

Facility: <u>INDIAN POINT UNIT 3</u>		Date of Examination: <u>10/30/17</u>
Developed by: Written: Facility <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NRC <input type="checkbox"/> // Operating: Facility <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NRC <input type="checkbox"/>		
Target Date*	Task Description (Reference)	Chief Examiner's Initials
-240	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a-b). For NRC-prepared exams, arrangements are made for the facility to submit reference materials (C.1.e; C.3.c; Attachment 3).	PA JS
-210	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.f).	PA JS
-210	3. Facility contact briefed on security and other requirements (C.2.c). As applicable, the facility contact submits to the NRC any prescreened K/As for elimination from the written examination outline, with a description of the facility's prescreening process (ES-401, D.1.b).	PA JS
-210	4. Reference material due for NRC-prepared exams (C.1.e; C.3.c; Attachment 3).	PA N/A JS
-210	5. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.e).	PA JS
-195	6. NRC-developed written examination outline (ES-401-1/2 or ES-401N-1/2 and ES-401-3 or ES-401N-3) sent to facility contact (must be on the exam security agreement) (C.1.e-f; C.2.h; C.3.d-e).	PA JS
-150	7. Operating test outline(s) and other checklists due, including Forms ES-201-2, ES-201-3, ES-301-1, ES-301-2, ES-301-5, and ES-D-1, as applicable (C.1.e-f; C.3.d-e).	PA JS
-136	8. Operating test outline(s) reviewed by the NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.d-e).	PA JS
-75	9. Proposed examinations (written, JPMs, and scenarios, as applicable) and outlines (Forms ES-301-1, ES-301-2, ES-D-1, ES-401-1/2 or ES-401N-1/2, and ES-401-3 or ES-401N-3); supporting documentation (including Forms ES-301-3, ES-301-4, ES-301-5, ES-301-6, ES-401-6, ES-401N-6, and any Form ES-201-2 and ES-201-3 updates); and reference materials due (C.1.e-h; C.3.d).	PA JS
-75	10. Examinations prepared by the NRC are approved by the NRC supervisor and forwarded for facility licensee review (C.1.i; C.2.h; C.3.f-g).	PA N/A JS
-60	11. Preliminary waiver/excusal requests due (C.1.m; C.2.c; ES-202).	PA JS
-50	12. Written exam and operating test reviews completed (C.3.f).	PA JS
-35	13. Examination review results discussed between the NRC and facility licensee (C.1.i; C.1.k-l; C.2.h; C.3.g). The NRC and the facility licensee conduct exam preparatory week.	PA JS
-30	14. Preliminary license applications and waiver/excusal requests, as applicable (NRC Form 398) due (C.1.m; C.2.i; ES-202).	PA JS
-14	15. Final license applications and waiver/excusal requests, as applicable (NRC Form 398), due and Form ES-201-4 prepared (C.1.m; C.2.k; ES-202).	PA JS
-7	16. Written examinations and operating tests approved by the NRC supervisor (C.2.j-k; C.3.h).	PA JS
-7	17. Request facility licensee management feedback on the examination (C.2.l).	PA JS
-7	18. Final applications reviewed; one or two (if more than 10) applications audited to confirm qualifications/eligibility; and examination approval and waiver/excusal letters sent (C.2.k; Attachment 5; ES-202, C.3.j; ES-204).	PA JS
-7	19. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee (C.3.k).	PA JS
-7	20. Approved scenarios and job performance measures distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i).	PA JS
* Target dates are based on facility-prepared examinations and the examination date identified in the corporate notification letter. These dates are for planning purposes and may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the facility licensee.		

Facility:		Date of Examination:		
Item	Task Description	Initials		
		a	b*	c**
WRITTEN	a. Verify that the outline(s) fit(s) the appropriate model in accordance with ES-401 or ES-401N.	PR	N/A	PR
	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.	PR	N/A	PR
	c. Assess whether the outline overemphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	PR	N/A	PR
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	PR	N/A	PR
SIMULATOR	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.	CR	BS	PR
	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.	CR	BS	PR
	c. To the extent possible, assess whether the outline(s) conforms with the qualitative and quantitative criteria specified on Form ES-301-4 and described in Appendix D and in Section D.5, "Specific Instructions for the 'Simulator Operating Test,'" of ES-301 (including overlap).	CR	BS	PR
WALKTHROUGH	a. Verify that the systems walkthrough outline meets the criteria specified on Form ES-301-2: (1) The outline(s) contains 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 applicant's 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 radiologically controlled area tasks meets the criteria on the form.	CR	BS	PR
	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.	CR	BS	PR
	c. Determine whether there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on subsequent days.	CR	BS	PR
GENERAL	a. Assess whether plant-specific priorities (including probabilistic risk assessment and individual plant examination insights) are covered in the appropriate exam sections.	CR	BS	PR
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41, 55.43, and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	CR	BS	PR
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	CR	BS	PR
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections and the last two NRC exams.	CR	BS	PR
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	CR	BS	PR
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	CR	BS	PR
a. Author b. Facility Reviewer (*) c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) d. NRC Supervisor		Printed Name/Signature CHARLES T. KOCSIS BRIAN A. SULLIVAN PETER OTT / [Signature] DONALD JACKSON / [Signature]		Date 5/30/17 5-31-17 10-17-17 10/24/17
* Not applicable for NRC-prepared examination outlines. — NRC DEVELOPED WALKTHROUGH OUTLINE — P.S. PETER OTT # The independent NRC reviewer initials items in column "c"; the chief examiner's concurrence is required.				

