

EXAM ASSIGNMENT TICKLER

Chief:	Sean D. Hedger	Facility:	W3	Date of Written Exam:	9/23/2015
UI:		Start of Op Test:	9/14/2015	End of Op Test:	9/18/2015
Written Exam Developed By: NRC / Facility		Operating Test Developed By: NRC / Facility			
Due Date	Description	Date Complete	Initials	Notes	
3/16/2015	Written Exam & Op Test Dates Confirmed	3/9/15	LSH		
4/13/2015	NRC Examiners & Facility Contact Assigned	2/9/15	LSH		
4/13/2015	Facility Contact Briefed on Security & Other Req's	2/9/15	LSH		
4/13/2015	Corporate Notification Letter sent	2/11/15	LSH	ES-201 Att-4 produced by CE	
5/11/2015	Reference material due (if NRC authored)	N/A	LSH	ES-201 Att-3	
6/15/2015	Integrated exam outlines due	6/08/15	LSH		
6/22/2015	Outlines reviewed by CE; feedback approved by BC	6/15/15	LSH	ES-201-2 signed by CE & BC	
6/22/2015	Feedback on integrated outlines provided to facility	6/15/15	LSH		
7/16/2015	DRAFT exam / docs / support reference material due	7/14/15	LSH		
7/21/2015	Peer review of written exam complete	7/19/15	LSH	Document review on ES-401-9	
7/30/2015	Written exam and operating test reviews completed	7/30/15	LSH	Document review on ES-401-9	
8/10/2015	Preliminary license applications due	8/11/15	LSH	NRC Forms 398/396	
8/17/2015	Preliminary license applications and waivers reviewed	8/13/15	LSH		
8/17/2015	On-site validation & 10% audit of license applications	8/17/15	LSH		
8/17/2015	DRAFT exam reviewed by CE; feedback approved by BC	8/11/15	LSH	OPS TEST - 7/27/15 WRITTEN EXAM - 8/11/15	
8/17/2015	Feedback on DRAFT exam provided to facility	8/11/15	LSH	OPS TEST - 7/30/15 WRITTEN EXAM - 8/11/15	
8/31/2015	Final applications due & List of Applicants prepared	8/27/15	LSH	ES-201-4 prepared by LA	
8/31/2015	Branch Chief approves FINAL exam (Written & Op Test)	09/10/15	LSH	LA produces / BC signs Exam Approval Letter (ES-201 Att-5)	
9/7/2015	Facility Licensee management queried regarding the licensee's views on the examination	09/08/15	LSH		
9/7/2015	Final applications approved & waiver letters sent	09/10/15	LSH		
9/7/2015	Proctoring/written exam admin guidelines reviewed w/ facility	08/17/15	LSH		
9/7/2015	Exam material to exam team	09/10/15	LSH		
9/14/2015	Administer Operating Test	09/14/2015	LSH		
9/30/2015	Facility post-exam documentation due	09/29/2015	LSH		
9/30/2015	NRC written exam grading completed	09/29/2015	LSH	ES-403-1 to BC	
9/25/2015	Examiner's document op test results on ES 303's	09/29/2015	LSH		
10/7/2015	Chief Examiner review of written exam & op test completed	10/05/15	LSH	Signed ES 303's to BC	
10/14/2015	Branch Chief review of exam results completed	10/05/2015	LSH		
10/21/2015	Waivers/deferrals reviewed for impact on licensing decision	10/05/15	LSH	N/A - NO WAIVERS OR DEFERRALS	
10/21/2015	License/Denial letters mailed; Facility notified of results	10/05/15 03/21/2011	LSH		
10/21/2015	RPS/IP number of examinees updated	09/30/2015	LSH	print Report-21	
11/4/2015	Examination Report Issued	11/02/2015	LSH	produced by CE	
11/11/2015	SUNSI checklist complete and exam docs to ADAMS	11/04/2015	LSH	SUNSI checklist to LA	
11/18/2015	Ref Mat'l Returned after Final Resolution of Appeals	11/02/2015	LSH	NO PRODUCTION DOCUMENTS 11/04/15 10/21/15	

