OPERATOR	Dennis A. Phillips	12/12/10			①
4. FRANKLIN R. BOWEN	UNIT SUPERVISOR / SRO	Franklin R. Bowen	12/12/10			①
5. JOHN B. RODEN	REVIEWER	John B. Roden	12/19/10	*		
6.						
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

NOTES:

① sign off tracked on separate copy that is included in this package.

* ATTACHED FAX

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/21/11 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 2/21/11. 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. Betty Thompson	Administrative	Betty Thompson	1/25/11	Betty Thompson	1/31/11	
2. JOHN HLYWA	N/S	John Hlywa	1/27/11	John Hlywa	03/21/11	
3. Allan Wier	RP Instructor	Allan Wier	2/12/11	Allan Wier	3/18/11	
4. Fred Pollak	Unit Supervisor	Fred Pollak	2/3/11	Fred Pollak		
5. J.D. Carpenter	INSTRUCTOR/VALIDATION	J.D. Carpenter	2/24/11	J.D. Carpenter	3/26/11	
6. KEVIN KIRCHBAUM	UNIT SUPERVISOR	Kevin Kirchbaum	2/5/11	Kevin Kirchbaum	3/2/11	
7. Carlos Santos	UNIT SUPERVISOR	Carlos Santos	2/7/11	Carlos Santos		
8. Tom Brown	RCG	Tom Brown	2-16-11	Tom Brown	3-31-11	
9. TIM BOLANDER	PTN/EPU	Tim Bolander	2/18/11	Tim Bolander		
10. Ronnie Lingle	OPERATIONS MGR	Ronnie Lingle	2-18-11	Ronnie Lingle	3 21/11	
11. Ed Gatto	OPS INSTRUCTOR/OPS JPMs	Ed Gatto	2-27-11	Ed Gatto	3/4/11	
12. ANNA LEWIS	OPS INSTRUCTOR / OPS JPMs	Anna Lewis	2/21/11	Anna Lewis	3/21/11	
13. WALT DAUGHTRY	OPS INSTRUCTOR / SEQUESTER/SPM	Walt Daughtry	2/21/11	Walt Daughtry	3-3-11	
14. MIKE SCHEIDEGGER	OPS INSTRUCTOR / SEQUESTER / SPM	Mike Scheidegger	2/21/11	Mike Scheidegger	3/3/11	
15. Brian Nichols	OPS Instructor / Sequester / JPM	Brian Nichols	2/21/11	Brian Nichols	3/3/11	

NOTES:

* E-MAIL RESPONSE
 ATTACHED
 * ATTACHED FAX

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/21/11 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 2/21/11. 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. Betty Thompson	Administrative	Betty Thompson	1/25/11			0
2. JOHN Hlywa	NIS	John Hlywa	1/21/11			0
3. Allan Uher	RP Instructor	Allan Uher	2/2/11			0
4. Fred Pollak	Unit Supervisor	Fred Pollak	2/3/11			0
5. J.D. Carpenter	INSTRUCTOR/VALIDATION	J.D. Carpenter	2/24/11			0
6. Todd A. Horton	AOM Operations	Todd A. Horton	2/4/11	*		
7.						
8.						
9.						
10.						
11.						
12.						
13.						
14.						
15.						

NOTES: ① sign off tracked on separate copy that is included in this package.

* E-MAIL RESPONSE ATTACHED

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/21/11 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 2/21/11. 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>Randall F. Sargent</u>	<u>OPS Instructor/Sequester /NPM</u>	<u>Randall F. Sargent</u>	<u>2/21/11</u>	<u>Randall F. Sargent</u>	<u>3/2/11</u>	
2. <u>Ron Lauver</u>	<u>OPS Instr/Sequester/JPM</u>	<u>Ron Lauver</u>	<u>2/21/11</u>	<u>Ron Lauver</u>	<u>3/3/11</u>	
3. <u>JAMES MANN</u>	<u>OPS INSTR/Sequester/JPM</u>	<u>James Mann</u>	<u>2/21/11</u>	<u>James Mann</u>	<u>3/3/11</u>	
4. <u>Troy Spillman</u>	<u>OPS Shift Manager</u>	<u>Troy Spillman</u>	<u>2/23/11</u>	<u>Troy Spillman</u>	<u>3/2/11</u>	
5. <u>CHARLES PIKE</u>	<u>OPS UNIT SUPERVISOR</u>	<u>Charles Pike</u>	<u>2/23/11</u>	<u>C. Pike</u>	<u>3/2/11</u>	
6. <u>PAUL RASMY</u>	<u>WRITTEN EXAM VALIDATION</u>	<u>Paul Rasmy</u>	<u>2/23/11</u>	<u>Paul Rasmy</u>	<u>3/2/11</u>	
7. <u>Winston Ryley</u>	<u>Written Exam Validation</u>	<u>Winston Ryley</u>	<u>2/23/11</u>	<u>Winston Ryley</u>	<u>3/2/11</u>	
8. <u>Randall Sargent</u>	<u>Written Exam Proctor</u>	<u>Randall Sargent</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	<u>Randall Sargent</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	
9. <u>Brian Nichols</u>	<u>Written Exam Proctor</u>	<u>Brian Nichols</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	<u>Brian Nichols</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	
10. <u>Ron Lauver</u>	<u>Written Exam</u>	<u>Ron Lauver</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	<u>Ron Lauver</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	
11. <u>LJACT DAUGHTRY</u>	<u>WRITTEN EXAM</u>	<u>LJACT DAUGHTRY</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	<u>LJACT DAUGHTRY</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	
12. <u>ATIANA LEWIS</u>	<u>OPS INSTRUCTOR / EVALUATOR / PROCTOR</u>	<u>Atiana Lewis</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	<u>Atiana Lewis</u>	<u>3/17/11</u>	
13.						
14.						
15.						

NOTES:

* E-MAIL RESPONSE ATTACHED

Abernethy

Benton, Terry

From: Abernethy, J.G.Jeff
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2011 7:19 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED abernethy

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.
Jeff Abernethy

Bernier ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Bernier, Wade
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 9:11 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:15 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Wade Bernier

Bishop

Benton, Terry

From: Bishop, Brad
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 6:23 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Brad Bishop

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2/21/11 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 _____. 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. Betty Thompson	Administrative	Betty Thompson	2/25/11			
2. JOHN HLYWA	N/S	John Hlywa	2/22/11			
3. Allan Usher	RP Instructor	Allan Usher	2/16/11		3/18/11	
4. Fred Pallak	Unit Supervisor	Fred Pallak	2/3/11			
5. J.D. Cardenter	INSTRUCTOR/VALIDATION	J.D. Cardenter	2/4/11			
6. KEVIN KIRCHBAUM	UNIT SUPERVISOR	Kevin Kirchbaum	2/5/11			
7. Carlos Santos	UNIT SUPERVISOR	Carlos Santos	2/2/11			
8. Tom Brown	RCO	Tom Brown	2-16-11			
9. TIM BOLANDER	PTN/EDU	Tim Bolander	2-18-11	Tim Bolander	3-18-11	
10. Ronnie Lingle	OPERATIONS MGR	Ronnie Lingle	2-18-11			
11. Ed Sath	CPS INSTRUCTOR/CPS JPMs	Ed Sath	2-21-11		3/4/11	
12. ANITA LEWIS	CPS INSTRUCTOR / CPS JPMs	Anita Lewis	2/21/11			
13. LAUREL DAUGHTRY	CPS INSTRUCTOR / SQUESTER/SPM	Laurel Daughtry	2/21/11		3-3-11	
14. MIKE SCHNEIDEGGER	CPS INSTRUCTOR / SQUESTER / SPM	Mike Schneidegger	2/21/11		3/3/11	
15. Brian Nichols	CPS Instructor / Squester / SPM	Brian Nichols	2/21/11		3/3/11	

NOTES:

Bonilla ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Bonilla, Francisco
Sent: Sunday, March 20, 2011 11:42 AM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Francisco R Bonilla

Brayer



Rich, Lawrence

From: Brayer, K.Keith
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 3:47 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Keith P. Brayer

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Cook ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Cook, G E
Sent: Sunday, March 20, 2011 7:27 AM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Does this mean I can remove the NRC Exam Security badge?

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

G. Cook

Gardinski

Benton, Terry

From: Gardinski, R.L.Ron
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2011 5:44 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.
Ron Gardinski

Guist

Benton, Terry

From: Nicholas, Christy
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:40 AM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: FW: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Guist, J.R.Jim
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2011 10:23 PM
To: Nicholas, Christy
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

James R. Guist

Hessling ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Hessling, Joseph
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2011 4:30 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Joe Hessling

Hilyer

Dennis, Fred

From: Dennis, Fred
Sent: Monday, March 28, 2011 7:25 AM
To: Dennis, Fred
Subject: FW: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Hilyer, Keith
Sent: Saturday, March 26, 2011 8:22 PM
To: Nicholas, Christy; Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Terry,

I was out of town due to a death in the family.

v/r

Keith

From: Nicholas, Christy
Sent: Wednesday, March 23, 2011 6:21 PM
To: Benton, Terry; Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

your name on the bottom.

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Keith H. Hilyer

Horton ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Horton, Todd
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:40 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: Re: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

I agree,
Todd Horton

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:15 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

✓

Kilian

Rich, Lawrence

From: Kilian, Reese
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 9:18 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Reese Kilian

Kirchbaum ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Kirchbaum, Kevin
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 1:15 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Kevin Kirchbaum

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Klauck

✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Klauck, J.M.John
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2011 9:58 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

John Klauck

Lingle

Rich, Lawrence

From: Lingle, Ronnie
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:17 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Ronnie Lingle

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Loudakis

Rich, Lawrence

From: Loudakis, G.George
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 7:53 AM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

George Loudakis

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

Mohn

Benton, Terry

From: Mohn, Steve
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 4:54 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Stephen E. Mohn

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

Nicholas

Benton, Terry

From: Nicholas, Christy
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 5:36 AM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

Christy J Nicholas

Pennenga ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Pennenga, Ronald
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:18 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: Re: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Sent from my iPhone

On Mar 18, 2011, at 12:15 PM, "Rich, Lawrence" <LAWRENCE.RICH@fpl.com> wrote:

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Ron Pennenga

Phillips ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Phillips, D A
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 4:05 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Dennis Allan Phillips

Pike



Rich, Lawrence

From: Pike, Charlie
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 1:15 PM
To: Benton, Terry; Rich, Lawrence
Cc: Hessling, Joseph
Subject: Post-Examination

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

Charlie Pike

Pitts ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Pitts, Drayton
Sent: Sunday, March 20, 2011 6:10 AM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

R. D. Pitts

Pollak ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Pollak, Frederick
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:34 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

Frederick P. Pollak

Dennis, Fred

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 3:10 PM
To: Dennis, Fred
Subject: FW: St Lucie Security Agreement

Fred,
Another one done. We should now have all non-PSL people signed off.
Thx,
Terry

From: Warren.Potter@aps.com [mailto:Warren.Potter@aps.com]
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 1:57 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: St Lucie Security Agreement

Terry –

From: Benton, Terry [mailto:Terry.Benton@fpl.com]
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 6:59 AM
To: Potter, Warren A
Cc: Wylie, Sean P
Subject: FW: St Lucie Security Agreement

Warren,
Will you please sign off the PSL exam security agreement by placing your name under the statement below signifying that you maintained the exam security requirements. Thank you very much!
Terry

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 2/21/11 thru 3/17/11. 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.

I have complied with the statement above.
Warren A. Potter

From: Farnsworth, P.F.Paul
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 12:46 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: FW: St Lucie Security Agreement

From: Sean.Wylie@aps.com [mailto:Sean.Wylie@aps.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 12:25 PM
To: Farnsworth, P.F.Paul
Subject: RE: St Lucie Security Agreement

Paul, I have received another email from Terry for Warren and I to sign and scan the document and then send it back to you. I will do both. Here is the response to your email

I, Sean Wylie (3/22/2011), 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 2/21/11 thru 3/17/11. 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.