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 10/30 - 11/10/17 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's 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's 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 10/30 - 11/10/17. From the date that I entered into this security agreement until the completion of examination administration, I did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these licensing examinations, except as specifically noted below and authorized by the NRC.

ES-201, Page 31 of 31

PRINTED NAME	JOB TITLE/RESPONSIBILITY	SIGNATURE (1)	DATE	SIGNATURE (2)	DATE	NOTE
1. CHARLIE KOCSIS	EXAM LEAD		4/18/17		11/7/17	
2. TIM JENKINS	EXAM DEV		7/19/17		11/7/17	
3. BRIAN SULLIVAN	FACILITY REVIEWER		5-31-17		11/7/17	
4. Tom Cannon	OPS REVIEWER		5/3/17		11/7/17	①
5. Tom OGGELI	OPS VALIDATOR		6/5/17		11/7/17	①
6. MARK LAUBACH	OPS		6-15-17		11-8-17	
7. Jerry Gullick	SIM		7-12-17		11-7-17	
8. ANDREW KINSEY	SIM		7/12/17		11/7/17	
9. ANDREW GOERRES	OPS VALIDATOR		7/13/17		11/7/17	
10. Tim GARDT	OPS VALIDATOR		7/13/17		11/7/17	①
11. DAVID AXELBY	SIMULATOR		7/19/17		11/7/17	
12. Michael McCarthy	OPS		7/27/17		11/7/17	
13. JOHN T GRAHAM	OPS		7/31/17		11/13/17	
14. Danny Gunn	OPS		7/31/17		11/24/17	
15. Thomas McKee	OPS Training		9/25/17		11/7/17	

NOTES:

① Per APPROVED EMAIL

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 10/16-11/7 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's 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's 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 10/30-11/10/17 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. PAUL BOWE	OPS		9/22/17		11/7/17	
2. Rich Caglio	OPS		9-28-17		11/2/17	
3. RICH BERKA	OPS		10/2/17		11/7/17	⓪
4. Chris Hron	OPS		10-3-17		11-7-17	
5. George Liebner	2 OPS		10/5/17		11/17/17	
6. MARC MARTIN	OPS		10/5/17		11/17/17	
7. PHIL QUESNEC	OPS		10/5/17		11/17/17	⓪
8. ROBERT SWANSON	TRAINING		10/24/17		11/7/17	⓪
9. David J. Schepel	OPS		10/27/17		11/7/17	⓪
10. Gary A. Norton	Training		10/27/17		11/7/17	
11. Amy [unclear]	OPERATIONS		10/27/2017		11/15/2017	
12. Dan Hron	Training		10/30/17		11/15/17	
13. Chris [unclear]	TRAINING		11/2/17		11/7/17	
14.						
15.						

NOTES:

⓪ Per ATTACHED EMAIL

Suneson, Robert R

From: Suneson, Robert R
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 2:20 PM
To: Cramer, Thomas A; Oggeri, Thomas; Gnad, Timothy; Graham, John Thomas; Gunn, Danny D; Ceglie, Richard M; Bedka, Richard A; Martin, Marc; Quesnel, Philip; Schepperly, David
Cc: Jenkins, Tim M; Kocsis, Charles T; Suneson, Robert R
Subject: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Gentlemen the exam on Unit 3 is complete and you are required to sign off the security agreement.

This is confirming to the best of your knowledge, you did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC license examinations administered during the weeks of 10/30/2017-11/10/2017. From the date entered into this security agreement until the completion of the examination administration, you did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these license examinations. Respond with the voting button yes (to sign off) or a response to me.


You may also come to my desk and physically sign off of the agreement.

Thanks Sunny

Please return your badges at the earliest convenience to either myself or Tim. If any of your badges are combined LOR/ILO do not remove until you get a replacement LOR badge from Myself, Tim or Charlie.

