

THE CARLA SMITH WAIVER PROCESS

Following the grading of the 2011 Vogtle exam, P. Capehart sent emails to both M. Meeks and J. Hopkins independently asking them if they would recommend giving a waiver to the applicants they examined (for future exams). Both M. Meeks and J. Hopkins recommended to not grant waivers for Carla Smith (reference attached emails). Carla was the only applicant that was not recommended for a routine waiver. P. Capehart forwarded these recommendations to M. Widmann, along with his own recommendation to not grant a waiver for Carla Smith.

On June 7, 2011, [REDACTED], Vogtle operations training supervisor, sent an email to M. Meeks discussing the potential waiver requests for the upcoming March 2012 initial exam. Of note in this email, [REDACTED] identifies Carla Smith as one of three applicants from the 2011 exam that Vogtle identified as requiring further evaluation. M. Meeks had been assigned as the Chief Examiner (under instruction) for the March 2012 exam, with M. Bates assigned as the Chief Examiner of record. After receiving this email, M. Meeks consulted with P. Capehart, J. Hopkins, M. Bates, and M. Widmann to formulate a consolidated response from the region. Because everyone agreed that Carla Smith's performance on the 2011 exam was sufficiently poor to not grant a routine waiver, the decision was made to notify Vogtle that all of the other applicants, except Carla Smith, would probably receive the routine waiver of the operating test. For Carla Smith, it was agreed to notify Vogtle that if she submitted a waiver request for the operating test, "...for C. Smith, Region II would likely deny a waiver of the operating test portion of the exam." M. Meeks replied to [REDACTED] email on August 2, 2011.

In Carla Smith's cover letter to request an appeal, she states:

It is understood that a waiver is granted on a case by case basis. If the intent was to deny the waiver then the applicant should have the opportunity to formally submit a waiver for review. If the regional office decided to deny the waiver then per ES-204, Page 2 of 7: "the regional office shall promptly notify the applicant in writing concerning the disposition of the request, and provide an explanation for the denial." Unfortunately this did not occur, The NRC examiners on the current examination team (to include the operating test examiner) were consulted and they strongly discouraged the submittal of a waiver of the operating exam on my behalf.

Throughout the exam development process, at no time did anyone from the NRC notify either Vogtle training personnel, or Carla Smith directly, that they were prohibited from submitting a waiver request from Carla Smith. As evidenced from the above statement and the attached emails, the consistent message to the Vogtle training management (there was no direct communication between anyone in the NRC and Carla Smith) was that if a waiver request was submitted, "it would likely be denied by the region." Contrary to the applicant's contention cited above, the "operating test examiner," M. Bates, did not have any interaction with Carla Smith directly concerning her potential operating test waiver. Furthermore, M. Bates was not directly involved in the discussions concerning Carla Smith's performance on the 2011 exam—the decision to likely deny a waiver was made by the 2011 exam team (P. Capehart, J. Hopkins, and M. Meeks), in consultation with the branch chief, independently of any input from M. Bates. Additional information concerning M. Bates' assignment as Carla Smith's examiner of record are included in a following section.

Irrespective of the region's likely denial of an operating test waiver for Carla Smith, the facility licensee did not submit any waiver request to the region. Therefore, the region never denied any waiver. Furthermore, the region never formally sent a letter to Carla Smith explaining a denial of a waiver (per ES-204) because the waiver request was never submitted.

In the applicant's cover letter to her appeal of the grading of her operating test, she states:

It is unclear to the applicant why I was required to retake the operating test. The applicant passed the previous years' simulator test with some margin and scored 100% (pass) on the JPM portion, (see results). Another applicant passed the JPM portion with the minimum score and was granted a waiver.