Sean Wylie
Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station
Operations Training
(623)393-5354
sean.wylie@aps.com

From: Farnsworth, P.F.Paul [mailto:P.F.Paul.Farnsworth@fpl.com]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 11:00 AM
To: Wylie, Sean P
Subject: St Lucie Security Agreement

Sean, again I'm really sorry about calling you so early Friday. I totally forgot about the time difference. If you could type in your name and date then "reply" this message back to me, I would appreciate it. Thanks again for all your help. After the Japan event, I wonder if our careers are over. Keep in touch. pf

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 2/21/11 thru 3/17/11. 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.

--- NOTICE ---

This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain confidential, privileged or proprietary information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original and any copy or printout. Unintended recipients are prohibited from making any other use of this e-mail. Although we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this e-mail, we accept no liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this e-mail or attachments, or for any delay or errors or omissions in the contents which result from e-mail transmission.

Price

Dennis, Fred

From: Dennis, Fred
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 1:43 PM
To: Dennis, Fred
Subject: FW: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Price, Clyde
Sent: Tuesday, March 29, 2011 1:29 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11. 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.

Clyde Price

Rasmus

Dennis, Fred

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 9:09 AM
To: Dennis, Fred
Subject: FW: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Another one!

From: Rasmus, Paul
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 8:59 AM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Terry,

I was out of town and just returned. Sorry for the delay.

V/R,
Paul

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Paul Rasmus

Roden

7724677521 P 1/1

22

NRC

2010-12-07 10:13

PAGE 3 of

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

I. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 2-21-11 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 _____. 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.	JAMES R. GUNST	Reactor Control Oper.	<i>James R. Gunst</i>	11-18-10			
2.	SETH DUSTON	TRAINING MANAGER	<i>Seth Duston</i>	11/1/10			
3.	DENNIS A. PRIUSIS	REACTOR CONTROL OPERATOR	<i>Dennis A. Priusis</i>	12/1/10			
4.	FRANK R. BOUILLÉ	UNIT SUPERVISOR / SRO	<i>Frank R. Bouillé</i>	12/1/10			
5.	JOHN B. RODEN	REVIEWER	<i>John B. Roden</i>	12/9/10	<i>John B. Roden</i>	3/20/11	
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.							
13.							
14.							
15.							

NOTES:

Ryley ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Ryley, W.A.Skip
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 3:30 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Name typed in the bottom.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Winston A. Ryley

Santos ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: Santos, Carlos
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 5:09 PM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Carlos Santos

Dennis, Fred

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 6:44 AM
To: Dennis, Fred
Subject: FW: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Fred, one more for our list. Terry

From: Sherwood, Roger
Sent: Thursday, March 24, 2011 11:21 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Roger Sherwood

Sketchley

Benton, Terry

From: Sketchley, Mark G
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 9:20 AM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: RE: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Never mind - this time I read your directions

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 8:46 AM
To: Price, Clyde; Bishop, Brad; Nicholas, Christy; Mohn, Steve; Sizemore, Charles; Sketchley, Mark G; Rasmus, Paul; Sherwood, Roger; Hilyer, Keith; Brown, T.S.Tom; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Guist, J.R.Jim
Cc: Duston, Seth; Horton, Todd; Lingle, Ronnie
Subject: PSL HLC-20 NRC Exam Security Agreement - ACTION REQUIRED

Team, please respond. The NRC must receive a "signed-off" security agreement OR the licenses will NOT be issued.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.
Mark Sketchley

✓
Spillman

Spillman, Troy

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

 T. Spillman 3/18/11

Rich, Lawrence

From: Webber, Robert
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2011 9:39 AM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21. 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

ROBERT WEBBER JR.

West ✓

Rich, Lawrence

From: West, Jason
Sent: Saturday, March 19, 2011 2:28 AM
To: Rich, Lawrence
Subject: RE: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

From: Rich, Lawrence
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 12:16 PM
To: Spillman, Troy; Pike, Charlie; Rasmus, Paul; Ryley, W.A.Skip; Guist, J.R.Jim; Phillips, D A; Bonilla, Francisco; Pollak, Frederick; Horton, Todd; Hartley, L.L.Larry; Holzmacher, G.H.Hank; Loudakis, G.George; West, Jason; Pennenga, Ronald; Kilian, Reese; Klauck, J.M.John; Pitts, Drayton; Abernethy, J.G.Jeff; Sherwood, Roger; Brayer, K.Keith; Hessling, Joseph; Cook, G E; Gardinski, R.L.Ron; Webber, Robert; Bernier, Wade; Kirchbaum, Kevin; Santos, Carlos; Brown, T.S.Tom; Lingle, Ronnie
Cc: Benton, Terry
Subject: HLC-20 Exam security agreement signoff.

Please acknowledge the below statement typing your name on the bottom.

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 2/21, 2/28 and Thursday 3/17/11 . 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.

Jason West

Dennis, Fred

From: Benton, Terry
Sent: Friday, March 25, 2011 9:57 AM
To: Dennis, Fred
Subject: FW: St Lucie Security Agreement

Another one.

From: Farnsworth, P.F.Paul
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 12:46 PM
To: Benton, Terry
Subject: FW: St Lucie Security Agreement

From: Sean.Wylie@aps.com [mailto:Sean.Wylie@aps.com]
Sent: Tuesday, March 22, 2011 12:25 PM
To: Farnsworth, P.F.Paul
Subject: RE: St Lucie Security Agreement

Paul, I have received another email from Terry for Warren and I to sign and scan the document and then send it back to you. I will do both. Here is the response to your email

I, Sean Wylie (3/22/2011), 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 2/21/11 thru 3/17/11. 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.

Sean Wylie
Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station
Operations Training
(623)393-5354
sean.wylie@aps.com

From: Farnsworth, P.F.Paul [mailto:P.F.Paul.Farnsworth@fpl.com]
Sent: Friday, March 18, 2011 11:00 AM
To: Wylie, Sean P
Subject: St Lucie Security Agreement

Sean, again I'm really sorry about calling you so early Friday. I totally forgot about the time difference. If you could type in your name and date then "reply" this message back to me, I would appreciate it. Thanks again for all your help. After the Japan event, I wonder if our careers are over. Keep in touch. pf

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 2/21/11 thru 3/17/11. 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:

--- NOTICE ---

This message is for the designated recipient only and may contain confidential, privileged or proprietary information. If you have received it in error, please notify the sender immediately and delete the original and any copy or printout. Unintended recipients are prohibited from making any other use of this e-mail. Although we have taken reasonable precautions to ensure no viruses are present in this e-mail, we accept no liability for any loss or damage arising from the use of this e-mail or attachments, or for any delay or errors or omissions in the contents which result from e-mail transmission.

Facility: St. Lucie Date of Examination: 2/21/11
 Examination Level (circle one): RO/SRO Operating Test Number: **NRC**

Administrative Topic (see Note)	Type Code*	Describe activity to be performed
Conduct of Operations	M, R	A1 Perform a Manual Calorimetric – Unit 2
Conduct of Operations	N, R	A2 Determine time SDC entry conditions are required based on available CST level.
Equipment Control	N, R	A3 Develop Equipment Clearance Order for 2A HPSI Pump
Radiation Control	M, R	A4 (SRO) Determine Exposure Limits Under Emergency Conditions A5 (RO) Determine Exposure Limits Under Normal Conditions
Emergency Plan	N, S or R	A6 (SRO) Respond to Security Event

NOTE: All items (5 total) are required for SROs. RO applicants require only 4 items unless they are retaking only the administrative topics, when all 5 are required.

*Type Codes & Criteria: (C)ontrol room, (S)imulator, or Class(R)oom
 (D)irect from bank (≤ 3 for ROs; ≤ 4 for SROs & RO retakes)
 (N)ew or (M)odified from bank (≥ 1)
 (P)revious 2 exams (≤ 1 ; randomly selected)

ADMINISTRATIVE JPM SUMMARY

- A1: Conditions given on Unit 2 at 30% power. Direction given to perform a manual calorimetric. Plant data is given on cue sheet so calculation can be performed in the classroom in a group setting.
- A2: Given CST level and plant conditions determine time SDC entry conditions required.
- A3: Develop ECO to replace defective shaft seals on the 2A High Pressure Safety Injection pump. Identification of applicable Technical Specifications when removing the 2A HPSI from service are also required.
- A4: SRO: A LOCA has occurred with an isolable leak on the Charging pump. Given the dose rate and time to isolate the leak the SRO is to determine if an individual can perform this evolution without exceeding the Emergency Plan guidelines.
- A5: RO: Radiological conditions are given to repair the refueling machine. Four individuals (two FPL and two contract personnel) are assigned to perform the repair. The individuals past exposure is given. The RO is to determine if the individuals can perform the repairs without the Site Vice Presidents approval.
- A6: TIME CRITICAL. Conditions will be given that armed intruders have entered the protected area. Direction is given to implement 0-AOP-72.01, 'Response to Security Events'. This will lead into implementing EPIPS.

Facility:	St. Lucie	Date of Examination:	2/21/11
Exam Level (circle one):	RO, SRO(I), SRO(U)	Operating Test No.:	<u>HLC-20 NRC</u>
Control Room Systems® (8 for RO; 7 for SRO-I; 2 or 3 for SRO-U, including 1 ESF)			
System / JPM Title		Type Code*	Safety Function
S-1	Align ECCS for Hot and Cold Leg Injection (2008 NRC exam)	D, EN, A, S, L, P	3
S-2 (All)	Perform Control Room Actions for Control Room Inaccessibility – Unit 2 (Modified 0821004)	M, L, S, A	8
S-3 (RO only)	Loss of Safety Related AC Bus – Train A (2A5 480V Load center)	N, S	6
S-4 (All)	Verify Containment Spray – Unit 2	N, S, A, EN, L	5
S-5 (All)	Establish Alternate Charging Flowpath to RCS Through 'A' HPSI Header – Unit 2.	P, D, A, S, L	2
S-6	Start 2A1 and 2A2 RCP post LOOP	N, S, A	4p
S-7	Respond to high CCW surge tank level, Unit 2 due to radioactive in-leakage.	D, S	9
C-1	Respond to failure of Wide Range Nuclear Instrumentation Unit 1 (0821036)	D, C	7
In-Plant Systems® (3 for RO; 3 for SRO-I; 3 or 2 for SRO-U)			
P-1 (All)	Restore Auxiliary Feedwater Flow following Steam Binding – Unit 1	N, L, E	4s
P-2 (All)	Local Operation of Boron Concentration Control – Unit 1	R, D, E, P	1
P-3	Disconnect 1B Instrument Inverter from service for preventive maintenance – Unit 1 (0821067)	D	6

@ All control room (and in-plant) systems must be different and serve different safety functions; all 5 SRO-U systems must serve different safety functions; in-plant systems and functions may overlap those tested in the control room.	
* Type Codes	Criteria for RO / SRO-I / SRO-U
(A)lternate path	4-6 / 4-6 / 2-3
(C)ontrol room	
(D)irect from bank	$\leq 9 / \leq 8 / \leq 4$
(E)mergency or abnormal in-plant	$\geq 1 / \geq 1 / \geq 1$
(EN)gineered safety feature	- / - / ≥ 1 (control room system)
(L)ow-Power / Shutdown	$\geq 1 / \geq 1 / \geq 1$
(N)ew or (M)odified from bank including 1(A)	$\geq 2 / \geq 2 / \geq 1$
(P)revious 2 exams	$\leq 3 / \leq 3 / \leq 2$ (randomly selected)
(R)CA	$\geq 1 / \geq 1 / \geq 1$
(S)imulator	

JPM SUMMARY DESCRIPTION

S1- Align ECCS for Hot and Cold Leg Injection

The applicant is required to align the 'B' train for Hot and Cold leg injection. V3523 will not open and the 'A' train will be required to be lined up for Hot and Cold Leg injection.

S2- Perform Control Room Actions for Control Room Inaccessibility – Unit 2

Perform Operator actions in the Control Room prior to Control Room evacuation due to a fire. Direction is given there is not enough time to perform SPTA's. JPM is alternate path in that one RCP cannot be stopped from its control switch. Stopping the RCP requires the 6.9KV bus to be de-energized.