Facility: <u>Waterford 3</u>		Date of Examination: <u>9/14/15</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 or ES-401N.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 or ES-401N and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	J	J/S	L/SZ
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.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	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.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	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.	J	J/S	L/SZ
3. W A L K T H R O U G H	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.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	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	J	J/S	L/SZ
	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.	J	J/S	L/SZ
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.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	J	J/S	L/SZ
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	J	J/S	L/SZ
a. Author	<u>Jim Mendoza</u>		Date: <u>6/2/15</u>	
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>John Signorelli</u>		<u>6-4-15</u>	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>Sean O. Hodger</u>		<u>09/09/15</u>	
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>Vincent Gandy</u>		<u>9/9/15</u>	
Note:	# Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required. * Not applicable for NRC-prepared examination outlines.			

CSL*
CSL*
CSL*
CSL*

* The NRC chief examiner prepared the draft written examination outline. Chris Cowdrey, another NRC examiner, performed an independent review of this outline.
 ES-201, Page 26 of 28
 (Reference: NUREG-1021, Rev. 10 ES-201, Section C.3.e)
L.D. [Signature] 09/10/2015
CLACK 9/1/15

Facility: Waterford 3		Date of Examination: 9/23/2015		Exam Level: RO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Item Description	Initial					
	a	b*	c**			
1. Questions and answers are technically accurate and applicable to the facility.	J	JH	LSJ			
2. a. NRC K/As are referenced for all questions. b. Facility learning objectives are referenced as available.	J	JH	LSJ			
3. SRO questions are appropriate in accordance with Section D.2.d of ES-401	J	JH	LSJ			
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).	J	JH	LSJ			
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 type="checkbox"/> the examinations were developed independently; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)	J	JH	LSJ			
6. Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank, at least 10 percent new, and the rest new or modified); enter the actual RO / SRO-only question distribution(s) at right.	Bank	Modified	New	J	JH	LSJ
	29 / 5	5 / 0	41 / 20			
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	C/A		J	JH	LSJ
	37 7 55/18 LSJ 09/09/15	38 18 48/47 LSJ 09/09/15				
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers or aid in the elimination of distractors.	J	JH	LSJ			
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.	J	JH	LSJ			
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet the guidelines in ES Appendix B.	J	JH	LSJ			
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.	J	JH	LSJ			
Printed Name / Signature		Date				
a. Author	Jim Mendoza / A. H. M. Q.		7-9-15			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	John Signorelli / John Signorelli		7-13-15			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Sean O. Hedger / S. O. Hedger		09/09/15			
d. NRC Supervisor	Vincent Gaddy / Vincent Gaddy		9/9/15			
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.						

* The NRC chief examiner prepared the draft written examination outline. Chris Cowdry, another NRC examiner, performed an independent review of this outline. (Reference: NUREG-1021, Rev. 10, ES-201, Section C.3.e)

S. O. Hedger 09/09/15

V. Gaddy 9/9/15

Facility: <u>Waterford 3</u>		Date of Examination: <u>Sept 14, 2015</u>		Operating Test Number: <u>1</u>	
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).	JFS	JFS	LSA	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	JFS	JFS	LSA	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s). (see Section D.1.a.)	JFS	JFS	LSA	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	JFS	JFS	LSA	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	JFS	JFS	LSA	
2. Walk-Through Criteria		a	b*	c#	
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 	JFS	JFS	LSA	
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.	JFS	JFS	LSA	
3. Simulator Criteria		a	b*	c#	
The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.		JFS	JFS	LSA	
	Printed Name / Signature	Date			
a.	Author <u>Jim Madocq</u>	<u>6/30/15</u>			
b.	Facility Reviewer(*) <u>John Signorelli</u>	<u>7-13-15</u>			
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>Sean O'Hedger</u>	<u>09/08/15</u>			
d.	NRC Supervisor <u>Vincent Gaddy</u>	<u>9/9/15</u>			
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.					

