# **EXAM ASSIGNMENT TICKLER**

Chief:	Kirkland	Facility:	CW	Date of Written Exam: 9/20/		9/20/2017	
U/I:		Start of Op Test:	9/11/2017		End of Op Test:	9/15/2017	
Written Exan	n Developed By: NRC / Fa	acility	Operating Test Developed By: NRC / Facility			cility	
Due Date	Description		Date Complete	Initials	Note For NRC prepared exams,		
1/14/2017	Examination administration date confirm	ed	12/19/16	pu	for the facility to submit refe		
2/13/2017	NRC examiners and facility contact assignment	gned	12/19/16	Jax			
2/13/2017	Facility contact briefed on security and o	ther requirements	12/19/16	Jax			
2/13/2017	Reference material due for NRC prepare	ed exams	N/A	Jan	ES-201 Att-3		
2/13/2017	Corporate Notification Letter sent		2/27/17	Low	ES-201 Att-4 produced by	CE	
2/28/2017	NRC developed written examination out	ine sent to facility contact	12/19/16	Jan	ES-401-1/2 and ES-401-3		
4/14/2017	Operating test outline(s) and other check	klists due	6/16/17	for	ES-201-2, 201-3, 301-1, 30	)1-2, 301-5, D-1	
4/28/2017	Operating test outline(s) reviewed by NF to facility licensee	RC and feedback provided	6/26/17	Jax	ES-201-2 signed by CE & I	3C	
6/28/2017	Proposed exams, outlines, supporting de reference materials due.	ocumentation, and	7/25/17	Jan	Exams prepared by the NR and forwarded for facility lice	'''	
7/5/2017	Peer review of written exam complete		7/27/17	Jak	Document review on ES-40	)1-9	
7/23/2017	Written exam and operating test reviews	completed	8/4/17	Jan	Document review on ES-40	)1-9	
8/7/2017	Feedback approved by Branch Chief		8/4/17	Jan			
8/7/2017	Examination review results discussed be licensee	etween NRC and facility	8/17/17	Jan			
8/12/2017	Preliminary license applications & waive	r/excusal requests due	8/10/17	Jak	NRC Forms 398/396		
8/14/2017	On-site validation & 10% audit of license	applications	8/14/17	Jan			
8/19/2017	Preliminary license applications and wair	vers reviewed	8/17/17	Jan			
8/28/2017	Final license applications & waiver/excu	sal requests due	8/28/17	pa	ES-201-4 prepared by LA		
9/4/2017	Written exams and operating tests appro	oved by Branch Chief	9/7/17	Jan			
9/4/2017	Request facility licensee management fe	edback on the exam	N/A	per			
9/4/2017	Final applications reviewed and audited; waiver/excusal letters sent	exam approval and	9/7/17	for	LA produces / BC signs Ex (ES-201 Att-5)	am Approval Letter	
9/4/2017	Proctoring/written exam administration g facility licensee	uidelines reviewed with	9/18/17	Jan .			
9/4/2017	Approved scenarios and JPMs distribute	ed to examiners	9/7/17	Jan			
9/11/2017	Administer Operating Test		9/14/17	Jan			
9/22/2017	Examiner's document op test results on	ES 303's	9/25/17	Jan			
10/10/2017	Post exam comments and graded exam	s received	9/25/17	Jak	ES-403-1 to BC		
10/17/2017	Post exam written comments reviewed a NRC grading completed	and incorporated and	9/26/17	fax			
10/17/2017	Post exam operating test comments rev updated		9/26/17	Jen			
10/24/2017	Chief examiner review of operating test grading completed	and/or written exam	9/26/17	Jan	Signed ES 303's to BC		
10/31/2017	Branch Chief review of exam results cor	npleted	9/27/17	Jan			
11/14/2017	Waivers/deferrals reviewed for impact o	n licensing decision	N/A	pu			
11/14/2017	License/Denial letters mailed; Facility notified of results		9/28/17	per			
11/14/2017	RPS/IP number of examinees updated		9/27/17	Jan	print Report-21		
11/21/2017	Examination Report Issued		10/12/17	Jan	produced by CE		
11/28/2017	SUNSI checklist complete and exam do	cs to ADAMS	10/23/17	fax	SUNSI checklist to LA		
12/5/2017	Ref Mat'l Returned after Final Resolution	of Appeals	N/A	Jan			
	Replaces NUREG-1021, Revision 11, Forms ES-201-1 and ES-501-1						

.....