S3- Loss of Safety Related AC Bus – Train 'A' (2A5 480V Load center)

A loss of the 2A5 480V LC occurs. The applicant is directed to perform General Actions for loss of the bus. After the General actions are performed the applicant is to re-energize the bus by closing the applicable breakers. The JPM will be terminated when the bus is re-energized.

S4- Verify Containment Spray – Unit 2

Conditions will be given that require verification of Containment Spray. Numerous failures associated with Containment Spray must be identified and corrected.

S5- Establish Alternate Charging Flowpath to RCS Through 'A' HPSI Header – Unit 2.

The Unit is in 2-EOP-15, Functional Recovery. A pipe break in the Charging header has resulted in the normal Charging flow unavailable. The applicant will use Appendix T from 2-EOP-99, Appendices, Tables and Figures, to establish a Charging flowpath using the 'A' HPSI header. This JPM is faulted in that the 2A Charging pump trips 5 seconds after starting. Applicant should refer back to 5.C and start the 2C Charging pump and continue with the lineup.

S6- Start 2A1 and 2A2 RCP post LOOP

After a LOOP, when offsite power is regained, direction to start 2A1 and 2A2 RCP's will be given. When the 2A2 RCP is started it will develop a severe oil leak which will require the pump to be tripped.

S7- Respond to CCW excessive activity, Unit 2

A CCW surge tank level high / compartment level low alarm is received. Direction is given to perform actions required by 2-AOP-14.01, "Component Cooling Water Abnormal Operations" and 2-AOP 14.02, "Component Cooling Water Excessive Activity". Procedure will direct the applicant to a leaking Sample Heat Exchanger that will be isolated.

C1- Respond to Linear Range NI channel malfunction, Unit 1

Numerous annunciators will be given in the initial conditions. The applicant will be required to identify the failure associated with the annunciators and carry out the appropriate actions using 1-AOP-99.01, Loss of Technical Specification Instrumentation.

P1- Restore Auxiliary Feedwater Flow following Steam Binding – Unit 1

The 1B Auxiliary Feedwater Pump had indications of steam binding. Direction is given to restore AFW flow following steam binding.

P2- Local Operation of Boron Concentration Control – Unit 1

Due to instrumentation problem in the Control Room blending of the VCT will be required locally. Off normal procedure 1-AOP-02.01 Boron Concentration Control System Abnormal Operations will be implemented to increase VCT level.

P3- Disconnect 1B Instrument Inverter from service for preventive maintenance – Unit 1

The 1B Instrument Inverter is to be removed from service for maintenance. The Instrument bus will be placed on the Maintenance Bypass Bus IAW 1-NOP-49.05B, 120VAC Instrument Bus 1MB (Class IE) Normal Operation.

Facility: <u>ST. LUCIE</u>		Date of Examination: <u>2-21-11</u>		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).	LMA	SL	SL	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	LMA	SL	SL	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s). (see Section D.1.a.)	LMA	SL	SL	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	LMA	SL	SL	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	LMA	SL	SL	
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 	LMA	SL	SL	
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.	LMA	SL	SL	
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.		LMA	SL	SL	
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a.	Author <u>LARRY RICH</u>	<u>2-3-11</u>			
b.	Facility Reviewer(*) <u>David Lanyi</u>	<u>2/3/11</u>			
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>GERARD W. LASKA</u>	<u>2/8/2011</u>			
d.	NRC Supervisor <u>MALCOLM T. WIDMANN</u>	<u>02/09/11</u>			
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.					

ES-301

Simulator Scenario Quality Checklist

Form ES-301-4

Facility: St. Lucie		Date of Exam : 2/21/11 Scenario Numbers: 2 / 4 / 5 / 6 Operating Test No.: 1		
QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES		Initials		
		a	b*	c#
1.	The initial conditions are realistic, in that some equipment and/or instrumentation may be out of service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events.	LAR	AR	AR
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	LAR	AR	AR
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) 	LAR	AR	AR
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.	LAR	AR	AR
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	LAR	AR	AR
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	LAR	AR	AR
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.	LAR	AR	AR
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	LAR	AR	AR
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.	LAR	AR	AR
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.	LAR	AR	AR
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	LAR	AR	AR
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).	LAR	AR	AR
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	LAR	AR	AR
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes	-	-
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	5 / 7 / 5 / 5	LAR	AR
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2 / 2 / 2 / 2	LAR	AR
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3 / 4 / 2 / 3	LAR	AR
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 1 / 1 / 1	LAR	AR
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	1 / 1 / 1 / 1	LAR	AR
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	0 / 0 / 0 / 0	LAR	AR
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3 / 3 / 2 / 2	LAR	AR

Facility: St. Lucie		Date of Exam : 2/21/11 Scenario Numbers: 7 / 8		Operating Test No.: 1	
QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES		Initials			
		a	b*	c#	
1.	The initial conditions are realistic, in that some equipment and/or instrumentation may be out of service, but it does not cue the operators into expected events.	LML	RL	RL	
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	LML	RL	RL	
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) 	LML	RL	RL	
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.	LML	RL	RL	
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	LML	RL	RL	
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	LML	RL	RL	
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.	LML	RL	RL	
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	LML	RL	RL	
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.	LML	RL	RL	
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.	LML	RL	RL	
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	LML	RL	RL	
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).	LML	RL	RL	
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	LML	RL	RL	
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes			
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / 6	LML	RL	
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	1 / 3	LML	RL	
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	4 / 3	LML	RL	
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 2	LML	RL	
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	1 / 2	LML	RL	
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	0 / 1	LML	RL	
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	2 / 2	LML	RL	

Facility:		St. Lucie		Date of Exam: 02/21/11		Operating Test No.:		NRC										
A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T T Y P E	Scenarios																
		2 (45%)			5 (100%)			8 (100%)						T O T A L	M I N I M U M			
		C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N							
		S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P					
SROI-1	RX								5						1	1	1	0
	NOR	1			2										2	1	1	1
	I/C	2,3,4,6, 8,9			3,5, 6,7, 9				2,6						13	4	4	2
	MAJ	7			8				7,8,9						5	2	2	1
	TS	2,5			1,4										4	0	2	2
RO-1	RX		1												1	1	1	0
	NOR						2								1	1	1	1
	I/C		3,6				3,6, 9								5	4	4	2
	MAJ		7				8								2	2	2	1
	TS														0	0	2	2
RO-2	RX					3									1	1	1	0
	NOR			1						5					2	1	1	1
	I/C			4,8, 9		2,5				4,10					7	4	4	2
	MAJ			7		8									2	2	2	1
	TS														0	0	2	2
SROI-2	RX								5						1	1	1	0
	NOR	1			2										2	1	1	1
	I/C	2,3,4,6, 8,9			3,5, 6,7, 9				2,6						13	4	4	2
	MAJ	7			8				7,8,9						5	2	2	1
	TS	2,5			1,4										4	0	2	2
RO-3	RX		1												1	1	1	0
	NOR						2								1	1	1	1
	I/C		3,6				3,6, 9								5	4	4	2
	MAJ		7				8								2	2	2	1
	TS														0	0	2	2
RO-4	RX					3									1	1	1	0
	NOR			1											1	1	1	1
	I/C			4,8		2,5									4	4	4	2
	MAJ			7		8									2	2	2	1
	TS														0	0	2	2

Facility:		St. Lucie		Date of Exam: 02/21/11		Operating Test No.:		NRC										
A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T T Y P E	Scenarios												T O T A L	M I N I M U M			
		2 (45%)			5 (100%)			6 (30%)			7 (4.5%)							
		C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N							
		S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P		R	I	U	
SROU-1	RX													0	1	1	0	
	NOR	1			2									2	1	1	1	
	I/C	2,3,4,6, 8,9			3,5, 6,7, 9									11	4	4	2	
	MAJ	7			8									2	2	2	1	
	TS	2,5			1,4									4	0	2	2	
RO-5 Includes scenario 8, page 4	RX		1											1	1	1	0	
	NOR						2							2	1	1	1	
	I/C		3,6				3,6, 9							8	4	4	2	
	MAJ		7				8							3	2	2	1	
	TS													0	0	2	2	
RO-6	RX					3								1	1	1	0	
	NOR			1										1	1	1	1	
	I/C			4,8, 9		2,5								5	4	4	2	
	MAJ			7		8								2	2	2	1	
	TS													0	0	2	2	
SROU-2	RX													0	1	1	0	
	NOR							1				1		2	1	1	1	
	I/C							2,3, 4,5, 6,8				2,3,4,5, 6,8			12	4	4	2
	MAJ							7				7		2	2	2	1	
	TS							2,3				2,6		4	0	2	2	
RO-7	RX								1					1	1	1	0	
	NOR												1	1	1	1		
	I/C							3,6				4,5,8		5	4	4	2	
	MAJ							7				7		2	2	2	1	
	TS													0	0	2	2	
RO-8	RX											1		1	1	1	0	
	NOR									1				1	1	1	1	
	I/C									4,5,8		3,6		5	4	4	2	
	MAJ									7		7		2	2	2	1	
	TS													0	0	2	2	

Facility:		St. Lucie		Date of Exam: 02/21/11		Operating Test No.:		NRC									
A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T T Y P E	Scenarios												T O T A L	M I N I M U M		
		6 (30%)			7 (4.5%)			8 (100%)									
		C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N						
		S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P		R	I	U
SRO (X)	RX														1	1	0
	NOR														1	1	1
	I/C														4	4	2
	MAJ														2	2	1
	TS														0	2	2
RO-9	RX		1											1	1	1	0
	NOR						1							1	1	1	1
	I/C		3,6				4,5,8							5	4	4	2
	MAJ		7				7							2	2	2	1
	TS													0	0	2	2
RO-10	RX					1								1	1	1	0
	NOR			1										1	1	1	1
	I/C			4,5,8		3,6								5	4	4	2
	MAJ			7		7								2	2	2	1
	TS													0	0	2	2
SRO (X)	RX														1	1	0
	NOR														1	1	1
	I/C														4	4	2
	MAJ														2	2	1
	TS														0	2	2
RO-11	RX		1											1	1	1	0
	NOR									5				1	1	1	1
	I/C		3,6							4,10				4	4	4	2
	MAJ		7							7,8,9				4	2	2	1
	TS													0	0	2	2
RO-12	RX					1								1	1	1	0
	NOR			1										1	1	1	1
	I/C			4,5,8		3,6								5	4	4	2
	MAJ			7		7								2	2	2	1
	TS													0	0	2	2

Facility:		St. Lucie		Date of Exam: 02/21/11		Operating Test No.:		NRC									
A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T T Y P E	Scenarios												T O T A L	M I N I M U M		
		7 (4.5%)			8 (100%)						4 (30%) SPARE						
		C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N			C R E W P O S I T I O N						
		S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P		R	I	U
SRO (X)	RX														1	1	0
	NOR														1	1	1
	I/C														4	4	2
	MAJ														2	2	1
	TS														0	2	2
RO-13	RX					5								1	1	1	0
	NOR			1										1	1	1	1
	I/C			4,5, 8		2,6								5	4	4	2
	MAJ			7		7,8, 9								4	2	2	1
	TS													0	0	2	2
SRO	RX														1	1	0
	NOR										1			1	1	1	1
	I/C										3,4, 5,6, 8,9			6	4	4	2
	MAJ										7			1	2	2	1
	TS										2,6			2	0	2	2
ATC	RX											1		1	1	1	0
	NOR														1	1	1
	I/C											3,5		2	4	4	2
	MAJ											7		1	2	2	1
	TS														0	2	2
BOP	RX														1	1	0
	NOR												1	1	1	1	1
	I/C												4,8, 9	3	4	4	2
	MAJ												7	1	2	2	1
	TS														0	2	2
RO-5	RX														1	1	0
	NOR						1								1	1	1
	I/C						4,5, 8								4	4	2
	MAJ						7								2	2	1
	TS														0	2	2

Instructions:

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 service in both the "at-the-controls (ATC)" and "balance-of-plant (BOP)" positions; Instant SROs must serve in both the SRO and the ATC positions, including at least two instrument or component (I/C) malfunction and one major transient in the ATC position. If an instant SRO additionally serves in the BOP position, one I/C malfunction can be credited toward the two I/C malfunctions required for 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.