Facility: Waterford 3		Date of Exam: Sept 14, 2015		Scenario Numbers: 1 / 2 / 3		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.	J	J/S	LSJ				
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	J	J/S	LSJ				
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) or conditions 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) 	J	J/S	LSJ				
4.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	J	J/S	LSJ				
5.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	J	J/S	LSJ				
6.	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.	N/A	N/A	N/A				
7.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	J	J/S	LSJ				
8.	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.	J	J/S	LSJ				
9.	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.	J	J/S	LSJ				
10.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	J	J/S	LSJ				
11.	The scenario set provides the opportunity for each applicant to be evaluated in each of the applicable rating factors. (Competency Rating factors as described on forms ES-303-1 and ES-303-3.)	J	J/S	LSJ				
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).	J	J/S	LSJ				
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	J	J/S	LSJ				
Target Quantitative Attributes (Per Scenario; See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes		--	--	--		
1.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2	/ 2 / 1	J	J/S	LSJ		
2.	Abnormal events (2-4)	2	/ 3 / 3	J	J/S	LSJ		
3.	Major transients (1-2)	2	/ 1 / 1	J	J/S	LSJ		
4.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2	/ 1 / 1	J	J/S	LSJ		
5.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1	/ 0 / 0	J	J/S	LSJ		
6.	EOP based Critical tasks (2-3)	2	/ 3 / 2	J	J/S	LSJ		
NOTE:	* The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c"; chief examiner concurrence required.							

Facility: <u>Waterford 3</u>	Date of Exam:	Exam Level: RO <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> SRO <input type="checkbox"/>			
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	<u>JM</u>	<u>JL</u>	<u>LSJ</u>		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	N/A	N/A	N/A		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	<u>JM</u>	<u>JL</u>	<u>LSJ</u>		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 ±2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	<u>JM</u>	<u>JL</u>	<u>LSJ</u>		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	N/A	N/A	N/A		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	<u>JM</u>	<u>JL</u>	<u>LSJ</u>		
Printed Name/Signature			Date		
a. Grader	<u>Jim Mendonca / J.M. Mendonca</u>		<u>9/23/15</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>John Signorelli / John Signorelli</u>		<u>9/28/15</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>Sean D. Hedger / S.D. Hedger</u>		<u>9/29/15</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>Vincent Gaddy / Vincent Gaddy</u>		<u>10/5/15</u>		
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Facility:	Date of Exam:	Exam Level:	RO <input type="checkbox"/>	SRO <input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	J	JS	LSD		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	N/A	N/A	N/A		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	J	JS	LSD		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 ±2% overall and 70 or 80, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	J	JS	LSD		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	N/A	N/A	N/A		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	J	JS	LSD		
Printed Name/Signature		Date			
a. Grader	<u>Jim Mendoza / Jim Mendoza</u>			<u>9/23/15</u>	
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>John Signorelli / John Signorelli</u>			<u>9/28/15</u>	
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>Sean D. Hedger / A.D.H.</u>			<u>9/29/15</u>	
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>Vincent Gaddy / Vincent Gaddy</u>			<u>10/5/15</u>	
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 10/01/2014 To 09/30/2015

Region: 4 Phase Code: 5

Exam Week	Site/Docket No./Insp Rpt #	# Candidates	Type	Exam Author	Chief Examiner	Examiners Assigned
02/01/2015	Waterford / 05000382 / 2015301 TAC #: X02546		Prep	NFF	HEDGER, SEAN D.	COWDREY, CHRISTAIN B. HEDGER, SEAN D. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C. STEELEY, CHRISTOPHER D.
07/27/2015	Waterford / 05000382 / 2015003 Procedure #: 7111111B				COWDREY, CHRISTAIN B.	COWDREY, CHRISTAIN B. LARSON, BRIAN T. STEELEY, CHRISTOPHER D.
08/17/2015	Waterford / 05000382 / 2015301 TAC #: X02546		Prep	NFF	HEDGER, SEAN D.	COWDREY, CHRISTAIN B. HEDGER, SEAN D. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C. STEELEY, CHRISTOPHER D.
09/14/2015	Waterford / 05000382 / 2015301 TAC #: X02546	RO - 6 SROU - 3	Admin	NFF	HEDGER, SEAN D.	COWDREY, CHRISTAIN B. HEDGER, SEAN D. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C. STEELEY, CHRISTOPHER D.
09/19/2015	Waterford / 05000382 / 2015301 TAC #: X02546		Doc	NFF	HEDGER, SEAN D.	COWDREY, CHRISTAIN B. HEDGER, SEAN D. OSTERHOLTZ, CLYDE C. STEELEY, CHRISTOPHER D.