Date of Examination:				
Task Description		Initials	S	
Task Description		b*	c#	
a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401 or ES-401N.	ABR	n	pe	
<ul> <li>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.</li> </ul>	lse	me	yee	
c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	ASR	me	100	
d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	132	he	Mil	
<ul> <li>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.</li> </ul>	182	h.c	yea	
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				
<ul> <li>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.</li> </ul>	132	he	pil	
<ul> <li>a. Verify that the systems walk-through outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2:</li> <li>(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</li> <li>(2) task repetition from the last two NRC examinations is within the limits specified on the form</li> <li>(3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s)</li> <li>(4) the number of new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form</li> <li>(5) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form.</li> </ul>	Pre_	me	şee	
<ul> <li>b. Verify that the administrative outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-1:</li> <li>(1) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on the form</li> <li>(2) at least one task is new or significantly modified</li> <li>(3) no more than one task is repeated from the last two NRC licensing examinations</li> </ul>	1sh	ne	gen	
<ul> <li>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.</li> </ul>	PBL	me	Jue	
<ul> <li>Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including PRA and IPE insights) are covered in the appropriate exam sections.</li> </ul>	Be	me	yen	
b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	PDS	me	you	
c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	PBZ	me_	MI	
d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	182	m	plet	
e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	100	hac	400	
f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	PBQ	me	ya	
ty Reviewer (*)  Mark Covey / Mar Gry			ete 5-/1 9-17 1117	
	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401 or ES-401N.  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.  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.  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.  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 revor or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form  (6) the number of revor or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form  (7) the tasks are distributed among the topics as specified on t	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401 or ES-401N.  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.  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.  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: (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 new or modified tasks meets or exceeds the minimums specified on the form  (6) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form.  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	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model, in accordance with ES-401 or ES-401N.  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.  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.  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 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) contom(s) with the qualitative and quantitative 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 cavaninations is within the limits specified on the form  (3) no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s)  (4) the number of alternate path, low-power, emergency, and RCA tasks meet the criteria on the form.  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 subsequen	

	Facility: Callaway	Facility: Callaway Date of Exam: 9/20/17 Exam Levi				Exam Leve	el: RO	SRO	X
	Item Description					*******	Initial	1980	
	nem Description						а	b*	c*#
1.	Questions and answers are tech	nnically accurate and applica	ble to the fa	cility.			w	m	ple
2.	a. NRC K/As are referen	nced for all questions.							
		ctives are referenced as ava					ac		MC
_	c. Correct answer expla	nation and distractor analys	is provided (	ES-401	, D.2	.g)		he	900
3.	SRO questions are appropriate	in accordance with Section I	D.2.d of ES-	401			lu	m	MIL
4	The sampling process was rand questions were repeated from the program office).					Service Control of the Control of th	av	me	yer
5.	Question duplication from the lic below (check the item that applied	A CONTRACTOR OF THE PARTY OF TH		lled as i	ndica	ited			
	The audit exam was systema	tically and randomly develop	ped, or			- 1			
	the audit exam was complete		vas started,	or		1			
	the examinations were devel					ŀ			0.0
	the licensee certifies that the other (explain).	re is no duplication, or						me	you
	outer (explain).						w		
6.	Bank use meets limits (no more	and the second s	Bank	Modif	ied	New	en	nz	you
	at least 10% new, and the rest n actual RO/SRO-only question di	and the state of t	21/4	114 413 50118		de	me	MIL	
7.	Between 38 and 45 questions of		Memor			C/A		M	/
	exam and at least 13 questions SRO-only portion of the exam at			,			m		yel
	comprehension/analysis level (s the actual RO/SRO-only questio	ee ES-401, D.2.c); enter	3511	1	40	14	w	me	you-
8.	References/handouts provided of distractors.	do not give away answers or	aid in the el	iminatio	n of		w	me	yex
9.	Question content conforms to sp	ecific K/A statements in the	previously a	pproved	d exa	mination			/ -
	outline and is appropriate for the						n	ine	yes
10.	Question psychometric quality a	nd format meet the guideline	es in Append	lix B.			u	m	yex
11.	The exam contains the required correct and agrees with the value		le-choice ite	ms; the	total	is	w	ne	yes
		Printed Nan	ne/Signature	•				Date	
		> 9 11. P	100 0	,				91-11-	
a.	Author	Willing O Swan /	1/201	9 /	, a.	16	<del></del>	7717	
b.	CII								
C.	NRC Chief Examiner (#)								
d.	NRC Regional Supervisor Vintent baddy / Vinu 1 horby 9/7/17								
		1				·	<del></del>		
Not	•	ls or signature are not applic r initials items in Column "c":							