Facility: PSL		Date of Examination: 2/21/2011				Operating Test No.: 1						
Competencies	APPLICANTS											
	RO-1				RO-2				SROI-1			
	RO BOP SCENARIO				BOP RO BOP SCENARIO				SRO SRO RO SCENARIO			
	2	5			2	5	8		2	5	8	
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	3,6,7	2,6,8,9			4,8,9	4,5	4,10		2-9	1-9	2,6	
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,3,5,6,7	1,2,3,6,8			1,2,4,7,8,9	3,4,5,8,9	3,4,5,7,8,9,10		1-9	1-9	2,5,6,7,9	
Operate Control Boards (2)	1,3,5,6,7	3,6,8,9			1,4,7,8,9	3,4,5,8,9	3,4,5,7,8,9,10				2,5,6,7,9	
Communicate and Interact	2,3,5,6,7	1,2,3,6,7,8,9			1,2,4,7,8,9	3,4,5,8,9	3,4,5,7,8,9,10		1-9	1-9	2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9	
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)									1-9	1-9		
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)									2,5	1,4		
Notes: (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO. (2) Optional for an SRO-U. (3) Only applicable to SROs.												

Instructions:

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

Facility:	PSL				Date of Examination:	2/21/2011				Operating Test No.:	1				
Competencies	APPLICANTS														
	RO-3				RO-4				SROI-2						
	RO BOP SCENARIO				BOP RO SCENARIO				SRO SRO RO SCENARIO				SCENARIO		
	2	5			2	5			2	5	8				
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	3,6, 7	2,6, 8,9			4,8, 9	4,5			2-9	1-9	2,6				
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,3, 5,6, 7	1,2, 3,6, 8			1,2, 4,7, 8,9	3,4, 5,8, 9			1-9	1-9	2,5, 6,7, 9				
Operate Control Boards (2)	1,3, 5,6, 7	3,6, 8,9			1,4, 7,8, 9	3,4, 5,8, 9					2,5, 6,7, 9				
Communicate and Interact	2,3, 5,6, 7	1,2, 3,6, 7,8, 9			1,2, 4,7, 8,9	3,4, 5,8, 9			1-9	1-9	2,3, 4,5, 6,7, 8,9				
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)									1-9	1-9					
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)									2,5	1,4					
Notes: (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO. (2) Optional for an SRO-U. (3) Only applicable to SROs.															

Instructions:

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

Facility:	PSL	Date of Examination:	2/21/2011	Operating Test No.:	1								
Competencies	APPLICANTS												
	RO-5				RO-6				SROU-1				
	RO	BOP	BOP		BOP	RO			SRO	SRO			SCENARIO
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO				
	2	5	8		2	5			2	5			
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	3,6,7	2,6,8,9	4,10		4,8,9	4,5			2-9	1-9			
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,3,5,6,7	1,2,3,6,8	3,4,5,7,8,9,10		1,2,4,7,8,9	3,4,5,8,9			1-9	1-9			
Operate Control Boards (2)	1,3,5,6,7	3,6,8,9	3,4,5,7,8,9,10		1,4,7,8,9	3,4,5,8,9							
Communicate and Interact	2,3,5,6,7	1,2,3,6,7,8,9	3,4,5,7,8,9,10		1,2,4,7,8,9	3,4,5,8,9			1-9	1-9			
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)									1-9	1-9			
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)									2,5	1,4			
Notes: (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO. (2) Optional for an SRO-U. (3) Only applicable to SROs.													

Instructions:

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

Facility:	PSL	Date of Examination:	2/21/2011	Operating Test No.:	1									
Competencies	APPLICANTS													
	RO-7				RO-8				SROU-2					
	RO		BOP		BOP		RO		SRO		SRO		SCENARIO	
	SCENARIO		SCENARIO		SCENARIO		SCENARIO		SCENARIO		SCENARIO			
	6	7			6	7			6	7				
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	3,6,7	4,5,7,8			4,8	3,6,7			2-8	2-8				
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,3,5,6,7	1,2,4,5,7,8			1,2,4,5,7,8,9	1,3,6,7			1-9	1-8				
Operate Control Boards (2)	1,3,6,7	1,2,4,5,7,8			1,2,4,5,7,8,9	1,6,7,8								
Communicate and Interact	1,2,3,5,6,7	1,2,3,4,5,7,8				1,2,3,6,7			1-9	1-8				
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)									1-9	1-8				
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)									2,4	2,6				
Notes:														
(1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.														
(2) Optional for an SRO-U.														
(3) Only applicable to SROs.														

Instructions:

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

Facility: PSL		Date of Examination: 2/21/2011				Operating Test No.: 1										
Competencies	APPLICANTS															
	RO-9				RO-10											
	RO BOP SCENARIO				BOP RO SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	6	7			6	7										
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	3,6, 7	4,5, 7,8			4,8	3,6, 7										
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,3, 5,6, 7	1,2, 4,5, 7,8			1,2, 4,5, 7,8, 9	1,3, 6,7										
Operate Control Boards (2)	1,3, 6,7	1,2, 4,5, 7,8			1,2, 4,5, 7,8, 9	1,6, 7,8										
Communicate and Interact	1,2, 3,5, 6,7	1,2, 3,4, 5,7, 8				1,2, 3,6, 7										
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)																
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)																
Notes: (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO. (2) Optional for an SRO-U. (3) Only applicable to SROs.																

Instructions:

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

Facility: PSL Date of Examination: 2/21/2011 Operating Test No.: 1

Competencies	APPLICANTS												
	RO-11				RO-12				RO-13				
	RO BOP SCENARIO				BOP RO SCENARIO				BOP RO SCENARIO				SCENARIO
	6	8			6	7			7	8			
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	3,6, 7	4,10			4,8	3,6, 7			4,5, 7,8	2,6			
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1,3, 5,6, 7	3,4, 5,7, 8,9, 10			1,2, 4,5, 7,8, 9	1,3, 6,7			1,2, 4,5, 7,8	2,5, 6,7, 9			
Operate Control Boards (2)	1,3, 6,7	3,4, 5,7, 8,9, 10			1,2, 4,5, 7,8, 9	1,6, 7,8			1,2, 4,5, 7,8	2,5, 6,7, 9			
Communicate and Interact	1,2, 3,5, 6,7	3,4, 5,7, 8,9, 10				1,2, 3,6, 7			1,2, 3,4, 5,7, 8	2,3, 4,5, 6,7, 8,9			
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)													
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)													

Notes:

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

Instructions:

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

FINAL

ES-401, Rev. 9E

PWR Examination Outline

Form ES-401-2

Facility: St. Lucie 2011-301														Date of Exam: February 2011				
Tier	Group	RO K/A Category Points											SRO-Only Points					
		K 1	K 2	K 3	K 4	K 5	K 6	A 1	A 2	A 3	A 4	G *	Total	A2	G*	Total		
1. Emergency & Abnormal Plant Evolutions	1	3	3	3	N/A			3	3	N/A			3	18	3	3	6	
	2	2	1	2				2	1				1	9	2	2	4	
	Tier Totals	5	4	5				5	4				4	27	5	5	10	
2. Plant Systems	1	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3	28	3	2	5		
	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	10	2	1	3		
	Tier Totals	4	4	4	3	3	3	4	3	3	3	4	38	5	3	8		
3. Generic Knowledge and Abilities Categories				1		2		3		4		10		1	2	3	4	7
				3		2		3		2		1	2	2	2			
<p>Note:1. Ensure that at least two topics from every applicable K/A category are sampled within each tier of the RO and SRO-only outlines (i.e., except for one category in Tier 3 of the SRO-only outline, the "Tier Totals" in each K/A category shall not be less than two).</p> <p>2. The point total for each group and tier in the proposed outline must match that specified in the table. The final point total for each group and tier may deviate by ± 1 from that specified in the table based on NRC revisions. The final RO exam must total 75 points and the SRO-only exam must total 25 points.</p> <p>3. Systems/evolutions within each group are identified on the associated outline; systems or evolutions that do not apply at the facility should be deleted and justified; operationally important, site-specific systems that are not included on the outline should be added. Refer to ES-401, Attachment 2, for guidance regarding the elimination of inappropriate K/A statements.</p> <p>4. Select topics from as many systems and evolutions as possible; sample every system or evolution in the group before selecting a second topic for any system or evolution.</p> <p>e. Absent a plant-specific priority, only those K/As having an importance rating (IR) of 2.5 or higher shall be selected. Use the RO and SRO ratings for the RO and SRO-only portions, respectively.</p> <p>6. Select SRO topics for Tiers 1 and 2 from the shaded systems and K/A categories.</p> <p>7.* The generic (G) K/As in Tiers 1 and 2 shall be selected from Section 2 of the K/A Catalog, but the topics must be relevant to the applicable evolution or system.</p> <p>8. On the following pages, enter the K/A numbers, a brief description of each topic, the topics' importance ratings (IRs) for the applicable license level, and the point totals (#) for each system and category. Enter the group and tier totals for each category in the table above; if fuel handling equipment is sampled in other than Category A2 or G* on the SRO-only exam, enter it on the left side of Column A2 for Tier 2, Group 2. Use duplicate pages for RO and SRO-only exams.</p> <p>9. For Tier 3, select topics from Section 2 of the K/A catalog, and enter the K/A numbers, descriptions, IRs, and point totals (#) on Form ES-401-3. Limit SRO selections to K/As that are linked to 10 CFR 55.43.</p>																		

ES-401		PWR Examination Outline Emergency and Abnormal Plant Evolutions - Tier 1/Group 1 (RO / SRO)						Form ES-401-2	
E/APE # / Name / Safety Function	K 1	K 2	K 3	A 1	A 2	G	K/A Topic(s)	IR	#
000007 (BW/E02&E10; CE/E02) Reactor Trip - Stabilization - Recovery / 1					X		007EA2.06 Ability to determine or interpret the following as they apply to a reactor trip: Occurrence of a reactor trip.	4.3/4.5	
000008 Pressurizer Vapor Space Accident / 3		X					008AK2.02 Knowledge of the interrelations between the Pressurizer Vapor Space Accident and the following: Sensors and detectors	2.7/2.7	
000008 Pressurizer Vapor Space Accident / 3 (SRO)						X	008G2.4.11 Knowledge of abnormal condition procedures.	4.0/4.2	
000009 Small Break LOCA / 3						X	009EG2.4.4 Ability to recognize abnormal indications for system operating parameters that are entry-level conditions for emergency and abnormal operating procedures.	4.5/4.7	
000011 Large Break LOCA / 3									
000015/17 RCP Malfunctions / 4		X					015AK2.07 Knowledge of the interrelations between the Reactor Coolant Pump Malfunctions (Loss of RC Flow) and the following: RCP seals	2.9/2.9	
000022 Loss of Rx Coolant Makeup / 2					X		022AA2.04 Ability to determine and interpret the following as they apply to the Loss of Reactor Coolant Makeup: How long PZR level can be maintained within limits	2.9/3.8	
000025 Loss of RHR System / 4			X				025AK3.01 Knowledge of the reasons for the following responses as they apply to the Loss of Residual Heat Removal System: Shift to alternate flowpath	3.1/3.4	
000026 Loss of Component Cooling Water / 8				X			026AA1.02 Ability to operate and / or monitor the following as they apply to the Loss of Component Cooling Water: Loads on the CCWS in the control room	3.2/3.3	
000027 Pressurizer Pressure Control System Malfunction / 3		X					027AK2.03 Knowledge of the interrelations between the Pressurizer Pressure Control Malfunctions and the following: Controllers and Positioners	2.6/2.8	
000029 ATWS / 1	X						029EK1.05 Knowledge of the operational implications of the following concepts as they apply to the ATWS: definition of negative temperature coefficient as applied to large PWR coolant systems	2.8/3.2	