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule
 From 10/01/2014 To 09/30/2015

Region: 4 Phase Code: 5

Summary By Date

09/2015	WAT - Waterford	RO - 6	SROI - 0	SROU - 3	LSRO - 0	Total for Waterford: 9
		09/2015				
		RO - 6	SROI - 0	SROU - 3	LSRO - 0	Total for 09/2015: 9
02/2015	WAT - Waterford	RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO - 0	Total for Waterford: 0
		02/2015				
		RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO - 0	Total for 02/2015: 0
08/2015	WAT - Waterford	RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO - 0	Total for Waterford: 0
		08/2015				
		RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO - 0	Total for 08/2015: 0
07/2015	WAT - Waterford	RO - 0	SROI - 0	SROU - 0	LSRO - 0	Total for 08/2015: 0

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 10/01/2014 To 09/30/2015

Summary By Site

WAT - Waterford	RO - 6	SROI - 0	SROU - 3	LSRO - 0	Total for Waterford: 9

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 10/01/20¹⁴ To 09/30/2015

12:47:23

Region: 4

Phase Code: 5

Summary By Region

Region 4	SROI - 0	SROU - 3	LSRO - 0	Total for Region 4: 9
RO - 6				

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 09/14/2015 and 09/23/2015 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 09/14/2015 and 09/23/2015. 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 Jim Mendoza	Project Lead/Exam Development Lead		2/11/15		9/21/15	
2 John Signorelli	Facility Reviewer		3/24/15		9-24-15	
3 Gonzolo Esquivel	Exam writer		3/4/15		9/23/15	
4 Jim Del Cano	Simulator Support		2/19/15		9/23/15	
5 DONOVAN COOPER	Validator		4/16/15		9/28/15	①
6 DAVID LITOLFF	Validator		4/27/15		9/30/15	①
7 Penny Perode	Validator		5/14/15		9/24/15	①
8 William M. Cowley	Validator		6/15/15		9/29/15	①
9 SCOTT BREWSTER	VALIDATOR		6/15/15		9/28/15	①
10 Ryan Trayer	Validator		6/15/15		9/28/15	①
11 Lenny Cambaros	VALIDATOR		6-17-15		9-28-15	①
12 Jesse Bohnenkamp	Validator		6/15/15		9/25/15	
13 Marcus J. Dunn	VALIDATOR		6/25/15		9/30/15	
14 David J Melancon	Ops Rep.		7-2-15		9/28/15	
15 GLENN M. DOUGLAS	Sim Support		8-6-15		9/23/15	

NOTES:

* signature obtained via e-mail confirmation. See attached e-mail confirmations.

1. Pre-Examination
 I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 9/14/2015 and 9/23/2015 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 9/14/15 & 9/23/15. 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
Walter Sumart	SM Validator		8/11/15		9/23/15	
Darryl Cornett	Validator		8-13-15		9-28-15	
Maurya Bouslet	NO Validator		8-17-15		9-24-15	
Earl S Rhodes	NO Validator		8-17-15		9-24-15	
Penard K. Jossauze	NO Validator		8-17-15		9-24-15	
Keith Vinas	sequester		9-14-15		9-23-15	
Kirk B. Kirkpatrick	sequester		9/14/15		9/23/15	
John C. Hernandez	sequester		9/14/15		9/23/15	
J. Seawind	SEQUESTER		9/14/15		9/28/15	
Sam Rumba	SEQUESTER		9/14/15		9/24/15	

NOTES:

Note 1:

Stood shift in the Control Room while an applicant from the class stood an under instruction watch in the Control Room. The trainee was assigned to another shift team member who was not on exam security. No instructions, evaluations, or performance feedback was provided to any applicant during under instruction watches by any operators on exam security.