The other referenced applicant from the 2011 exam is [REDACTED]. For his operating test, he has three total comments on the entire simulator scenarios. Although [REDACTED] was graded as "UNSAT" on three JPMs, two of these are administrative JPMs and one was a simulator JPM. A comparison between the two applicants' grading of the 2011 operating test is shown below:

Operating Test Portion	Carla Smith	[REDACTED]
Total Number of Simulator Scenario Comments	12	3
Number of Administrative JPM Failures	0	2
Number of System/In-Plant JPM Failures	0	1
Number of Administrative JPMs with Comments	1	1
Number of System/In-Plant JPMs with Comments	5	2

As stated in NUREG 1021, ES-301 B.3., the simulator scenario portion of the operating test is "...the most performance-based aspect of the operating test and is used to evaluate the applicant's ability to safely operate the plant's systems under dynamic, integrated conditions." With this guidance in mind, the applicant's comparative performance on the dynamic simulator scenarios weighed more heavily in the regional decision to grant the waiver to [REDACTED]; on the one hand, and to notify the facility that the region would likely deny the waiver for Carla Smith, on the other.

In hindsight, Carla Smith's performance on the dynamic simulator portion of the 2012 exam, which led to documentation of approximately 18 comments on the 303 form, retroactively supports the region's position that her performance on the 2011 exam warranted additional evaluation on the 2012 exam.

Meeks, Michael

From: Capehart, Phillip
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Meeks, Michael
Subject: Input for waivers
Attachments: image001.png; image002.jpg

Michael, Malcolm has asked for input as to the status of future (operating portion of the exam) waivers for the Vogtle retake exam. I wanted to get your input as to the individuals you examined and passed on the operating portion of the exam. Of the 3 applicants that passed the operating portion of the exam but failed the written, do you recommend that they receive waivers for a retake for the operating portion of the exam? Malcolm is reviewing the 303s and would like to get back to [REDACTED] ASAP.



Phillip G. Capehart
Senior Operations Engineer
RII Operator Licensing
04-997-4483

Meeks, Michael

From: Capehart, Phillip
Sent: Tuesday, May 03, 2011 7:39 AM
To: Widmann, Malcolm
Cc: Meeks, Michael; Hopkins, Jay; Bacon, Daniel
Subject: FW: Input for waivers
Attachments: image001.png; image002.jpg

Malcolm, I spoke with both Michael and Jay about the possibility of future waiver denials. The only individual that all 3 of us are in agreement about is Carla. Even though she passed the operating test portion, we would recommend a future waiver of this portion of the exam be denied.

Phil

From: Meeks, Michael
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 3:19 PM
To: Capehart, Phillip
Subject: RE: Input for waivers

Phil,

I do not have any problems or concerns with granting a waiver of the operating exam to the three individuals listed below that I examined [REDACTED]).

[REDACTED] I would recommend NOT granting waivers of the operating exam to [REDACTED] and C. Smith.

So you know, while I am at the G-103 class this week, I will have access to all NRC accounts and drives during my class in the day; however, the NRC laptop I have at the hotel is not working. I have access to the O: drive here at Region I if you need me to make changes to stuff, or read other people's changes...

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)
245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257
office: 404.997.4467
email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov

From: Capehart, Phillip
Sent: Monday, May 02, 2011 2:59 PM
To: Meeks, Michael
Subject: Input for waivers

Michael, Malcolm has asked for input as to the status of future (operating portion of the exam) waivers for the Vogtle retake exam. I wanted to get your input as to the individuals you examined and passed on the operating portion of the exam. Of the 3 applicants that passed the operating portion of the exam but failed the written, do you recommend that they receive waivers for a retake for the operating portion of the exam? Malcolm is reviewing the 303s and would like to get back to Rick Brigdon ASAP.

Barefield
Dyer
Jenkins



Phillip G. Capehart
Senior Operations Engineer
RII Operator Licensing
404-997-4483

Meeks, Michael

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 7:24 AM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; Brigdon, Richard D.
Subject: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

Michael,

We are in the process of identifying individuals in which we plan on requesting a waiver for the March 2012 Operating Exam in accordance with ES-204, Section D.1.a. The individuals in which we are confident that we will request an Operating Exam waiver are:

[REDACTED]

Three other individuals from that class also passed the March 2011 Operating Exam; however, we are presently evaluating their status and are inquiring as to whether or not Region II would approve an Operating Exam waiver for the individuals below:

[REDACTED]

If I understand ES-204, these waiver requests should be documented on Form 398 when the license applications are submitted and would be considered routine waivers with review/approval through the Region II office. I also understand that the requirements of D.1.k must also be met to waive the 24 month GFE requirement. However, in order to allow us to develop an appropriate recovery plan, I am asking if Region II would evaluate the status of the individuals listed above and indicate whether or not a waiver would be approved. If I need to follow up with a formal request (i.e. letter), please let me know so I may submit it in a timely manner.