000029 ATWS / 1 (SRO)						X	029G2.4.18 Knowledge of the specific bases for EOPs	3.3/4/0	
000038 Steam Gen. Tube Rupture / 3						X	038EG2.4.46 Ability to verify that the alarms are consistent with the plant conditions	4.2/4.2	
000040 (BW/E05; CE/E05; W/E12) Steam Line Rupture - Excessive Heat Transfer / 4			X				CE/E05EK3.3 Knowledge of the reasons for the following responses as they apply to the (Excess Steam Demand) Manipulation of controls required to obtain desired operating results during abnormal, and emergency situations.	3.8/4.0	
000040 (BW/E05; CE/E05; W/E12) Steam Line Rupture - Excessive Heat Transfer / 4 (SRO)					X		040AA2.05 Ability to determine and interpret the following as they apply to the Steam Line Rupture: When ESFAS systems may be secured	4.1/4.5	
000054 (CE/E06) Loss of Main Feedwater / 4	X						CE/E06EK1.3 Knowledge of the operational implications of the following concepts as they apply to the (Loss of Feedwater) Annunciators and conditions indicating signals, and remedial actions associated with the (Loss of Feedwater).	3.2/3.7	
000054 (CE/E06) Loss of Main Feedwater / 4 (SRO)						X	054G2.4.30 Knowledge of events related to system operation/status that must be reported to internal organizations or external agencies, such as the State, the NRC, or the transmission system operator.	2.7/4.1	
000055 Station Blackout / 6			X				055EK3.02 Knowledge of the reasons for the following responses as they apply to the Station Blackout: Actions contained in EOP for loss of offsite and onsite power	4.3/4.6	
000056 Loss of Off-site Power / 6				X			056AA1.07 Ability to operate and / or monitor the following as they apply to the Loss of Offsite Power: Service water pump	3.2/3.2	
000057 Loss of Vital AC Inst. Bus / 6 (SRO)					X		057AA2.16 Ability to determine and interpret the following as they apply to the Loss of Vital AC Instrument Bus: Normal and abnormal PZR level for various modes of plant operation	3.0/3.1	
000058 Loss of DC Power / 6				X			058AA1.02 Ability to operate and / or monitor the following as they apply to the Loss of DC Power: Static inverter dc input breaker, frequency meter, ac output breaker, and ground fault detector	3.1/3.1	
000062 Loss of Nuclear Svc Water / 4					X		062AA2.04 Ability to determine and interpret the following as they apply to the Loss of Nuclear Service Water: The normal values and upper limits for the temperatures of the components cooled by SWS	2.5/2.9	
000065 Loss of Instrument Air / 8						X	065AG2.1.23 Ability to perform specific system and integrated plant procedures during all modes of plant operation.	4.3/4.4	
000077 Generator Voltage and Electric Grid Disturbances / 6	X						077AK1.02 Knowledge of the operational implications of the following concepts as they apply to Generator Voltage and Electric Grid Disturbances: Over-excitation	3.3/3.4	

000077 Generator Voltage and Electric Grid Disturbances / 6 (SRO)					X		077AA2.03 Ability to determine and interpret the following as they apply to Generator Voltage and Electric Grid Disturbances: Generator current outside the capability curve	3.5/3.6	
W/E04 LOCA Outside Containment / 3									
W/E11 Loss of Emergency Coolant Recirc. / 4									
BW/E04; W/E05 Inadequate Heat Transfer - Loss of Secondary Heat Sink / 4									
BE05; Steam line rupture-Excessive Heat Transfer									
K/A Category Totals:	3	3	3	3	3	3	Group Point Total:		18
SRO K/A Category Totals:					3	3	Group Point Total:		6

[illegible]

[illegible]

CE/A11; W/E08 RCS Overcooling - PTS / 4 (SRO)					X		CA11AA2.1 Ability to determine and interpret the following as they apply to the (RCS Overcooling) Facility conditions and selection of appropriate procedures during abnormal and emergency operations.	2.9/3.3	
CE/A16 Excess RCS Leakage / 2									
CE/E09 Functional Recovery									
K/A Category Point Totals:	2	1	2	2	1	1	Group Point Total:		9
K/A Category Point Totals: (SRO)					2	2	Group Point Total:		4

ES-401		PWR Examination Outline Plant Systems - Tier 2/Group 1 (RO / SRO)										Form ES-401-2		
System # / Name	K 1	K 2	K 3	K 4	K 5	K 6	A 1	A 2	A 3	A 4	G	K/A Topic(s)	IR	#
003 Reactor Coolant Pump										X		003A4.02 Ability to manually operate and/or monitor in the control room: RCP motor parameters	2.9/2.9	
003 Reactor Coolant Pump (SRO)											X	003G2.2.40 Ability to apply Technical Specifications for a system.	3.4/4.7	
004 Chemical and Volume Control			X									004K3.04 Knowledge of the effect that a loss or malfunction of the CVCS will have on the following: RCPS	3.7/3.9	
004 Chemical and Volume Control					X							004K5.30 Knowledge of the operational implications of the following concepts as they apply to the CVCS: Relationship between temperature and pressure in CVCS components during solid plant operation	3.8/4.2	
005 Residual Heat Removal										X		005A4.01 Ability to manually operate and/or monitor in the control room: Controls and indication for RHR pumps	3.6/3.4	
006 Emergency Core Cooling							X					006A1.05 Ability to predict and/or monitor changes in parameters (to prevent exceeding design limits) associated with operating the ECCS controls including: CCW flow (establish flow to RHR heat exchanger prior to placing in service)	2.9/3.3	
007 Pressurizer Relief/Quench Tank											X	007G2.4.6 Knowledge of EOP mitigation strategies	3.7/4.7	
008 Component Cooling Water		X										008K2.02 Knowledge of bus power supplies to the following: CCW pump, including emergency backup	3.0/3.2	
008 Component Cooling Water (SRO) <i>changed to A2.03 8/19/2010</i>								X				008A2.07 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operations on the CCWS, and (b) based on those predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: Consequences of high or low CCW flow rate and temperature; the flow rate at which the CCW standby pump will start	2.5/2.8	

010 Pressurizer Pressure Control							X								010K6.01 Knowledge of the effect of a loss or malfunction of the following will have on the PZR PCS: Pressure detection systems	2.7/3.1	
012 Reactor Protection							X								012A1.01 Ability to predict and/or monitor Changes in parameters (to prevent exceeding design limits) associated with operating the RPS controls including: Trip setpoint adjustment	2.9/3.4	
012 Reactor Protection													X		012G2.4.2 Knowledge of system set points, interlocks and automatic actions associated with EOP entry conditions.	4.5/4.6	
013 Engineered Safety Features Actuation								X							013A2.01 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operations on the ESFAS; and (b) based on those predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: LOCA	4.6/4.8	
013 Engineered Safety Features Actuation									X						013A3.02 Ability to monitor automatic operation of the ESFAS including: Operation of actuated equipment	4.1/4.2	
013 Engineered Safety Features Actuation (SRO)													X		013G2.2.44 Ability to interpret control room indications to verify the status and operation of a system, and understand how operator actions and directives affect plant and system conditions.	4.2/4.4	
022 Containment Cooling		X													022K2.01 Knowledge of power supplies to the following: Containment cooling fans	3.0/3.1	
022 Containment Cooling 8/19/2010		X													022K2.02 01 Knowledge of power supplies to the following: Chillers 022K 4.02	2.5/2.4 3.1/3.4	
025 Ice Condenser															N/A		
026 Containment Spray							X								026A1.03 Ability to predict and/or monitor changes in parameters (to prevent exceeding design limits) associated with operating the CSS controls including: Containment sump level	3.5/3.5	
026 Containment Spray			X												026AK3.02 Knowledge of the effect that a loss or malfunction of the CSS will have on the following: Recirculation spray system	4.2/4.3	

039 Main and Reheat Steam									X				039A2.04 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operations on the MRSS; and (b) based on predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: Malfunctioning steam dump	3.4/3.7	
039 Main and Reheat Steam (SRO)									X				039A2.03 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operations on the MRSS; and (b) based on predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: Indications and alarms for main steam and area radiation monitors (during SGTR)	3.4/3.7	
059 Main Feedwater	X												059K1.05 Knowledge of the physical connections and/or cause-effect relationships between the MFW and the following systems: RCS	3.1/3.2	
061 Auxiliary/Emergency Feedwater					X								061K5.02 Knowledge of the operational implications of the following concepts as the apply to the AFW: Decay heat sources and magnitude	3.2/3.6	
061 Auxiliary/Emergency Feedwater (SRO)									X				061A2.05 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operations on the AFW; and (b) based on those predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: Automatic control malfunction	3.1/3.4	
062 AC Electrical Distribution				X									062K4.06 Knowledge of ac distribution system design feature(s)and/or interlock(s) which provide for the following: Bus lockouts	2.6/3.2	
062 AC Electrical Distribution				X									062K4.01 Knowledge of ac distribution system design feature(s)and/or interlock(s) which provide for the following: One-line diagram of 6.9kV distribution, including power sources of normal and alternative power	2.9/3.3	
063 DC Electrical Distribution			X										063K3.01 Knowledge of the effect that a loss or malfunction of the DC electrical system will have on the following: ED/G	3.7/4.1	

064 Emergency Diesel Generator	X													064K1.05 Knowledge of the physical connections and/or cause-effect relationships between the ED/G system and the following systems: Starting Air Systems	3.4/3.9	
064 Emergency Diesel Generator						X								064K6.08 Knowledge of the effect of a loss or malfunction of the following will have on the ED/G system: Fuel oil storage tanks	3.2/3.3	
073 Process Radiation Monitoring										X				073A4.03 Ability to manually operate and/or monitor in the control room: Check source for operability demonstration	3.1/3.2	
076 Service Water											X			076G2.2.3 (multi-unit license) Knowledge of the design, procedural, and operational differences between units.	3.8/3.9	
078 Instrument Air	X													078K1.05 Knowledge of the physical connections and/or cause-effect relationships between the IAS and the following systems: MSIV air	3.4/3.5	
103 Containment										X				103A3.01 Ability to monitor automatic operation of the containment system, including: Containment Isolation	3.9/4.2	
K/A Category Point Totals:	3	3	3	2	2	2	3	2	2	3	3			Group Point Total:		28
K/A Category Point Totals: (SRO)								3			2			Group Point Total:		5

ES-401		PWR Examination Outline Plant Systems - Tier 2/Group 2 (RO / SRO)												Form ES-401-2	
System # / Name	K 1	K 2	K 3	K 4	K 5	K 6	A 1	A 2	A 3	A 4	G	K/A Topic(s)	IR	#	
001 Control Rod Drive															
002 Reactor Coolant	X											002K1.03 Knowledge of the physical connections and/or cause-effect relationships between the RCS and the following systems: Borated water storage tank	3.8/3.8		
011 Pressurizer Level Control															
014 Rod Position Indication															
015 Nuclear Instrumentation		X										015K2.01 Knowledge of bus power supplies to the following: NIS channels, components, and interconnections	3.3/3.7		
016 Non-nuclear Instrumentation					X							016K5.01 Knowledge of the operational implication of the following concepts as they apply to the NNIS: Separation of control and protection circuits	2.7/2.8		
016 Non-nuclear Instrumentation (SRO)							X					016A2.02 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operations on the NNIS; and (b) based on those predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: Loss of power supply	2.9/3.2		
017 In-core Temperature Monitor											X	017G2.4.21 Knowledge of the parameters and logic used to assess the status of safety functions, such as reactivity control, core cooling and heat removal, reactor coolant system integrity, containment conditions, radioactivity release control, etc.	4.0/4.6		
027 Containment Iodine Removal															
028 Hydrogen Recombiner and Purge Control															
029 Containment Purge															
033 Spent Fuel Pool Cooling			X									033K3.03 Knowledge of the effect that a loss or malfunction of the Spent Fuel Pool Cooling System will have on the following: Spent fuel temperature	3.0/3.3		
034 Fuel Handling Equipment						X						034K6.02 Knowledge of the effect of a loss or malfunction on the following will have on the Fuel Handling System : Radiation monitoring systems	2.6/3.3		

