

Facility: <u>SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION</u>		Date of Examination: <u>8/10, 14, 15/01</u>
Examinations Developed by: <u>(Facility)</u> / NRC (circle one)		
Target Date*	Task Description / Reference	Chief Examiner's Initials
-180	1. Examination administration date confirmed (C.1.a; C.2.a & b)	gHW
-120	2. NRC examiners and facility contact assigned (C.1.d; C.2.e)	gHW
-120	3. Facility contact briefed on security & other requirements (C.2.c)	gHW
-120	4. Corporate notification letter sent (C.2.d)	gHW
[-90]	[5. Reference material due (C.1.e; C.3.c)]	N/A
-75	6. Integrated examination outline(s) due (C.1.e & f; C.3.d)	gHW
-70	7. Examination outline(s) reviewed by NRC and feedback provided to facility licensee (C.2.h; C.3.e)	gHW
-45	8. Proposed examinations, supporting documentation, and reference materials due (C.1.e, f, g & h; C.3.d)	gHW
-30	9. Preliminary license applications due (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	gHW
-14	10. Final license applications due and assignment sheet prepared (C.1.i; C.2.g; ES-202)	gHW
-14	11. Examination approved by NRC supervisor for facility licensee review (C.2.h; C.3.f)	gHW
-14	12. Examinations reviewed with facility licensee (C.1.j; C.2.f & h; C.3.g)	gHW
-7	13. Written examinations and operating tests approved by NRC supervisor (C.2.i; C.3.h)	gHW
-7	14. Final applications reviewed; assignment sheet updated; waiver letters sent (C.2.g, ES-204)	gHW
-7	15. Proctoring/written exam administration guidelines reviewed with facility licensee and authorization granted to give written exams (if applicable) (C.3.k)	gHW
-7	16. Approved scenarios, job performance measures, and questions distributed to NRC examiners (C.3.i)	gHW
<p>* Target dates are keyed to the examination date identified in the corporate notification letter. They are for planning purposes and may be adjusted on a case-by-case basis in coordination with the facility licensee.</p> <p>[] Applies only to examinations prepared by the NRC.</p>		

Facility: SSSES Units 1/2		Date of Examination: 8/13/2001		
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 per ES-401.	PB	✓	gHW
	b. Assess whether the outline was systematically and randomly prepared in accordance with Section D.1 of ES-401 and whether all K/A categories are appropriately sampled.	PB	✓	gHW
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	PB	✓	gHW
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	PB	✓	gHW
2. S I M	a. Using Form ES-301-5, verify that the proposed scenario sets cover the required number of normal evolutions, instrument and component failures, and major transients.	PB	✓	gHW
	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; ensure 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 scenarios will not be repeated over successive days.	PB	✓	gHW
	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.	PB	✓	gHW
3. W / T	a. Verify that: (1) the outline(s) contain(s) the required number of control room and in-plant tasks, (2) no more than 30% of the test material is repeated from the last NRC examination, (3)* no tasks are duplicated from the applicants' audit test(s), and (4) no more than 80% of any operating test is taken directly from the licensee's exam banks.	PB	✓	gHW
	b. Verify that: (1) the tasks are distributed among the safety function groupings as specified in ES-301, (2) one task is conducted in a low-power or shutdown condition, (3) 40% of the tasks require the applicant to implement an alternate path procedure, (4) one in-plant task tests the applicant's response to an emergency or abnormal condition, and (5) the in-plant walk-through requires the applicant to enter the RCA.	PB	✓	gHW
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered, with emphasis on performance-based activities.	PB	✓	gHW
	d. Determine if there are enough different outlines to test the projected number and mix of applicants and ensure that no items are duplicated on successive days.	PB	✓	gHW
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 section.	PB	✓	gHW
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	PB	✓	N/A
	c. Ensure that K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	PB	✓	gHW
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	PB	✓	gHW
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	PB	✓	gHW
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRQ).	PB	✓	gHW
a. Author		Philip Ballard		Printed Name / Signature Date 5-18-01 5-18-01
b. Facility Reviewer (*)		Tom Markowski		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)		Julian H. Williams / Julian H. Williams		5/23/01 5/13/01
d. NRC Supervisor		Richard J. Conite		
Note: * Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c," chief examiner concurrence required.				

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for the week(s) of 8-13-2001 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. 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