In addition, I understand that you may not be the Chief Examiner for our March 2013 exam, however, I am asking for some assistance as to how I should proceed with a similar issue. There is one individual that will be enrolled in the LOIT program this fall and is scheduled to take an Initial Operating Exam in March 2013 that is about 2 months shy of the prerequisite 36 month eligibility requirement. We currently plan on requesting a waiver for this individual as well but I do not believe this would be considered a routine waiver as described in ES-204; thus requiring NRR approval. As you might expect, we would like to know whether or not this waiver request would be accepted. My question, how should I proceed? Should I submit a formal letter (signed by our VP) requesting evaluation of this request prior to submitting the Form 398 application? If so, when would submittal of a request be considered timely?

Any assistance on these issues would be greatly appreciated.

[REDACTED]
Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

[REDACTED]

Meeks, Michael

From: Capehart, Phillip
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2011 2:06 PM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: Bates, Mark; Schaaf, Kenneth; Widmann, Malcolm; Franke, Mark
Subject: RE: schedule additions

OK, I changed the schedule and RPS to reflect the change in the dates for the Vogtle exam. Also, I will be replacing Bruno on this exam to allow him more time to prep the Farley exam he is chiefing.

Phil

From: Meeks, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, August 16, 2011 1:17 PM
To: Widmann, Malcolm
Cc: Schaaf, Kenneth; Capehart, Phillip; Franke, Mark; Bates, Mark
Subject: RE: schedule additions

Malcolm,

For what's it worth, I am willing to do the in-office portion of the Emergency Procedures inspection for WB2 mentioned below, as long as it can be worked in among my Chief Examiner U/I for Vogtle—especially since I will be working on the same IP (?) at Robinson with Rick the week of 12/5/2011 as mentioned below and during our branch meeting today.

Another schedule change for the March/April Vogtle exam is due to the Masters golf tournament, which is scheduled for April 5-8, 2012. Recommend putting a "Doc" block in for the "middle" week of 4/02 (2012) for myself, Bruno, and Mark Bates; and shifting the exam weeks to the right by one week (i.e. all three of us onsite the week of 4/09; Bruno and myself onsite the week of 4/16).

Thanks—

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

*Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)
245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257
office: 404.997.4467
email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov*

From: Widmann, Malcolm
Sent: Thursday, August 11, 2011 4:26 PM
To: Capehart, Phillip; Schaaf, Kenneth

Cc: Franke, Mark; Aiello, Ronald; Capehart, Phillip; Laska, Gerard; Baldwin, Richard; Meeks, Michael; Bacon, Daniel; Toth, Amanda; Bates, Mark; Lanyi, David

Subject: schedule additions

We have some other activities, not exam related, that need to be added to the current FY schedule and 2012. Mostly for WB2 but some ROB follow-up stuff too.

- Delete 11/14 "WB U2 SU inspection" for Baldwin and Meeks.
- Add 11/28 "U1 SIM Insp" for Aiello and Baldwin
- Add 12/5 week "ROB EOP Inspection" for Baldwin and Meeks.
- Add 2/20 week "WB U2 prep" (onsite inspection of training objectives) for Aiello and Capehart
- Add (as a place holder) weeks 2/27, 3/5, 3/12 "WB U2 Review" for Aiello, Capehart, Laska (3-50Q tests); - Need to check on leave for Aiello on 3/5 if it is real
- Add week 3/26 "WB U2 Exam" for Aiello and Capehart (onsite)
- Correct under Bates "VG-IP" week 3/5, class size to 14/9/1 (licensee informed me via telecon).
- Add 5/7 "ROB PI&R" for Lanyi.
- Add (placeholders) 5/7 "WB U2 SU" (start-up inspection) for Bacon, Laska, Toth; 5/14 for Bacon, Lanyi, Toth; 5/21 Lanyi, Toth; 5/28 Aiello, Bates, Lanyi, Laska, Toth.