035 Steam Generator (SRO)																			X	035G2.4.47 Ability to diagnose and recognize trends in an accurate and timely manner utilizing the appropriate control room reference material.	4.2/4.2	
041 Steam Dump/Turbine Bypass Control																						
045 Main Turbine Generator																		X		045A2.17 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operation on the MT/G system; and (b) based on those predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: Malfunction of electrohydraulic control	2.7/2.9	
055 Condenser Air Removal																		X		055A3.03 Ability to monitor automatic operation of the CARS, including: Automatic diversion of CARS exhaust	2.5/2.7	
056 Condensate																						
068 Liquid Radwaste																						
071 Waste Gas Disposal																		X		071A1.06 Ability to predict and/or monitor changes in parameters(to prevent exceeding design limits) associated with Waste Gas Disposal System operating the controls including: Ventilation system	2.5/2.8	
072 Area Radiation Monitoring																						
075 Circulating Water																				075K4.01 Knowledge of circulating water system design feature(s) and interlock(s) which provide for the following: Heat sink	2.5/2.8	
075 Circulating Water (SRO)																		X		075A2.02 Ability to (a) predict the impacts of the following malfunctions or operations on the circulating water system; and (b) based on those predictions, use procedures to correct, control, or mitigate the consequences of those malfunctions or operations: Loss of circulating water pumps	2.5/2.7	
079 Station Air																						
086 Fire Protection																						
K/A Category Point Totals:	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1								Group Point Total:		10
K/A Category Point Totals: (SRO)												2								Group Point Total:		3

Facility:	St. Lucie	Date of Exam:	2/2011			
Category	K/A #	Topic	RO		SRO-Only	
			IR	Q#	IR	Q#
1. Conduct of Operations	2.1.17	Ability to make accurate, clear, and concise verbal reports.	3.9		4.0	
	2.1.37	Knowledge of procedures, guidelines, or limitations associated with reactivity management.	4.3		4.6	
	2.1.5	Ability to use procedures related to shift staffing, such as minimum crew complement, overtime limitations, etc.	2.9		3.9	
	2.1.40	Knowledge of refueling administrative requirements. (SRO)	2.8		3.9	
	Subtotal		3		1	
2. Equipment Control	2.2.22	Knowledge of limiting conditions for operations and safety limits.	4.0		4.7	
	2.2.42	Ability to recognize system parameters that are entry-level conditions for Technical Specifications.	3.9		4.6	
	2.2.15	Ability to determine the expected plant configuration using design and configuration control documentation, such as drawings, line-ups, tag-outs, etc. (SRO)	3.9		4.3	
	2.2.21	Knowledge of pre- and post-maintenance operability requirements. (SRO)	2.9		4.1	
	Subtotal		2		2	
3. Radiation Control	2.3.11	Ability to control radiation releases.	3.8		4.3	
	2.3.12	Knowledge of radiological safety principles pertaining to licensed operator duties, such as containment entry requirements, fuel handling responsibilities, access to locked high-radiation areas, aligning filters, etc.	3.2		3.7	
	2.3.5	Ability to use radiation monitoring systems, such as fixed radiation monitors and alarms, portable survey instruments, personnel monitoring equipment, etc.	3.5		3.6	
	2.3.13	Knowledge of radiological safety procedures pertaining to licensed operator duties, such as response to radiation monitor alarms, containment entry requirements, fuel handling responsibilities, access to locked high-radiation areas, aligning filters, etc. (SRO)	3.4		3.8	
	2.3.4	Knowledge of radiation exposure limits under normal or emergency conditions. (SRO)	3.2		3.7	
	Subtotal		3		2	
4. Emergency Procedures / Plan	2.4.28	Knowledge of procedures relating to a security event (non-safeguards information).	3.2		4.1	
	2.4.34	Knowledge of RO tasks performed outside the main control room during an emergency and the resultant operational effects.	4.2		4.1	

	2.4.16	Knowledge of EOP implementation hierarchy and coordination with other support procedures or guidelines such as, operating procedures, abnormal operating procedures, and severe accident management guidelines. (SRO)	3.5		4.4	
	2.4.44	Knowledge of emergency plan protective action recommendations. (SRO)	2.4		4.4	
	Subtotal		2		2	
Tier 3 Point Total			10			

Tier / Group	Randomly Selected K/A	Reason for Rejection
2/1	022K2.02.01	St. Lucie does not have Chillers. Changed to 022K4.02
2/2	055.A3.03	CARS does not have automatic diversion of exhaust. Changed to 056A2.04
2/1	008A2.07	CCW standby pump does not have a low flow start. Changed to 008A2.03
1/2	060AK1.04	Not RO job function. Changed to 060AK1.01
1/1	029G2.4.18	Could not write SRO only question. Changed to 029EG2.4.29

Facility: St. Lucie		Date of Exam: 2/21/11		Exam Level: RO X	SRO X		
Item Description				Initial			
				a	b*	c#	
1.	Questions and answers are technically accurate and applicable to the facility.			LML	DL	DL	
2.	a.	NRC K/As are referenced for all questions.			LML	DL	DL
	b.	Facility learning objectives are referenced as available.			LML	DL	DL
3.	SRO questions are appropriate in accordance with Section D.2.d of ES-401			LML	DL	DL	
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).			LML	DL	DL	
5.	Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was systematically and randomly developed; or <input type="checkbox"/> the audit exam was completed before the license exam was started; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)			LML	DL	DL	
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 LML 71/40 189/2	Modified LML 81/0 45/2	New 25 62/248	LML	DL	
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 LML 32/08 33/910	C/A LML 48/17 42/4615		LML	DL	
8.	References/handouts provided do not give away answers or aid in the elimination of distractors.			LML	DL	DL	
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.			LML	DL	DL	
10.	Question psychometric quality and format meet the guidelines in ES Appendix B.			LML	DL	DL	
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.			LML	DL	DL	
		Printed Name / Signature			Date		
a. Author	Larry Rich			1/4/11			
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	Dave Lanyi			1/4/11			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	GERARD W. LUSICA			3/7/2011			
d. NRC Regional Supervisor	MALCOLM T. WIDEMAN			03/07/11			
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.							

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation	
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only			
<p>Instructions</p> <p>[Refer to Section D of ES-401 and Appendix B for additional information regarding each of the following concepts.]</p> <p>1. Enter the level of knowledge (LOK) of each question as either (F)undamental or (H)igher cognitive level.</p> <p>2. Enter the level of difficulty (LOD) of each question using a 1 - 5 (easy - difficult) rating scale (questions in the 2 – 4 range are acceptable).</p> <p>3. Check the appropriate box if a psychometric flaw is identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stem lacks sufficient focus to elicit the correct answer (e.g., unclear intent, more information is needed, or too much needless information). The stem or distractors contain cues (i.e., clues, specific determiners, phrasing, length, etc). The answer choices are a collection of unrelated true/false statements. The distractors are not credible; single implausible distractors should be repaired, more than one is unacceptable. One or more distractors is (are) partially correct (e.g., if the applicant can make unstated assumptions that are not contradicted by stem). <p>4. Check the appropriate box if a job content error is identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is not linked to the job requirements (i.e., the question has a valid K/A but, as written, is not operational in content). The question requires the recall of knowledge that is too specific for the closed reference test mode (i.e., it is not required to be known from memory). The question contains data with an unrealistic level of accuracy or inconsistent units (e.g., panel meter in percent with question in gallons). The question requires reverse logic or application compared to the job requirements. <p>5. <u>Check questions that are sampled</u> for conformance with the approved K/A and those that are <i>designated SRO-only</i> (K/A and license level mismatches are unacceptable).</p> <p>6. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the question as written (U)nsatisfactory (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?</p> <p>7. At a minimum, explain any "U" ratings (e.g., how the Appendix B psychometric attributes are not being met).</p>																
1	F	1									X			U	007EA2.06 Question appears to match the K/A. However it is a NOT question (Backwards logic). All turbine valves being closed is never an indication of a reactor trip. Suggestion: write the question looking	

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
															at a condition that should have caused a trip etc. NEW Made changes question now SAT. 2/09/2011 SAT3/1/2011
2	H	2												S	008AK2.02 Question kind of matches the K/A. SAT MOD
3	H	1				X								U	009EG2.4.4 Question kind of matches K/A..Very similar to SRO # 76. So how can # 76 be SRO only? # 76 helps answer # 3. After reviewing the SRO version, I was able to answer this question without any reference. With RCS Pressure at 1580 psia, how can an answer with LTOP in effect be plausible? (B and D not plausible). NEW Made changes (Unit 2 question) Look at final question when written. 2/09/2011 SAT3/1/2011
4	H	2				X								U	015AK2.07 Question appears to match the K/A. As written the applicant need only know the RCS pressure that is maintained after a loss of two RCPs. The reason is mute because it the only reason associated with the correct pressure limit. "A" answer does offer some competition as being plausible (and may also be correct) in many cases the SIAS setpoint is based on a loss of subcooling. D could also be argued as correct. Need to add to the stem IAW EOP-02 to exclude this answer as being correct. NEW Replaced question, need to reformat question and eliminate excess words. Otherwise question appears to be SAT. 2/09/2011 Band Limit. SAT3/1/2011

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
5	H	2												S	022AA2.04 Question kind of matches the K/A. SAT NEW (Changed to approximate) SAT3/1/2011
6	H	2												S	025AK3.01 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW
7	H	2				X								U	026AA1.02 Question appears to match the K/A. What indications do you have in the control room for containment spray pump seal coolers? Unless there is indication, this is not plausible. With pressurizer level off scale low, and RCS pressure so low, how can letdown temperature and RCP seals be plausible distractors? Will get another examiner to review question to offer a second opinion. Replaced question with new question SAT 2/09/2011. SAT3/1/2011 NEW
8	H	2												S	027AK2.03 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT BANK
9	F	2	X											E	029EK1.05 Question appears to match the K/A. This is really a GFES question. Needs to state that no operator actions were taken. Major is subjective. Would largest negative reactivity insertion be better? Will get another opinion on operational validity as far a being just a GFES question.

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
															NEW Made changes as requested. SAT. 2/9/2011 Add and why SAT3/1/2011
10	H	1										X		U	038EG2.4.46 Question does not meet the K/A. There is not a tube rupture in place. (use of the word "Leak" typically means small amount), and would be very difficult observe on many of the parameters that you have listed. Therefore they are not plausible. Need to have a tube rupture to satisfy the K/A. Will get another opinion on K/A match. NEW Changed the question to address concerns and asked which alarm would indicate first. Will review final question. SAT. SAT3/1/2011
11	H	2	X											E	CE/E05EK3.3 Question appears to match the K/A. Stem needs some clarification. IAW EOP-05? Or IAW OPS-539? Both B and D will achieve the desired results, and EOP-05 directs the operator to steam the least affected SG using the ADV. NEW Made changes as requested SAT. 2/9/2011
12	H	2				X								E	CE/E06EK1.3 Question kind of matches the K/A. Distractor C is not plausible. Need to develop another distractor. NEW Changed distractor C to read: maintain current DC alignment and all RCPs running. SAT3/1/2011