Facility: Callaway Date of Examination: 9/11/17 – 9/15/17 Operating Test Nun	nber:	2017-	1
1. General Criteria		Initial	s
	а	b*	c#
a. The operating test conforms to the previously approved outline; changes are consistent with sampling requirements (e.g., 10 CFR 55.45, operational importance, safety function distribution).	de	me	yer
<ul> <li>There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.</li> </ul>	nu	me	yal
c. The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s) (see Section D.1.a.).	ill	me	NR.
<ul> <li>d. Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.</li> </ul>	w	mc	you
e. It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	ier	ne	you
2. Walkthrough Criteria		-	_
a. Each JPM includes the following, as applicable:  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—  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  b. Ensure that any changes from the previously approved systems and administrative walkthrough outlines (Forms ES-301-1 and ES-301-2) have not caused the test to deviate from any of the acceptance criteria (e.g., item distribution, bank use, repetition from the last two NRC examinations) specified on those forms and Form ES-201-2.	w	me me	yes
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.	w	mc	yen
a. Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor  * The facility licensee signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests.  # The independent NRC reviewer initials items in column "c": the chief examiner concurrence is required.		Da 9/9 9-5-9/6 9/1	17

-	lity: Callaway Date of Exam: 9/11/17 – 9/15/17 Scenario Numbers: 1 (span	b)/ 2 / 0 / / Operating /	1		_
	QUALITATIVE ATTRIBUTES			Initials	-
			а	b*	c#
1.	The initial conditions are realistic in that some equipment and/or instrumentation but it does not cue the operators into expected events.	may be out of service,	Be	me	Ke
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.		PEL.	me	yes
3.	Each event description consists of the following:				
	<ul> <li>the point in the scenario when it is to be initiated</li> <li>the malfunction(s) or conditions that are entered to initiate the event</li> <li>the symptoms/cues that will be visible to the crew</li> <li>the expected operator actions (by shift position)</li> <li>the event termination point (if applicable)</li> </ul>		me	me	yes
4.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.		POR	me	pell
5.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable and allows the examination team evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	to obtain complete	PRL	me	you
6.	If time compression techniques are used, the scenario summary clearly so indical Operators have sufficient time to carry out expected activities without undue time Cues are given.		NIA	me	K
7.	The simulator modeling is not altered.		de	me	ya
<ol> <li>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.</li> </ol>					ya
Scenarios are new or significantly modified in accordance with Section D.5 of ES-301.					40
10.	ne	me	yes		
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.)					ya
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).					
13.	Applicants are evaluated on a similar number of preidentified critical tasks across possible.	scenarios, when	u	me	ya
14.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew p	position.	we	me	14
	Target Quantitative Attributes per Scenario (See Section D.5.d)	Actual Attributes	_		-
1.	Maifunctions after EOP entry (1–2)	1/1/1/1	w	me	N
2.	Abnormal events (2–4)	4/4/4/4	w	me	NE
3.	Major transients (1–2)	1/1/1/1	le	ne	N
4.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	1/1/1/1	pu	me	1/4
5.	Entry into a contingency EOP with substantive actions (≥ 1 per scenario set)	0/0/0/1	Kr	me	yes
6.	Preidentified critical tasks (≥ 2)	2/2/2/2	Per	me	y

<sup>\*</sup> The facility licensee signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests.
# An independent NRC reviewer initials items in column "c"; chief examiner concurrence is required.