We also need to add IPs to be inspected at WB2; 370 man hrs (2 guys - 6 weeks, not all at once) effort to address IPs. Slated for March-April of 2012.

IP 41500, Training inspection (for differences and SAT inspection): **Level of effort = 136 man hours (2 people, 1 week in office and 1 week in the field). If a HQ Human Factors person is used and one typically is, add 40 hours. 16 hours post inspection documentation.**

IP 42400, Plant Procedures inspection: **Level of effort = 104 hours. 2 people one week in the field with 8 hour prep and 16 man hours post inspection documentation.**

IP 42452, Emergency Procedures inspection: **Level of effort = 136 man hours (2 people, 1 week in office and 1 week in the field). On occasion a third person is used. If so, add 40 hours. 16 hours post inspection documentation.**

- P I I -

Meeks, Michael

From: Meeks, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 10:18 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED] Bates, Mark; Franke, Mark
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

[REDACTED]

Sorry to be so long getting back to you. I have checked with Mark Bates and Malcolm and have preliminary answers for you:

1. For [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]: these would be routine waivers approved by Region II. These individuals would have the operating test portion of the exam waived, and would only need to take the written exam. When their applications are submitted, they would need to specify deficiencies (i.e. as noted in the last NRC exam) and the remedial training they did to correct these deficiencies.

2. For C. Smith, Region II would likely deny a waiver of the operating test portion of the exam. However, she could re-take the entire exam (both a complete operating exam and the written).

3. For the individual in the March 2013 class, we need some additional information. S-204 D.1.i allows the region to approve a routine waiver of "up to 6 months of the 3 years of (responsible nuclear) power plant experience for an RO (or an SRO), but not to exceed 2 months of the year of onsite experience for an RO and 1 month of the 6 for an SRO." Therefore, if the applicant meets this criteria, Region II could approve a routine waiver. If the applicant does not meet this criteria, we would need to receive authorization from the IOLB program office (NRC Headquarters) to grant the waiver. In either case, after the applicant passed the NRC exam, we would issue a "pass" letter stating that the applicant passed the exam, and that the license would be issued once the applicant completes the required experience.

Please let me know if you have any further questions—

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)
245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257
office: 404.997.4467
email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov

1
- P I I -

- P I I -

From: [Redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 7:24 AM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [Redacted]
Subject: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

Michael,

We are in the process of identifying individuals in which we plan on requesting a waiver for the March 2012 Operating Exam in accordance with ES-204, Section D.1.a. The individuals in which we are confident that we will request an Operating Exam waiver are:

[Redacted]

Three other individuals from that class also passed the March 2011 Operating Exam; however, we are presently evaluating their status and are inquiring as to whether or not Region II would approve an Operating Exam waiver for the individuals below:

[Redacted]

Charlissa Smith (55-23694).

If I understand ES-204, these waiver requests should be documented on Form 398 when the license applications are submitted and would be considered routine waivers with review/approval through the Region II office. I also understand that the requirements of D.1.k must also be met to waive the 24 month GFE requirement. However, in order to allow us to develop an appropriate recovery plan, I am asking if Region II would evaluate the status of the individuals listed above and indicate whether or not a waiver would be approved. If I need to follow up with a formal request (i.e. letter), please let me know so I may submit it in a timely manner.

In addition, I understand that you may not be the Chief Examiner for our March 2013 exam, however, I am asking for some assistance as to how I should proceed with a similar issue. There is one individual that will be enrolled in the LOIT program this fall and is scheduled to take an Initial Operating Exam in March 2013 that is about 2 months shy of the prerequisite 36 month eligibility requirement. We currently plan on requesting a waiver for this individual as well but I do not believe this would be considered a routine waiver as described in ES-204; thus requiring NRR approval. As you might expect, we would like to know whether or not this waiver request would be accepted. My question, how should I proceed? Should I submit a formal letter (signed by our VP) requesting evaluation of this request prior to submitting the Form 398 application? If so, when would submittal of a request be considered timely?