Thanks

Bob Suneson
IPEC ILO Program Lead



Suneson, Robert R

From: Bedka, Richard A
Sent: Saturday, November 11, 2017 7:57 PM
To: Suneson, Robert R
Subject: Yes: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Suneson, Robert R

From: Martin, Marc
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 2:28 PM
To: Suneson, Robert R
Subject: Yes: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Suneson, Robert R

From: Quesnel, Philip
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 3:19 PM
To: Suneson, Robert R
Subject: Yes: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Suneson, Robert R

From: Schepperly, David
Sent: Tuesday, November 07, 2017 2:24 PM
To: Suneson, Robert R
Subject: Yes: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Suneson, Robert R

From: Cramer, Thomas A
Sent: Wednesday, November 08, 2017 2:37 AM
To: Suneson, Robert R
Subject: Yes: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Suneson, Robert R

From: Oggeri, Thomas
Sent: Tuesday, November 14, 2017 1:26 PM
To: Suneson, Robert R; Schepperly, David
Subject: Re: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Sunny,

I did not divulge any information to any unauthorized personnel. Left two badges on your desk, one from Dave and one from me.

Take care.

Tom

From: Suneson, Robert R
Sent: Tuesday, November 7, 2017 2:19:53 PM
To: Cramer, Thomas A; Oggeri, Thomas; Gnadt, Timothy; Graham, John Thomas; Gunn, Danny D; Ceglio, Richard M; Bedka, Richard A; Martin, Marc; Quesnel, Philip; Schepperly, David
Cc: Jenkins, Tim M; Kocsis, Charles T; Suneson, Robert R
Subject: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Gentlemen the exam on Unit 3 is complete and you are required to sign off the security agreement. This is confirming to the best of your knowledge, you did not divulge to any unauthorized persons any information concerning the NRC license examinations administered during the weeks of 10/30/2017-11/10/2017. From the date entered into this security agreement until the completion of the examination administration, you did not instruct, evaluate, or provide performance feedback to those applicants who were administered these license examinations. Respond with the voting button yes (to sign off) or a response to me.

You may also come to my desk and physically sign off of the agreement.
Thanks Sunny

Please return your badges at the earliest convenience to either myself or Tim. If any of your badges are combined LOR/ILO do not remove until you get a replacement LOR badge from Myself, Tim or Charlie.
Thanks

Bob Suneson
IPEC ILO Program Lead

Suneson, Robert R

From: Gnadt, Timothy
Sent: Saturday, November 18, 2017 9:53 PM
To: Suneson, Robert R
Subject: Yes: UNit 3 ILO exam security Agreement

Facility: Indian Point 3		Date of Examination: 10/30/17		Operating Test Number: 1		
1. General Criteria				Initials		
				a	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).	SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s) (see Section D.1.a.).	SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
2. Walkthrough Criteria				--	--	--
a.	<p>Each JPM includes the following, as applicable:</p> <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 	SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
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.	SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
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.		SAT	BIS	P.A.	WJ	
		Printed Name/Signature		Date		
a.	Author	Tim Jenkins <i>[Signature]</i>		8-10-17		
b.	Facility Reviewer (*)	Brad Sullivan <i>[Signature]</i>		8-15-17		
c.	NRC Chief Examiner (#)	Peter M. Platt <i>[Signature]</i>		10-19-17		
d.	NRC Supervisor	Donald Jackson <i>[Signature]</i>		10/21/17		
<p>* 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.</p>						

Facility: Indian Point 3		Date of Exam: 10/30/17	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.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
3.	Each event description consists of the following: <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) 	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
4.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
5.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
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.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
7.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
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.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
9.	Scenarios are new or significantly modified in accordance with Section D.5 of ES-301.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
10.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
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.)	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
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).	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
13.	Applicants are evaluated on a similar number of preidentified critical tasks across scenarios, when possible.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
14.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	SMF	PKS	PKS PKS
Target Quantitative Attributes per Scenario (See Section D.5.d)		Actual Attributes	--	--
1.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2 / 1 / 2 / 2	SMF	PKS PKS
2.	Abnormal events (2-4)	5 / 7 / 5 / 6	SMF	PKS PKS
3.	Major transients (1-2)	1 / 1 / 2 / 2	SMF	PKS PKS
4.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2 / 2 / 2 / 2	SMF	PKS PKS
5.	Entry into a contingency EOP with substantive actions (≥ 1 per scenario set)	1 / 1 / 1 / 1	SMF	PKS PKS
6.	Preidentified critical tasks (≥ 2)	3 / 2 / 3 / 3	SMF	PKS PKS
* 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.				