Fa	cility: Callaway	Date of Exam: 4/20/17 Exam Level:	RO [	SRO	X		
	Item Description Initials						
			а	b	С		
1.	Clean answer sheets	copied before grading	Re	Q	son		
2.	justified and docume	y changes and question deletions nted (facility reviewer initials not required mination comments are submitted)	u.	W/R	NIR		
3.	• • •	ecked for addition errors c > 25% of examinations)	Pu	A	jek		
4.	4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% ±2% overall and 70% or 80%, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only exam) reviewed in detail						
5.	5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified						
6.	6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by one-half or more of the applicants						
	Prin	ted Name/Signature		Date			
a.	Grader	Phillip B Sum / Plase		9/20/17	<u> </u>		
b.	Facility Reviewer(*)	Cody J Eubanks / ODIM		9/21/17	-		
C.	c. NRC Chief Examiner (*) John Kirkland July 9/26/17						
d.	NRC Supervisor (*)	Vincent Gadly Vinent Garly	6	1/27/17	_		
(*)	(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.						

### Page 1 of 4 09/27/2017 13:54:41 Report 21

# Operator Licensing Exam Schedule From 10/01/2016 To 09/30/2017

Region: 4

Phase Code: 5

Exam Week	Site/Docket No./Insp Rpt #	# Can	didates	Туре	Exam Author	Chief Examiner	Examiners Assigned
04/19/2017	Callaway / 05000483 / 2017301 TAC #: X02591			Prep	NFF	KIRKLAND, JOHN C.	KIRKLAND, JOHN C. LARSON, BRIAN T. STEELY, CHRISTOPHER D.
08/14/2017	Callaway / 05000483 / 2017301 TAC #: X02591			Prep	NFF	KIRKLAND, JOHN C.	KIRKLAND, JOHN C. LARSON, BRIAN T. STEELY, CHRISTOPHER D.
08/19/2017	Callaway / 05000483 / 2017301 TAC #: X02591			Prep	NFF	KIRKLAND, JOHN C.	KIRKLAND, JOHN C. LARSON, BRIAN T. STEELY, CHRISTOPHER D.
09/11/2017	Callaway / 05000483 / 2017301 TAC #: X02591	SROU - 1	SROI - 6	Admin	NFF	KIRKLAND, JOHN C.	KIRKLAND, JOHN C. LARSON, BRIAN T. STEELY, CHRISTOPHER D.
09/16/2017	Callaway / 05000483 / 2017301 TAC #: X02591			Doc	NFF	KIRKLAND, JOHN C.	KIRKLAND, JOHN C. LARSON, BRIAN T. STEELY, CHRISTOPHER D.

Sites: CALL Orgs: ALL

Exam Author: ALL

ES-201, Page 27 of 28

### 1. <u>Pre-Examination</u>

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 9/11/2017 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

PRINTED NAME	JOB TITLE / RESPONSIBILITY	SIGNATURE (1)	DATE SIGNATURE (2) DATE NOTE
1. Cody Eybanks 2. Steve Janes 3. Phillip Sura 4. Marlin Walling 5. Mark Covy 6. John C. Gorman 7. Mark OTTEN 8. Jesse Schachen 9. Kalip Davidson 10. Jesse Pitts 11. Tim Holland 12. Jeff Landrum 13. Daie Nichos 14. Branden Lean 15. John Parsons	Exam Writer  STS -  Feran Author  Clevicul Suffort  Marger Ops  Harry Ops  URO  URO  Operations Supervisor  Shift manger  RD  RO  Shift Manger	SIGNATURE (1)  CHAM  PASSAM  MALA WALLA  M	1-4-17 / 9/10 1-4-17 / 9/10 1-5-17 / 9/10 1-5-17 / 9/10 1-5-17 / 9/10 1-5-17 / 9/10 1-1-17
NOTES: Sonnett	***	chols signall	7-5-17 1 Jame 11 amob 9-25-17