Any assistance on these issues would be greatly appreciated.

[Redacted]
Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant
[Redacted]
[Redacted]

Tracking:

- P I I -

Recipient

[REDACTED]

Widmann, Malcolm

[REDACTED]

Bates, Mark

Franke, Mark

Delivery

Delivered: 8/2/2011 10:18 AM

Delivered: 8/2/2011 10:18 AM

Delivered: 8/2/2011 10:18 AM

Read

Read: 8/2/2011 10:23 AM

- P I I -

Meeks, Michael

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 2:15 PM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

For item 3 below, we will be requesting a waiver for no greater than 80 days of the 36 months responsible power plant experience for an instant SRO candidate (ES-202 D.2.a.(1)). All other requirements will be met.

Also, how would I go about finding out whether or not Region II will grant an operating exam waiver for the individuals submitted? This would be very beneficial as we tailor their remediation program to the specific needs.

Thanks for your help,

[REDACTED]
*Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant*

From: Meeks, Michael [mailto:Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 10:18 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED]; Bates, Mark; Franke, Mark
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

[REDACTED]

Sorry to be so long getting back to you. I have checked with Mark Bates and Malcolm and have preliminary answers for you:

1. For [REDACTED]: these would be routine waivers approved by Region II. These individuals would have the operating test portion of the exam waived, and would only need to take the written exam. When their applications are submitted, they would need to specify deficiencies (i.e. as noted in the last NRC exam) and the remedial training they did to correct these deficiencies.
2. For C. Smith, Region II would likely deny a waiver of the operating test portion of the exam. However, she could re-take the entire exam (both a complete operating exam and the written).
3. For the individual in the March 2013 class, we need some additional information. ES-204 D.1.i allows the region to approve a routine waiver of "up to 6 months of the 3 years of (responsible nuclear) power plant experience for an RO (or an SRO), but not to exceed 2 months of the year of onsite experience for an RO and 1 month of the 6 for an SRO." Therefore, if the applicant meets this criteria, Region II could approve a routine waiver. If the applicant does not meet this criteria, we would need to receive authorization from the IOLB program office (NRC Headquarters) to grant the waiver. In either case, after the applicant passed the NRC exam, we would

- P I I -

- P I I -

issue a "pass" letter stating that the applicant passed the exam, and that the license would be issued once the applicant completes the required experience.

Please let me know if you have any further questions—

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)

245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)

Atlanta, GA 30303-1257

office: 404.997.4467

email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 7:24 AM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED]
Subject: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

Michael,

We are in the process of identifying individuals in which we plan on requesting a waiver for the March 2012 Operating Exam in accordance with ES-204, Section D.1.a. The individuals in which we are confident that we will request an Operating Exam waiver are:

[REDACTED]

Three other individuals from that class also passed the March 2011 Operating Exam; however, we are presently evaluating their status and are inquiring as to whether or not Region II would approve an Operating Exam waiver for the individuals below:

[REDACTED] and
Charlissa Smith (55-23694).

If I understand ES-204, these waiver requests should be documented on Form 398 when the license applications are submitted and would be considered routine waivers with review/approval through the Region II office. I also understand that the requirements of D.1.k must also be met to waive the 24 month GFE requirement. However, in order to allow us to develop an appropriate recovery plan, I am asking if Region II would evaluate the status of the individuals listed above and indicate whether or not a waiver would be approved. If I need to follow up with a formal request (i.e. letter), please let me know so I may submit it in a timely manner.

In addition, I understand that you may not be the Chief Examiner for our March 2013 exam, however, I am asking for some assistance as to how I should proceed with a similar issue. There is one individual that will be enrolled in the LOIT program this fall and is scheduled to take an Initial Operating Exam in March 2013 that is about 2 months shy of the prerequisite 36 month eligibility requirement. We currently plan on requesting a waiver for this individual as well but I do not believe this would be considered a routine waiver as described in ES-204; thus requiring NRR approval. As you might expect, we would like to know whether or not this waiver request would be accepted. My question, how should I proceed? Should I submit a formal letter (signed by our VP) requesting

- P I I -

evaluation of this request prior to submitting the Form 398 application? If so, when would submittal of a request be considered timely?