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
13	H	2					X							E	<p>055EK3.02 Question kind of matches the K/A. In reading the justification document for the caution prior to step 19, I am not totally in agreement that distractor D is totally correct. I believe the true reason is a little more complex, and someone could argue that there is not a correct answer. Will discuss.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Changed distractors to make D totally correct, and C not correct. SAT3/1/2011</p>
14	H	2												S	<p>056AA1.07 Question appears to match K/A. SAT NEW</p>
15	F	1												E	<p>058AA1.02 Question appears to match K/A. Distractors C and D should start out with inverter alarm, and becomes de-energized. Otherwise SAT. Not very discriminating.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Changed the question to address issues. Will look at question in final form.2/9/2011 SAT3/1/2011</p>
16	H	2				X						?		U	<p>062AA2.04 Question kind of matches the K/A. Do not believe that C and D are plausible. Distractor analysis is also talking about something else in D. Does not make sense. We really are not testing the normal values and upper limits.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Made changes as requested SAT. 2/09/2011 SAT3/1/2011</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
17	H	2												S	065AG2.1.23 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT Modified
18	H	2										X		E	077AK1.02 Question kind of matches the K/A. Not sure if we are actually testing the operational implications/will have another examiner review. Otherwise SAT. NEW After discussion determined to be SAT. Licensee did not like question and will attempt to write another. If the replacement question is SAT that will be acceptable. If not this question will remain. 2/9/2011 SAT3/1/2011
19	H	2					X					X		E	001AA2.04 Question kind of matches the K/A. (GFES) The distractor analysis and the lesson information provided do not agree, distractor analysis states that reactor power will stabilize at the initial reactor power and RCS temperature will increase, however the example that you provided states both power and temperature will rise. For a better match of the K/A, the trend should state that indicated reactor power will increase, then lower back to the original value, or something similar. Assuming turbine load remains constant cues the applicant that reactor power must be the same as it initially was. We need to make some adjustments to the question. BANK Replaced question, made several changes to new question. 2/09/2011 SAT3/1/2011

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
20	H	2	X											E	<p>028AA1.01 Question does not match K/A, but as discussed is written for heater protection (low level). However, again the question is attempting to test 3 items, and the applicant need only know two of these to answer the question. Question needs to be rewritten to test only two items.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Will continue to work on question. Question is backwards logic. 2/9/2011 SAT3/1/2011</p>
21	H	2										X		U	<p>051AK3.01 Question does not really meet the K/A, there are no reasons mentioned. Need to rewrite question to test reasons.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Changed question as requested. SAT. 2/9/2011</p>
22	F	2					X							E	<p>059AG2.1.30 Question appears to match the K/A. Can valve 6627X be closed by failing air to the valve locally at the tank? If so B could be another correct answer.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Made changes as requested. SAT 2/9/2011</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
23	F	2										?		E	<p>060AK1.01 Question may meet the K/A. How much gas will be released if new fuel cladding is ruptured? Most fuel does have some kind of gas inside, but most builds up from fission. Need to discuss this question. May need to use a spent fuel rod damaged in the pool (bubbles come up through the water and this will be seen on the monitor.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Upon discussion determined the new fuel would not have a gas release. Need to rewrite question. May need a K/A Change.</p> <p>Rewrote question SAT3/1/2011</p>
24	H	2												S	<p>069AK3.01 Question kind of meets the K/A. SAT</p> <p>NEW</p>
25	H	2												S	<p>074EK1.04 Question appears to meet the K/A. SAT</p> <p>BANK 2005 Callaway.</p>
26	H	2												S	<p>CA13AK2.2 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT</p> <p>NEW</p>
27	H	2	X											E	<p>CA11AA1.2 Question appears to match the K/A. What procedure directs the operator to throttle AFW flow? There were no steps in EOP-3.0, If we ask this question there needs to be a procedure step to direct this. Did the loss of offsite power occur while performing actions of EOP-3.0? Will the operators</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
															leave this procedure for another? Need to make this clear. NEW Changed question to be in EOP-1.0 and changed stem to separate what had happened prior to the SIAS. SAT 2/9/2011
28	F	2				X								E	003A4.02 Question appears to match the K/A. Just from the construction of the distractors, it is apparent that the loss of air will affect the oil levels of the RCPs. We need to balance out the distractors. NEW Made changes as requested. SAT 2/09/2011
29	H	2												S	004K3.04 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW
30	H	2				X								U	004K5.30 Question appears to match the K/A. Distractors C and D do not appear to be plausible. Most plants when shutdown do not have the pressurizer level control valve in automatic (the plant is solid). What if we put PIC 2201 in manual? T NEW Replaced question, still need to fix the second part of the stem. 2/9/2011 SAT3/1/2011
31	H	2					X							E	005A4.01 Question appears to match the K/A. Distractor analysis does not appear to be correct. If the temperature control valve goes fully closed. (less or no flow through the HX RCS) temp will go up, but answer B states that amps will decrease (one valve at 100% open and one valve fully closed so flow goes from essentially 125% to 100%, if the valves pass the same amount of flow. However two of the distractors state that amps will essentially remain the same. Need to discuss. Have you run this on the

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
															<p>simulator?</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Made some changes will change that 3306 is open 25%. SAT 2/9/2011 SAT3/1/2011</p>
32	H	2												S	<p>006A1.05 Question kind of matches the K/A. <i>Due to system alignment the SDC HX (Cooled by CCW) provide NPSH to HPSI, and this appears to satisfy the K/A.</i> SAT</p> <p>NEW</p>
33	H	2					X							E	<p>007G2.4.6 Question appears to match the K/A. Not sure the distractor analysis matches up with the distractors. Will an SIAS have occurred on Unit 1 @ 1800 psia? If not D may be a correct response unless you state the first action that would be taken in accordance with EOP-1.0.</p> <p>BANK 2008 NRC exam Need to look at making a safety valve lifting or ES throttling. Will Look at fix when complete. SAT3/1/2011</p>
34	F	2												S	<p>008K2.02 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT</p> <p>NEW</p>
35	H	2												S	<p>010K6.01 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT</p> <p>Bank</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
36	H	2												S	012A1.01 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT Modified
37	H	2												S	012G2.4.2 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT Modified
38	H	2												S	013A2.01 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW
39	H	1												S	013A3.02 Question appears to match the K/A. Not very discriminating. SAT NEW
40	F	2												S	022K2.01 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW
41	H	2				X								E	022K4.02 Question appears to match the K/A. Change the first part of distractor B to be Four Fans in Fast, this would make it more plausible. NEW
42	H	2				X								E	026A1.03 Question appears to match the K/A. On the second part of distractors A and C change #2 to read close one spray header valve either FCV... or FCV...Unless they cannot be operated separately. Will discuss. Throttle closed added. NEW changed A distractor to 3 and 3. SAT3/1/2011

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
43	H	2												S	026AK3.02 Question appears to match the K/A. Not very discriminating, but OK. SAT NEW
44	F	2												S	039A2.04 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW
45	H	2				X								U	059K1.05 Question Kind of matches the K/A. Distractor analysis and question do not match, distractors B and D are not plausible. Why would anyone think that only the A cold leg would be affected? BANK 2004 PSL NRC Exam Replaced with a 2006 Bank, SAT 2/09/2011
46	F	2				X								E	061K5.02 Question appears to match the K/A. Is there a difference between U1 and U2 concerning the AFW system? If so this could make other distractors more plausible. Using the TDAFW pump is not very plausible. (as noted it is usually twice what is required (no RCPs would have to be secured and is based on filling the SGs on a loss of all AC. NEW will use an AFW flow rate with RCP pumps Running or not. Still have work to do. SAT3/1/2011
47	H	2	X				X							E	062K4.01 Question appears to match the K/A. Again I am not sure that the distractor analysis is correct for this question. The analysis mentions a unit trip, however there is nothing in the question referring to a unit trip. From the comments provided, not sure which answer is correct. After discussion question is SAT. 2/9/2011 NEW

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
48	F	2												S	062K4.06 Question appears to match the K/A. Not very discriminating. SAT NEW
49	F	2	X			X								E	063K3.01 Question appears to match the K/A. Again I am not sure that the distractor analysis is correct for this question. Not sure which answer is the correct answer. NEW After discussion question is SAT. 2/9/2011
50	F	2				X								E	064K1.05 Question appears to meet the K/A. Because there are three air pressures that are sufficient to start the D/G, as an applicant I would discount distractor D. Some work is required to balance out the distractors. I think that we can make this question work. This question is testing three items. Need to work on two items. NEW Make sure the alarm would be in. then SAT3/1/2011
51	F	2												S	064K6.08 Question appears to meet the K/A. SAT NEW
52	F	2												S	073A4.03 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW
53	F	2												S	076G2.2.3 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
54	H	2				X								E	<p>078K1.05 Question appears to match the K/A. Usually air (or nitrogen) is the motive force to open an MSIV and keep it open, and if it is lost the valve will close, so why would D be a plausible distractor? Need to develop a more plausible distractor for D.</p> <p>NEW Will write a new question just looking at air and difference between units. 2/10/2011 SAT3/1/2011</p>
55	H	2												S	<p>103A3.01 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT BANK 2004</p>
56	H	2												S	<p>002K1.03 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW</p>
57	H	2												S	<p>015K2.01 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT NEW</p>
58	F	2				X								U	<p>016K5.01 Question kind of matches K/A. Distractors A and B do not appear to be plausible. Is there a time when the controllers fail to manual? It does not appear that even if the transmitter fails high that the controller will transfer to manual. Need more information, or we need to adjust question to make A and B more plausible.</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Rewrote question concept is SAT. Will look at final question when complete. 2/9/2011 SAT3/1/2011</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
59	F	2												S	017G2.4.21 Question kind of matches K/A. SAT NEW
60	F*	2				X								E	033K3.03 Question kind of matches K/A. Reference used to write question (revision 36B and reference sent in reference package are different (Revision 38). Distractor D is not plausible as written. It is the only distractor that states remains stable. It appears that there are two different ways to get these valves to open, 1 perform attachment J and place valves in auto, and 2 take the switch to locked close and back to open. Could be make a question out of this to improve distractor plausibility? Rewrite distractor A, remove statement from stem. (minimum). NEW Made changes as requested. SAT3/1/2011
61	F	2	X											E	034K6.02 Question appears to match the K/A. SAT Is this question okay with your operations rep? It would seem that stopping fuel handling until the alarm was checked out would be conservative. Need to state IAW AP 26.02. NEW Made changes as requested SAT
62	H	2				X								E	045A2.17 Question appears to match K/A. Distractors A and B should state: DEH will be in operator Auto, place DEH in Manual. Governor Valves will be in ... NEW Remove all distractor verbage after control. Then SAT. 2/10/2011
63	F	2												S	056A2.04 Question appears to match K/A. SAT NEW

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
64	F	2												S	071A1.06 Question appears to match K/A. SAT Modified
65	F	2												S	075K4.01 Question appears to match K/A. SAT NEW
66	F	2	X			X								E	G2.1.17 Question appears to match K/A. Stem should state IAW OPS-522. In order to make D more plausible, you could add the portion of after the US acknowledges...Will Discuss. NEW Made changes as requested. SAT 2/10/2011
67	F	2				X								E	G2.1.37 Question appears to match K/A. What is the flow capacity of one train of SDC? The highest flow in this question should not be greater than one train of SDC. The flows that are greater than one train of SDC flow are not plausible. NEW Made changes as requested. SAT 2/10/2011
68	F	2												S	G2.1.5 Question appears to match K/A. SAT NEW
69	F	2					X							S	G2.2.22 Question appears to match K/A. SAT All of the technical specification actions are not stated in the distractors. Just looking at being able to appeal the question. The complete action is to have the parameter within the limit and be in HSB within 1 hour. Can we include this? NEW

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
70	F	2												S	G2.2.42 Question appears to match K/A. SAT NEW
71	F*	2												S	G2.3.11 Question appears to match K/A. SAT BANK 2008 PSL NRC Exam
72	F	2				X								E	G2.3.12 Question kind of matches the K/A. Only one of the distractors has the letdown area monitored A to make it more plausible. Also need to add IAW 1-NOP-02.02. NEW Change distractors A and B to read charging pump cubicle, and letdown area.
73	F	2												S	G2.3.5 Question kind of matches the K/A. SAT New
74	F	3												S	G2.4.28 Question appears to match K/A. SAT NEW
75	F	2				X								E	G2.4.34 Question appears to match K/A. Need explain how distractor D is plausible. NEW Changed to state the charging header is aligned. SAT 2/10/2011