Facility:		IPEC		Date of Exam:		10/30/2017		Operating Test No.:		1						
A P P L I C A N T	E V E N T T Y P E	Scenarios														
		1			2			3			4		T O T A L	M I N I M U M (*)		
		CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION			CREW POSITION					
		S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C	B O P	S R O	A T C				
SRO-I 1/4	RX				3							1	1	1	0	
	NOR	1										12	3	1	1	1
	I/C	2346 7			456 79							4679 10	15	4	4	2
	MAJ	5			8							8	3	2	2	1
	TS	23											2	0	2	2
SRO-I 2/5	RX		1										1	1	1	0
	NOR					3						12	3	1	1	1
	I/C		2347			4579						3679 10	13	4	4	2
	MAJ		5			8						8	3	2	2	1
	TS											34	2	0	2	2
SRO-I 3/6	RX											2	1	1	1	0
	NOR			1	3								2	1	1	1
	I/C			246 7	4567 9							3679 10	14	4	4	2
	MAJ			5	8							8	3	2	2	1
	TS				146								3	0	2	2
Instructions:																
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Check the applicant level and enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each event type; TS are not applicable for RO applicants. ROs must serve in both the at-the-controls (ATC) and balance-of-plant (BOP) positions. Instant SROs (SRO-I) must serve in both the SRO and the ATC positions, including at least two instrument or component (I/C) malfunctions and one major transient, in the ATC position. If an SRO-I <i>additionally</i> serves in the BOP position, one I/C malfunction can be credited toward the two I/C malfunctions required for the ATC position. Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or <i>controlled</i> abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.5.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D. (*) Reactivity and normal evolutions may be replaced with additional I/C malfunctions on a one-for-one basis. Whenever practical, both instrument and component malfunctions should be included; only those that require verifiable actions that provide insight to the applicant's competence count toward the minimum requirements specified for the applicant's license level in the right-hand columns. For new reactor facility licensees that use the ATC operator primarily for monitoring plant parameters, the chief examiner may place SRO-I applicants in either the ATC or BOP position to best evaluate the SRO-I in manipulating plant controls. 																

Facility:	IPEC			Date of Examination:	10/30/2017				Operating Test No.:	1							
Competencies	APPLICANTS																
	SRO-I 1/4				SRO-I 2/5				SRO-I 3/6								
	SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO				SCENARIO				
	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	1	2	3	4	
Interpret/Diagnose Events and Conditions	2-7	1 4-9		3-10	235 67	12 5 7-9		3-10	4-7				3 7-10				
Comply with and Use Procedures (1)	1-7			134		9		1-10	45	1-9							
Operate Control Boards (2)		3-9		1-4 7-10	1-7	1 3-9			1 3-7				27-10				
Communicate and Interact	1-7	1-9		1-10	1-7	1-9		1-10	1-7	1-9			1-10				
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	1-7							1-10		1-9							
Comply with and Use TS (3)	23							34		14 6							
Notes:																	
(1) Includes TS compliance for an RO.																	
(2) Optional for an SRO-U.																	
(3) Only applicable to SROs.																	

Instructions:

Check the applicants' license type and enter one or more event numbers that will allow the examiners to evaluate every applicable competency for every applicant. (This includes all rating factors for each competency.) (Forms ES 303 1 and ES 303 3 describe the competency rating factors.)

Facility: <u>IP3</u>		Date of Exam: <u>11/2/17</u>		Exam Level: RO	SRO	✓
Item Description	Initials					
	a	b	c			
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	<i>MS</i>	<i>BLS</i>	<i>PK</i>			
2. Proposed answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented (facility reviewer initials not required (N/R) if NO post-examination comments are submitted)	<i>MS</i>	<i>BLS</i>	<i>PK</i>			
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	<i>MS</i>	<i>BLS</i>	<i>PK</i>			
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% ±2% overall and 70% or 80%, as applicable, ±4% on the SRO-only exam) reviewed in detail	<i>MS</i>	<i>BLS</i>	<i>PK</i>			
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	<i>MS</i>	<i>BLS</i>	<i>PK</i>			
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	<i>MS</i>	<i>BLS</i>	<i>PK</i>			
Printed Name/Signature		Date				
a. Grader	<u><i>R. Swanson</i></u>	<u>11-27-17</u>				
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>BRIAN A. Sullivan</u>	<u>11-27-17</u>				
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>PETER OTT / <i>Peter Ott</i> David S. Hc / <i>David S. Hc</i></u>	<u>1/3/18</u>				
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>Donald E. Jackson</u>	<u>1/3/18</u>				
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.						