Any assistance on these issues would be greatly appreciated.

[REDACTED]
Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

- P I I -

Meeks, Michael

From: Meeks, Michael
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2011 11:01 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED]; Bates, Mark; Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

[REDACTED]

Thanks for your email. I am just back in the office today from a two-week exam, and starting to go through my email backlog.

- [REDACTED] wrote: "For item 3 below, we will be requesting a waiver for no greater than 80 days of the 36 months responsible power plant experience for an instant SRO candidate (ES-202 D.2.a.(1)). All other requirements will be met."

Good, therefore as long as the individual has 6 months of responsible nuclear power plant experience at Vogtle this should be a routine waiver that we can approve within the Region per ES-204 D.1.i. When the results of the exam are issued, the individual applicant would receive a letter stating that he had passed the exam, and once you certify to us that the remaining 80 days of responsible nuclear power plant experience are met (i.e. after the exam), we would issue the individual a license.

- [REDACTED] wrote: "Also, how would I go about finding out whether or not Region II will grant an operating exam waiver for the individuals submitted? This would be very beneficial as we tailor their remediation program to the specific needs."

I'm not sure I understand if you are asking a new question. For [REDACTED]: as long as these individuals' applications demonstrate that they have completed a remedial training program to address deficiencies, these would be routine waivers approved by Region II. These five individuals would have the operating test portion of the exam waived, and would only need to take the written exam. For C. Smith, Region II would likely deny a waiver of the operating test portion of the exam. However, she could re-take the entire exam (both a complete operating exam and the written). I had briefed regional management on the above individuals and received concurrence before I sent my earlier email; so they were "preliminary" answers insofar as we have not received/evaluated the actual applications.

Please let me know if you have any further questions—

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)
245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257
office: 404.997.4467
email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov

- P I I -

From: [redacted] [mailto:[redacted]]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 2:15 PM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: [redacted]
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

For item 3 below, we will be requesting a waiver for no greater than 80 days of the 36 months responsible power plant experience for an instant SRO candidate (ES-202 D.2.a.(1)). All other requirements will be met.

Also, how would I go about finding out whether or not Region II will grant an operating exam waiver for the individuals submitted? This would be very beneficial as we tailor their remediation program to the specific needs.

Thanks for your help,

[redacted]
Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

From: Meeks, Michael [mailto:Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 10:18 AM
To: [redacted]
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [redacted]; Bates, Mark; Franke, Mark
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

[redacted]

Sorry to be so long getting back to you. I have checked with Mark Bates and Malcolm and have preliminary answers for you:

1. For [redacted]: these would be routine waivers approved by Region II. These individuals would have the operating test portion of the exam waived, and would only need to take the written exam. When their applications are submitted, they would need to specify deficiencies (i.e. as noted in the last NRC exam) and the remedial training they did to correct these deficiencies.
2. For C. Smith, Region II would likely deny a waiver of the operating test portion of the exam. However, she could re-take the entire exam (both a complete operating exam and the written).
3. For the individual in the March 2013 class, we need some additional information. ES-204 D.1.i allows the region to approve a routine waiver of "up to 6 months of the 3 years of (responsible nuclear) power plant experience for an RO (or an SRO), but not to exceed 2 months of the year of onsite experience for an RO and 1 month of the 6 for an SRO." Therefore, if the applicant meets this criteria, Region II could approve a routine waiver. If the applicant does not meet this criteria, we would need to receive authorization from the IOLB program office (NRC Headquarters) to grant the waiver. In either case, after the applicant passed the NRC exam, we would

- P I I -

issue a "pass" letter stating that the applicant passed the exam, and that the license would be issued once the applicant completes the required experience.