MENDOZA, JAMES H

From: Cooper, Donovan
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 3:30 PM
To: MENDOZA, JAMES H
Subject: RE: Security Agreement

I was in compliance with all of the rules.

Sent from my Verizon Wireless 4G LTE smartphone

----- Original message -----

From: "MENDOZA, JAMES H" <jmendoz@entergy.com>
Date: 09/28/2015 1:34 PM (GMT-06:00)
To: "Cooper, Donovan" <dcoope3@entergy.com>, "MELANCON, DAVID J" <DMELAN1@entergy.com>, "LITOLFF, DAVID F" <DLITOLF@entergy.com>, "Dunn, Marcus" <mdunn@entergy.com>
Cc: "ESQUIVEL, GONZALO" <gesquiv@entergy.com>
Subject: Security Agreement

We need to get you off of the security agreement for the 2015 RO/SRO NRC LOI Exam. Please inform me that you were in compliance with the post examination requirements written below (from the security agreement). If you were, I will sign you off the security agreement and attach the e-mail confirmation to it.

Thank you,

Jim

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 09-14-2015 and 09-23-2015. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorize

MENDOZA, JAMES H

From: LITOLFF, DAVID F
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 8:30 AM
To: MENDOZA, JAMES H
Subject: RE: Security Agreement

I was in compliance

From: MENDOZA, JAMES H
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 1:34 PM
To: Cooper, Donovan; MELANCON, DAVID J; LITOLFF, DAVID F; Dunn, Marcus
Cc: ESQUIVEL, GONZALO
Subject: Security Agreement

We need to get you off of the security agreement for the 2015 RO/SRO NRC LOI Exam. Please inform me that you were in compliance with the post examination requirements written below (from the security agreement). If you were, I will sign you off the security agreement and attach the e-mail confirmation to it.

Thank you,

Jim

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 09/14/2015 and 09/23/2015. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized.

MENDOZA, JAMES H

From: Dunn, Marcus
Sent: Wednesday, September 30, 2015 5:58 AM
To: MENDOZA, JAMES H
Subject: RE: Security Agreement

I was in compliance.

Marcus J Dunn

From: MENDOZA, JAMES H
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 1:34 PM
To: Cooper, Donovan; MELANCON, DAVID J; LITOLFF, DAVID F; Dunn, Marcus
Cc: ESQUIVEL, GONZALO
Subject: Security Agreement

We need to get you off of the security agreement for the 2015 RO/SRO NRC LOI Exam. Please inform me that you were in compliance with the post examination requirements written below (from the security agreement). If you were, I will sign you off the security agreement and attach the e-mail confirmation to it.

Thank you,

Jim

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 09/14/2015 and 09/23/2015. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorize

MENDOZA, JAMES H

From: MELANCON, DAVID J
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 1:49 PM
To: MENDOZA, JAMES H
Subject: RE: Security Agreement

I was so in compliance!!
Can I take off the badge?

I have training next week, I will drop off my badge then!!

David

From: MENDOZA, JAMES H
Sent: Monday, September 28, 2015 1:34 PM
To: Cooper, Donovan; MELANCON, DAVID J; LITOLFF, DAVID F; Dunn, Marcus
Cc: ESQUIVEL, GONZALO
Subject: Security Agreement

We need to get you off of the security agreement for the 2015 RO/SRO NRC LOI Exam. Please inform me that you were in compliance with the post examination requirements written below (from the security agreement). If you were, I will sign you off the security agreement and attach the e-mail confirmation to it.

Thank you,

Jim

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 09/14/2015 and 09/23/2015. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized.