

In the Matter of:

Charlissa C. Smith
(Denial of Senior Reactor Operator License)

ASLBP #: 13-925-01-SP-BD01	Identified: 7/17/2013
Docket #: 05523694	Withdrawn:
Exhibit #: CCS-035-00-BD01	Stricken:
Admitted: 7/17/2013	
Rejected:	
Other:	

[REDACTED] CCS-035

From: Muller, David
Sent: Wednesday, July 18, 2012 7:39 AM
To: Jackson, Donald
Cc: McHale, John
Subject: RE: Heard You On The Phone.....How Goes It??

My review hasn't started yet, although I have reviewed my notes on the flip chart pages. Still catching up on a few things, plus 2 weeks in Chattanooga for training. But we took good notes so I expect things to go fairly well. My plan is to:

1. Review our review of the errors the applicant contested and see which rating factors (RFs) the errors should be assigned to. This is what we did in Atlanta, and I don't plan on deviating much at all with how we came out (I think I have maybe one or two question marks).
2. Review the errors the applicant did not contest but that were documented by Region II in the **original individual examination (grade) report**. Hopefully, nothing will change here (and I am a bit hesitant to change things the applicant did NOT contest), and the errors and the RFs assigned by Region II were appropriate.
3. Once all the errors have been assigned to RFs, determine if the affected RF score is a 2 or a 1. Three errors in a RF is a score of 1; two errors in a RF score will likely result in a score of 2 because I am thinking that the applicant likely did something correct in that RF elsewhere during the simulator exam. I will figure this out by looking at the overall scenario content (D-1s and D-2s) for all the scenarios the applicant did and which crew positions the applicant was in, plus whatever else I can glean from my notes from Atlanta and any info provided by Region II.
4. Compute the final scores in each competency based on the RF scores and determine an overall pass/fail. At this point I will let you know how things came out. I will also talk to my management to see what I (we) should do about all the errors that Region II did not choose to document in the original individual examination report, i.e., "the x marks on that table."
5. If we are to consider the "the x marks on that table" we will likely need to discuss these like we did in Atlanta after we become familiar with what the x marks are; i.e., is it really an error and what RF(s) it should be assigned to.
6. Write it up!

Sounds easy, right?

Dave

From: Jackson, Donald
Sent: Tuesday, July 17, 2012 2:32 PM
To: Muller, David
Subject: Heard You On The Phone.....How Goes It??

I am in office this week, and Mon/Tues next week. Then I am on A/L 7/25-31. Please let me know how your review is going on Vogtle OP exam. I reviewed the new material, and see little change with where we ended up, but you are key as you have the official tally.

VR
DON J