Please let me know if you have any further questions—

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)
245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257
office: 404.997.4467
email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 7:24 AM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED]
Subject: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

Michael,

We are in the process of identifying individuals in which we plan on requesting a waiver for the March 2012 Operating Exam in accordance with ES-204, Section D.1.a. The individuals in which we are confident that we will request an Operating Exam waiver are:

[REDACTED].

Three other individuals from that class also passed the March 2011 Operating Exam; however, we are presently evaluating their status and are inquiring as to whether or not Region II would approve an Operating Exam waiver for the individuals below:

[REDACTED] and
Charlissa Smith (55-23694).

If I understand ES-204, these waiver requests should be documented on Form 398 when the license applications are submitted and would be considered routine waivers with review/approval through the Region II office. I also understand that the requirements of D.1.k must also be met to waive the 24 month GFE requirement. However, in order to allow us to develop an appropriate recovery plan, I am asking if Region II would evaluate the status of the individuals listed above and indicate whether or not a waiver would be approved. If I need to follow up with a formal request (i.e. letter), please let me know so I may submit it in a timely manner.

In addition, I understand that you may not be the Chief Examiner for our March 2013 exam, however, I am asking for some assistance as to how I should proceed with a similar issue. There is one individual that will be enrolled in the LOIT program this fall and is scheduled to take an Initial Operating Exam in March 2013 that is about 2 months shy of the prerequisite 36 month eligibility requirement. We currently plan on requesting a waiver for this individual as well but I do not believe this would be considered a routine waiver as described in ES-204; thus requiring NRR approval. As you might expect, we would like to know whether or not this waiver request would be accepted. My question, how should I proceed? Should I submit a formal letter (signed by our VP) requesting

3
- P I I -

evaluation of this request prior to submitting the Form 398 application? If so, when would submittal of a request be considered timely?

Any assistance on these issues would be greatly appreciated.

[REDACTED]
Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Recipient

[REDACTED] V.
[REDACTED]
Bates, Mark
Widmann, Malcolm
[REDACTED]

Delivery

Delivered: 9/27/2011 11:01 AM
Delivered: 9/27/2011 11:01 AM

Read

Read: 9/27/2011 11:11 AM

- P I I -

Meeks, Michael

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2011 11:09 AM
To: Meeks, Michael
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

Thanks, I just wanted to verify that we were all on the same page.

[REDACTED]
Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

From: Meeks, Michael [mailto:Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, September 27, 2011 11:01 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: [REDACTED] Bates, Mark; Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED] [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

[REDACTED]

Thanks for your email. I am just back in the office today from a two-week exam, and starting to go through my email backlog.

[REDACTED] wrote: "For item 3 below, we will be requesting a waiver for no greater than 80 days of the 36 months responsible power plant experience for an instant SRO candidate (ES-202 D.2.a.(1)). All other requirements will be met."

Good, therefore as long as the individual has 6 months of responsible nuclear power plant experience at Vogtle this should be a routine waiver that we can approve within the Region per ES-204 D.1.i. When the results of the exam are issued, the individual applicant would receive a letter stating that he had passed the exam, and once you certify to us that the remaining 80 days of responsible nuclear power plant experience are met (i.e. after the exam), we would issue the individual a license.

[REDACTED] wrote: "Also, how would I go about finding out whether or not Region II will grant an operating exam waiver for the individuals submitted? This would be very beneficial as we tailor their remediation program to the specific needs."

I'm not sure I understand if you are asking a new question. For [REDACTED]: as long as these individuals' applications demonstrate that they have completed a remedial training program to address deficiencies, these would be routine waivers approved by Region II. These five individuals would have the operating test portion of the exam waived, and would only need to take the written exam. For C. Smith, Region II would likely deny a waiver of the operating test portion of the exam. However, she could re-take the entire exam (both a complete operating exam and the written). I had briefed regional management on the above individuals and received concurrence before I sent my earlier email; so they were "preliminary" answers insofar as we have not received/evaluated the actual applications.

- P I I -

Please let me know if you have any further questions—

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

*Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)
245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257
office: 404.997.4467
email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov*

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Friday, September 09, 2011 2:15 PM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: [REDACTED]
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

For item 3 below, we will be requesting a waiver for no greater than 80 days of the 36 months responsible power plant experience for an instant SRO candidate (ES-202 D.2.a.(1)). All other requirements will be met.

Also, how would I go about finding out whether or not Region II will grant an operating exam waiver for the individuals submitted? This would be very beneficial as we tailor their remediation program to the specific needs.

Thanks for your help,

[REDACTED]
*Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant*
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

From: Meeks, Michael [mailto:Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, August 02, 2011 10:18 AM
To: [REDACTED]
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED] Bates, Mark; Franke, Mark
Subject: RE: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

[REDACTED]

Sorry to be so long getting back to you. I have checked with Mark Bates and Malcolm and have preliminary answers for you:

1. For [REDACTED]:
these would be routine waivers approved by Region II. These individuals would have the operating test portion of the exam waived, and would only need to take the written exam. When their applications are submitted, they would need to specify deficiencies (i.e. as noted in the last NRC exam) and the remedial training they did to correct these deficiencies.

2. For C. Smith, Region II would likely deny a waiver of the operating test portion of the exam. However, she could re-take the entire exam (both a complete operating exam and the written).

3. For the individual in the March 2013 class, we need some additional information. ES-204 D.1.i allows the region to approve a routine waiver of "up to 6 months of the 3 years of (responsible nuclear) power plant experience for an RO (or an SRO), but not to exceed 2 months of the year of onsite experience for an RO and 1 month of the 6 for an SRO." Therefore, if the applicant meets this criteria, Region II could approve a routine waiver. If the applicant does not meet this criteria, we would need to receive authorization from the IOLB program office (NRC Headquarters) to grant the waiver. In either case, after the applicant passed the NRC exam, we would issue a "pass" letter stating that the applicant passed the exam, and that the license would be issued once the applicant completes the required experience.

Please let me know if you have any further questions—

Best regards,

Michael Meeks

*Operations Examiner/Operations Engineer
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Region II)
245 Peachtree Center Ave. NE (Suite 1200)
Atlanta, GA 30303-1257
office: 404.997.4467
email: Michael.Meeks@nrc.gov*

From: [REDACTED]
Sent: Tuesday, June 07, 2011 7:24 AM
To: Meeks, Michael
Cc: Widmann, Malcolm; [REDACTED]
Subject: Vogtle NRC Exam Waiver Questions

Michael,

We are in the process of identifying individuals in which we plan on requesting a waiver for the March 2012 Operating Exam in accordance with ES-204, Section D.1.a. The individuals in which we are confident that we will request an Operating Exam waiver are:

[REDACTED]

Three other individuals from that class also passed the March 2011 Operating Exam; however, we are presently evaluating their status and are inquiring as to whether or not Region II would approve an Operating Exam waiver for the individuals below:

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED] and
Charlissa Smith (55-23694).

If I understand ES-204, these waiver requests should be documented on Form 398 when the license applications are submitted and would be considered routine waivers with review/approval through the Region II office. I also understand that the requirements of D.1.k must also be met to waive the 24 month GFE requirement. However, in order to allow us to develop an appropriate recovery plan, I am asking if Region II would evaluate the status of the individuals listed above and indicate whether or not a waiver would be approved. If I need to follow up with a formal request (i.e. letter), please let me know so I may submit it in a timely manner.

In addition, I understand that you may not be the Chief Examiner for our March 2013 exam, however, I am asking for some assistance as to how I should proceed with a similar issue. There is one individual that will be enrolled in the LOIT program this fall and is scheduled to take an Initial Operating Exam in March 2013 that is about 2 months shy of the prerequisite 36 month eligibility requirement. We currently plan on requesting a waiver for this individual as well but I do not believe this would be considered a routine waiver as described in ES-204; thus requiring NRR approval. As you might expect, we would like to know whether or not this waiver request would be accepted. My question, how should I proceed? Should I submit a formal letter (signed by our VP) requesting evaluation of this request prior to submitting the Form 398 application? If so, when would submittal of a request be considered timely?

Any assistance on these issues would be greatly appreciated.

[REDACTED]
Nuclear Operations Training Supervisor
Vogtle Electric Generating Plant

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]