37 Sats, 10 Unsats, and 28 Enhancements

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws				4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A		
<p>Instructions</p> <p>[Refer to Section D of ES-401 and Appendix B for additional information regarding each of the following concepts.]</p> <p>1. Enter the level of knowledge (LOK) of each question as either (F)undamental or (H)igher cognitive level.</p> <p>2. Enter the level of difficulty (LOD) of each question using a 1 - 5 (easy - difficult) rating scale (questions in the 2 - 4 range are acceptable).</p> <p>3. Check the appropriate box if a psychometric flaw is identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The stem lacks sufficient focus to elicit the correct answer (e.g., unclear intent, more information is needed, or too much needless information). The stem or distractors contain cues (i.e., clues, specific determiners, phrasing, length, etc). The answer choices are a collection of unrelated true/false statements. The distractors are not credible; single implausible distractors should be repaired, more than one is unacceptable. One or more distractors is (are) partially correct (e.g., if the applicant can make unstated assumptions that are not contradicted by stem). <p>4. Check the appropriate box if a job content error is identified:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The question is not linked to the job requirements (i.e., the question has a valid K/A but, as written, is not operational in content). The question requires the recall of knowledge that is too specific for the closed reference test mode (i.e., it is not required to be known from memory). The question contains data with an unrealistic level of accuracy or inconsistent units (e.g., panel meter in percent with question in gallons). The question requires reverse logic or application compared to the job requirements. <p>5. <u>Check questions that are sampled</u> for conformance with the approved K/A and those that are <i>designated SRO-only</i> (K/A and license level mismatches are unacceptable).</p> <p>6. Based on the reviewer's judgment, is the question as written (U)nsatisfactory (requiring repair or replacement), in need of (E)ditorial enhancement, or (S)atisfactory?</p> <p>7. At a minimum, explain any "U" ratings (e.g., how the Appendix B psychometric attributes are not being met).</p>														

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
76	H	2	X			X							X	U	<p>008EG2.4.11 Question kind of matches the K/A. May not be SRO only. It appears that there is a vapor space leak (via the relief), and it refers to AOPs. Will get another opinion. Question page states that C is the proposed answer, but the distractor analysis states that A is the correct answer. I do not know which is correct, (I believe it is C) and the procedure flow path is not apparent. Do not believe that distractor B is plausible. (three high pressure sources of addition, and only one LPSI) Why is there a statement informing the applicant that the AOP was entered, and status checks are being performed per the ONP? Should they not know this? This question appears to be very similar to RO question # 3. Although they are at different plant conditions. Need to fix one or the other Mark agrees.</p> <p>Made changes to the stem and several distractors. Question now SAT. 2/9/2011</p> <p>NEW</p>
77	H	2	X											E	<p>029EG2.4.29 Question appears to match the K/A, and appears to be SRO only. The way the question is set up we are testing three separate items, and the applicant need only know two of three to get the answer correct. We need to test Alert/Site Area and time of declaration like distractors C and D. Or test the whether a 4 hour report or emergency plan declaration is required. I would prefer if the choices were declaring an alert is required by time 0016 or 0023, or a site emergency is required by time 0016 or 0023.Will discuss.</p> <p>NEW Changed question to resolve concerns, also changed stem to include maximum time to declare event. Consider using EPIP Chart. SAT 3/2/2011</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
78	H	2	X										?	E	<p>040AA2.05 Question appears to match K/A. Not sure if it is SRO only. Are these actions required by the procedure, if so we should state this in the stem Which one of the following states the required actions in accordance with EOP 5.0? Also need to have a more direct stem Which one of the following describes the actions (required by EOP-5.0 based on the above conditions). Are ROs required to know SI throttle conditions, and Containment Spray Termination Criteria? (Are these on a foldout page or something similar? Second Examiner did not believe the question was at the SRO level.</p> <p>After further discussion agreed the question was SRO only. Question needs to stay as is.</p> <p>NEW</p>
79	F	1												S	<p>054AG2.4.30 Question kind of matches the K/A. Appears to be SRO only. Not very discriminating.</p> <p>NEW</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
80	H	2				X								U	<p>057AA2.16 Question appears to match the K/A. Upon further review does not appear to match K/A. Not a Vital Bus. Appears to have an SRO aspect to it. It is not clear in the explanation whether the 120V Vital AC Bus 2B will cause any of the alarms, or instrument failures. Is there also a T/S associated with the loss of the instrument bus? If none of the alarms or instrument failures are caused by a loss of the 120V Vital AC Bus 2B then distractors A and B are not plausible. Upon discussion with staff decided the question essentially met the K/A. Need to make SRO only without a direct lookup. Will make changes to discuss basis or other items that are not direct lookup.</p> <p>NEW Made Changes as requested SAT 3/2/2011</p>
81	H	2												S	<p>077AA2.03 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to have SRO only aspect. Is figure 16 the only reference? If so, the question appears to be SAT. If not, we need to discuss any further references. Your distractor analysis mentioned action level 1, but this is not mentioned in the actual question.</p> <p>NEW</p>
82	H	1				X								S	<p>0024AG2.2.25 Question appears to match the K/A. Question appears to have an SRO only aspect. Would not meet the KA at the SRO level as written. Distractors C and D do not appear to be plausible. (Largest -αT is at always at EOL- GFES). Recommend changing all distractor to EOL and use after xenon decay and prior to xenon decay. Discussed between examiners, it may be SRO only if all of the distractors are EOL and we test the basis of after xenon decay or before xenon decay. Discussed, after changes and decided question was SAT</p> <p>NEW</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
83	H	2					X							S	<p>037AGG2.4.41 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO only. Are you sure that there is an non-isolable steam release? If so the question appears to be SAT. If the release can be terminated or filtered, then the question does not appear to have a correct answer. A&D and C&D subset issue. Need to make A or C the correct answer. After discussion decided to change to Unit 2 or leave as unit 1 and place pressure in stem and ask if an upgrade is required.</p> <p>NEW Made Changes as discussed SAT 3/2/2011</p>
84	H	2				X								E	<p>069AA2.01 Question appears to match the K/A, and appears to be SRO only. In Distractors C and D first half, you are providing an action. Therefore, the statement should either be yes, or no. If you desire the question to remain the same, something should be added to the stem (and why?) and another statement added after yes explaining why the answer is yes.</p> <p>NEW Made changes as requested SAT 2/10/2011.</p>
85	H	2				X							?	E	<p>CA11AA2.1 Question appears to meet the K/A. Not sure if it is SRO only. It seems like we are asking entry conditions for the procedures, and this is RO knowledge. Will have another examiner review to verify. If the cooldown is stopped, (and RCS pressure continues to rise, subcooling will still increase). So, how can to lower subcooling? Not sure if this is the correct statement. Statement from Mark. " EOP-15.0 is never wrong". Therefore there are two correct answers. Plan to add another event (tube leak) and use flowchart to determine what takes precedence. Will continue to work.</p> <p>NEW Made Changes as requested SAT 3/2/2011</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
86	H	2												E	<p>003G2.2.40 Question appears to match K/A. Appears to be SRO only. Change first part of each stem to read: RCP 2A1 and 2A2 and associated SG must be operable...</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>Another distractor other than mixing needs to be developed. 2/10/2011.</p> <p>Made Changes as requested SAT 3/2/2011</p>
87	H	2												E	<p>008A2.03 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to have an SRO aspect. After looking at the procedures, I am not sure if we are asking the correct question. I do not have a problem with the procedure selection piece of the question, but I can see an applicant questioning the failing open of the FCV. (we are making them assume that it is not functioning properly. We need to fix this portion of the question.</p> <p>NEW Continue to work on question (procedure contains actions or something similar) Still needs to be SRO only and match K/A.</p> <p>Made significant changes SAT 3/2/2011</p>
88	H	2												S	<p>013G2.2.44 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO Only.</p> <p>NEW</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
89	H	2	X										X	U	<p>039A2.03 Question appears to match the K/A. Question may have an SRO aspect. Again, we are asking for three items in a question, and the applicant need only know two of three to arrive at the correct answer. What component and correct procedure to enter for example, he need not know that the TS is applicable. Need to repair question so that the SRO aspect is tested, and the applicant must use SRO knowledge to arrive at the correct answer. Second examiner did not believe the question was at the SRO level. Also agreed that the question has too many parts. Revised question as requested, also changed second part of A and D. Question is now SAT. 2/09/2011.</p> <p>NEW</p>
90	H	2											X	U	<p>061A2.05 Question appears to match the K/A. Does NOT appear to be SRO only. Question states Unit 1, but the procedure included is Unit 2. Would the board operators initiate AFAS-1 using the initiation switches on the RTGB without referring to the procedure? Need to look at this one some more. Second examiner verified, not SRO only. Will continue to work on making the question SRO only.</p> <p>NEW Will add IAW TS Made Changes as requested SAT 3/2/2011</p>
91	H	2										X		S	<p>016A2.02 Not sure that the question meets the K/A. May have an SRO aspect. There does not appear to be a reference to a procedure (other than T.S.). Will have another examiner review and verify. Discussed using the T. S. as the procedure. SAT</p> <p>NEW Change how many channels to actuate. Made Changes as requested SAT 3/2/2011</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
92	H	2				X								E	<p>035G2.4.47 Question appears to match K/A. Appears to have an SRO aspect to it. B and C do not appear to be plausible. Why would anyone pick 0120 without knowing the starting level? Besides all readings are at 5gpd. Need to change the levels and times to make distractor more plausible.</p> <p>NEW First change was not successful will combine both questions to ensure Q is SRO only.</p> <p>Made Changes as requested SAT 3/2/2011</p>
93	F	2												S	<p>075A2.02 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO only.</p> <p>NEW Licensee wanted to change the question somewhat after validation. Will look at revision.</p> <p>Made additional changes to ask if Q is reportable or not reportable. Still SAT</p>
94	F	2												S	<p>G2.1.40 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO only.</p> <p>NEW</p>
95	F	1												S	<p>G2.2.15 Question appears to meet the K/A. Appears to be SRO only. Not Very Discriminating.</p> <p>NEW</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
96	F	2												S	<p>G2.2.21 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO only. Would like you to change B and D to Local idle start... leaving off the external leakage check. This is more plausible. The DG is always run to return it to service. How can you do an external leakage check without running the diesel? Otherwise SAT.</p> <p>NEW</p>
97	F	1											X	U	<p>G2.3.13 Question appears to match the K/A. Does not appear to be SRO only. These actions are based on entry into what procedure? Second Examiner agreed question is not SRO Only. Replaced question SAT. 2/09/2011</p> <p>BANK</p>
98	F	2												E	<p>G2.3.4 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO only. Distractors C and D not very discriminating. Could we come up with someone else to give permission?</p> <p>NEW</p> <p>EOF fully operational, will continue to work.</p> <p>Made Changes as requested SAT 3/2/2011</p>
99	H	2												S	<p>G2.4.16 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO only. SAT</p> <p>NEW</p>

Q#	1. LOK (F/H)	2. LOD (1-5)	3. Psychometric Flaws					4. Job Content Flaws				5. Other		6. U/E/ S	7. Explanation
			Stem Focus	Cues	T/F	Cred. Dist.	Partial	Job- Link	Minutia	#/ units	Back- ward	Q= K/A	SRO Only		
100	H	2												S	G2.4.44 Question appears to match the K/A. Appears to be SRO only. SAT NEW

12 Sats, 5 Unsats, and 8 Enhancements

Facility: St. Lucie 2011-301		Date of Exam: 03/17/2011		Exam Level: RO/SRO	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	☑	N/A			
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	N/A		N/A		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	☑				
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 \pm 2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, \pm 4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	☑				
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	☑				
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	☑				
Printed Name/Signature			Date		
a. Grader	 KENNETH D. SCHMITT			3-30-11	
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	N/A			N/A	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	 GERARD W. LASIKA			3/30/2011	
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	 MALCOLM T. WITMANN			04/01/11	
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Facility: <u>ST. LUCIE</u>		Date of Exam: <u>3/17/11</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	LMP	B			
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	LMP	DL			
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	LMP	RL			
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 \pm 2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, \pm 4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	LMP	DL			
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	LMP	DL			
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	LMP	RL			
a. Grader		Printed Name/Signature <u>Terry Benton</u> <u>LARRY KILH</u>		Date <u>3-18-11</u>	
b. Facility Reviewer(*)		<u>David Lany</u>		<u>3/22/11</u>	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)		_____		_____	
d. NRC Supervisor (*)		_____		_____	
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Licensee Grading Sheet.