-201, Page 27 of 28

#### 1. Pre-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 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. 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
34 34 34 34	1. ANDREW NELSON 2. JOHN OAKES 3. ETT T. Sohr It 4. DANIEL MUELLER 5. JAKE SANTIE 6. Brandon Sulam. 7. JON FICARD 8. NORK VOLDENHAW 9. MATT SOLIOTS 10. RON CASH 11. STEVE MINER 12. Travis HOTT 13. NATHAN CASEY 14. Leland Blond 15. Engan Parker	SIM SOFTWINE SPEC  SIM ENGINEER  SIM ENGINEER  SIM Engineer  RO  RO  CRS  RO  RP FLS  OS  RO  SRO  SRO  SRO  SRO  SRO	SIGNATURE (1)  SIGNAT	7 (5   7 4/5   7 7-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17 2-10-17	Exat. Schubb COT Eric T. Schubb SZIZ	9/24/7 9/21/20 16-11-11 10-11-1 10-10-1 9/25/1 9/25/1 10/3/1 10/3/1 10/3/1 10/3/1	10/03,
	NOTES:		0		00		,

-	-	~	^	4
-	•	_ ,	n	и

### **Examination Security Agreement**

Form ES-201-3

#### 1. Pre-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 \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_. 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. Daniel Pallerdy 2. Deft Guill 3. David Strefermin 4. L. R. & Morgan 5. CLAY COMNEHAM 6. MARK Homel 7. Daniel Hamis 8. Augu Davison 9. STEVE Kochens 10. Augus 11. 12. 13.	SRO OS OS OS RO SRO (ILT) ILT IJSTRUCTOR STS- (LT CPS - DPS ILT INSTRUCTOR OPS- ADIS POLK	SIGNATURE (1)	7-21-17 July 18-15-17 March 19-11-17 911-17	DATE NOTE  10-1-17  9-27-17  10-1-17  9/21/17  9/21/17  9/21/17  9/21/17
15	-			

NOTES:

ES-201, Page 27 of 28

### Swan, Phillip B

From:

Lee and Cheryl Gorman <irish2@satelephone.com>

Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2017 1:52 PM

To: Swan, Phillip B

**Subject:** Re: Callaway Exam Security Signoff

To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning 2017 NRC Initial Licensing examinations at Ameren. Furthermore, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to applicants who were administered these licensing examinations authorized by the NRC.

### Regards

J. Lee Gorman

From: Swan, Phillip B

Sent: Tuesday, October 03, 2017 1:28 PM

To: irish2@satelephone.com

Cc: Otten, Mark

Subject: Callaway Exam Security Signoff

Lee,

Could you do provide an email saying that you "To the best of my knowledge, I did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC licensing examination. Furthermore, 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." for all three master security agreements you were on: ILT, Annual, and Biennial.

Thank You

Phillip Swan
Callaway Ops Training – Exam Group
pswan@ameren.com
573-544-8102

This communication and any attachments may be privileged and/or confidential and protected from disclosure, and are otherwise the exclusive property of Ameren Corporation and its affiliates (Ameren) or the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Note that any views or opinions presented in this message do not necessarily represent those of Ameren. All e-mails are subject to Ameren policies. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the message and deleting the material from any computer.

# Swan, Phillip B

From: Sent: To: Subject:	Dale Nichols <dalenichols84@gmail.com> Monday, October 16, 2017 5:32 PM Swan, Phillip B Re: ILT Exam Security signoff</dalenichols84@gmail.com>
Subject.	Ne. 121 Exam Security signon
I attest to the best of my know Dale Nichols	ledge I have complied with the exam security requirements stated in this email.
On Oct 16, 2017 5:20 PM, "Sv	van, Phillip B" < <u>PSwan@ameren.com</u> > wrote:
Hey Dale,	
,	
Hope you feel better and look	forward to seeing you back at work.
Hated to ask but need to get the email) to the following conce	his completed paperwork to the NRC – so If you can attest (by replying to this rning the ILT exam security.
NRC licensing examinations	e, did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the administered during the week(s) of . From the date that I entered into this security on of examination administration, I did
	ide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these at as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC."
Let me know if there is anyth	ing you need.
Phillip Swan	
•	attachments may be privileged and/or confidential and protected from disclosure, ve property of Ameren Corporation and its affiliates (Ameren) or the intended

and are otherwise the exclusive property of Ameren Corporation and its affiliates (Ameren) or the intended recipient. If you are not the intended recipient, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution or copying of this communication is strictly prohibited. Note that any views or opinions presented in this message do not necessarily represent those of Ameren. All e-mails are subject to Ameren policies. If you have received this in error, please notify the sender immediately by replying to the message and deleting the material from any computer.