8/10 through 8/15/01

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 8/10 through 8/15/01. 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. RICHARD E. CHIN	EXAM Developer/Coordinator	Richard E. Chin	12-3-00	Richard E. Chin	8/15/01
*2. Philip G. Ballard	Exam developer / contractor	Philip G. Ballard	1-10-01	Philip G. Ballard	8/15/01
*3. Edwin W. Bowles	Exam Developer / contractor	Edwin W. Bowles	1-15-01	Edwin W. Bowles	8/15/01
*4. CLEON E. DODGE	NSE SIM Support	Cleon E. Dodge	2/1/01	Cleon E. Dodge	8/15/01
5. EISA R. WATUGH	Admin. Supp.	Eisa R. Watugh	4/18/01	Eisa R. Watugh	8/15/01
6. Thomas R. Markowski	Ops Supervisor Nuclear	Thomas R. Markowski	5-1-01 (11:10)	Thomas R. Markowski	8-25-01
7. Jerry Radushko-Bri	Ops Supervisor Nuclear	Jerry Radushko-Bri	5-28-01	Jerry Radushko-Bri	8-27-01
8. VICKY A. HORVAT	CLERICAL	Vicky A. Horvat	05/03/01	Vicky A. Horvat	8/15/01
9. Donald E. Roland	Shift Supervisor - OPS	Donald E. Roland	06/03/01	Donald E. Roland	8/27/01
10. JOSEPH A. BROKUS	PLANT CONTROL OPER	Joseph A. Brokus	6/3/01	Joseph A. Brokus	8/16/01
11. SCOTT W. CLEMENTS	PLANT CONTROL OPER	Scott W. Clements	6/3/01	Scott W. Clements	8/15/01
12. Gregory J. Fessler	NRC Security Exam Support	Gregory J. Fessler	6/13/01	Gregory J. Fessler	8/15/01
13. Terry W. Logsdon	Simulator Instr./Validation	Terry W. Logsdon	6/19/01	Terry W. Logsdon	8/27/01
14. Mark A. Trevino	Nuc. Supervisor Ops Training	Mark A. Trevino	6/24/01	Mark A. Trevino	8/15/01
15. Scott Dieffenbacher	Computer Hardware Analyst	Scott Dieffenbacher	7/17/01	Scott Dieffenbacher	8/15/01
16. Jon Sark	Simulator Instr. Sim Operator	Jon Sark	8/10/01	Jon Sark	8/15/01
17. Sidney Morgan	Simulator Instructor	Sidney Morgan	8/10/01	Sidney Morgan	8/15/01
18. THOMAS HUNT	SIM INST.	THOMAS HUNT	8/14/01	THOMAS HUNT	8/15/01

NOTES: * NSEI-AD-709 Simulator Exam Security has been reviewed

24 of 24 JHh

Facility: <u>SSES Units 1 & 2</u>		Date of Examination: <u>8/14-15/01</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).	PB	✓	JHW	
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	PB	✓	JHW	
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s) (see Section D.1.a).	PB	✓	JHW	
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between operating test categories is within acceptable limits.	PB	✓	JHW	
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	PB	✓	JHW	
2. WALK-THROUGH (CATEGORY A & B) CRITERIA			--	--	--
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 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 	PB	✓	JHW	
b.	The prescribed questions in Category A are predominantly open reference and meet the criteria in Attachment 1 of ES-301.	PB	✓	JHW	
c.	Repetition from operating tests used during the previous licensing examination is within acceptable limits (30% for the walk-through) and do not compromise test integrity.	PB	✓	JHW	
d.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	PB	✓	JHW	
3. SIMULATOR (CATEGORY C) CRITERIA			--	--	--
a.	The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.	PB	✓	JHW	
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a. Author	<u>PHILIP G. BALARD</u> 	<u>6/27/01</u>			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Thomas R. Markowski</u> 	<u>6-27-01</u>			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>Julian H. Williams</u> 	<u>7/20/01</u>			
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>Richard J. Cente</u> 	<u>7/28/01</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: SSSES Units 1/2		Date of Exam: 8/13/2001		Scenario Numbers: 1 / 2 / ALT		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.	PB	T	gHW			
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.	PB	T	gHW			
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) 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) 	PB	T	gHW			
4.	No more than one non-mechanistic failure (e.g., pipe break) is incorporated into the scenario without a credible preceding incident such as a seismic event.	PB	T	gHW			
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.	PB	T	gHW			
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.	PB	T	gHW			
7.	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.	*PB	T	gHW			
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.	PB	T	gHW			
9.	The scenarios have been validated. Any open simulator performance deficiencies have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios.	PB	T	gHW			
10.	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.4 of ES-301.	PB	T	gHW			
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).	PB	T	gHW			
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).	PB	T	gHW			
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.	PB	T	gHW			
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.4.D)		Actual Attributes					
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	6 / 5 / 5	PB	T	gHW		
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	2 / 1 / 1	PB	T	gHW		
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	3 / 4 / 4	PB	T	gHW		
4.	Major transients (1-2)	2 / 1 / 2	PB	T	gHW		
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2 / 2 / 2	PB	T	gHW		
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1 / 1 / 1	PB	T	gHW		
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	2 / 3 / 2	PB	T	gHW		

* TIME COMPRESSION IS NOT USED. PB 6/27/01

OPERATING TEST NO.: 1, SROU -1 (SSES Units 1/2)

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1	2	3	4
RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	4				
	Major	1				
As RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	0				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I						
	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
As SRO	Major	1				
	Reactivity	0	1			
	Normal	1	1			
	Instrument / Component	2	4			
SRO-U	Major	1	1			

- Instructions:
- (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.
 - (2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.
 - (3) 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 requirement.

Author:

Richard G. B. [Signature] 6/27/01

NRC Reviewer:

Julien H. Williams 7/27/01

OPERATING TEST NO.: 1, SROU -2 (SSES Units 1/2)

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1	2	3	4
RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	4				
	Major	1				
As RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	0				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I						
As SRO	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-U	Reactivity	0		1		
	Normal	1		1		
	Instrument / Component	2		4		
	Major	1		1		

- Instructions:
- (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.
 - (2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.
 - (3) 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 requirement.

Author:

P. G. Ball 6/27/01

NRC Reviewer:

J. A. Williams 7/20/01

OPERATING TEST NO.: 1, RO -1 (SSES Units 1/2)

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1 RO	2 BOP	3	4
RO	Reactivity	1	1			
	Normal	1		1		
	Instrument / Component	4	1	3		
	Major	1	1	1		
As RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	0				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I						
As SRO	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-U						
SRO-U	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				

- Instructions:
- (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.
 - (2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.
 - (3) 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 requirement.

Author:

Peter G. Balda 6/27/01

NRC Reviewer:

Julian H. Williams 7/20/01

OPERATING TEST NO.: 1, RO -2 (SSES Units 1/2)

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number			
			1 BOP	2 RO	3	4
RO	Reactivity	1		2		
	Normal	1	1			
	Instrument / Component	4	3	1		
	Major	1	1	1		
As RO	Reactivity	1				
	Normal	0				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-I						
As SRO	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				
SRO-U						
SRO-U	Reactivity	0				
	Normal	1				
	Instrument / Component	2				
	Major	1				

- Instructions:
- (1) Enter the operating test number and Form ES-D-1 event numbers for each evolution type.
 - (2) Reactivity manipulations may be conducted under normal or *controlled* abnormal conditions (refer to Section D.4.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D.
 - (3) 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 requirement.

Author:

Peter G. Ballard 6/27/01

NRC Reviewer:

Julian H. Williams 7/20/01

SSes Units 1/2	Applicant # RO 1				Applicant # RO 2			
Competencies	SCENARIO				SCENARIO			
	1 RO	2 BOP			1 BOP	2 RO		
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	3, 5	2, 3, 6			3, 6	2, 5, 7		
Diagnose Events and Conditions	3, 5, 6	2, 3			2, 3, 6, 7	2, 5, 7		
Understand Plant and System Response	3, 4, 5	3, 7			3, 6	2, 4, 7		
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	3, 4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3			1, 2, 3, 6, 7	4, 5, 7		
Operate Control Boards (2)	4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3			1, 6, 7	4, 5, 7		
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	3, 4, 5, 6	2, 3, 6, 7			2, 3, 4, 6	2, 3, 4, 5, 7		
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A		
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	N/A	N/A			N/A	N/A		

Notes:

(1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO.
 (2) Optional for an SRO-U.
 (3) Only applicable to SROs.

Instructions:

Circle the applicant's license type and enter one or more event numbers that will allow the examiners to evaluate every applicable competency for every applicant.

Author:

Philip G. [Signature] 6/27/01

NRC Reviewer:

Julian A. Williams 7/20/01

SSES Units 1/2	Applicant # SROU 1			Applicant # SROU 2		
Competencies	SCENARIO			SCENARIO		
	1	2		1	2	
Understand and Interpret Annunciators and Alarms	3, 5, 6, 7				2, 3, 5, 6, 7	
Diagnose Events and Conditions	3, 5, 6				2, 3, 5, 6, 7	
Understand Plant and System Response	1, 3, 6, 7				2, 3, 5, 6, 7	
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1, 3, 5, 6, 7				1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7	
Operate Control Boards (2)	N/A				N/A	
Communicate and Interact With the Crew	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7				1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7				1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	1, 2				2, 3, 5	
Notes: (1) Includes Technical Specification compliance for an RO. (2) Optional for an SRO-U. (3) Only applicable to SROs.						

Instructions:

Circle the applicant's license type and enter one or more event numbers that will allow the examiners to evaluate every applicable competency for every applicant.

Author:

Paul G. Ballantyne 6/27/01

NRC Reviewer:

Julian A. Williams 7/20/01

ES-401

Written Examination Quality Checklist

Form ES-401-7 (R8, S1)

Facility: SSES		Date of Exam: 8/10/01		Exam Level: RO/SRO						
Item Description	Initial									
	a	b*	c#							
1. Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility	PB	✓	gHW							
2. a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available	PB	✓	gHW							
3. RO/SRO overlap is no more than 75 percent, and SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401	PB	✓	gHW							
4. Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process			gHW							
5. Question duplication from the license screening/audit exam was controlled as indicated below (check the item that applies) and appears appropriate: <input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)	PB	✓	gHW							
6. Bank use meets limits (no more than 75 percent from the bank at least 10 percent new, and the rest modified); enter the actual question distribution at right	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Bank</td> <td>Modified</td> <td>New</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RO 19 SRO 17</td> <td>RO 23 SRO 19</td> <td>RO 58 SRO 64</td> </tr> </table>	Bank	Modified	New	RO 19 SRO 17	RO 23 SRO 19	RO 58 SRO 64	PB	✓	gHW
Bank	Modified	New								
RO 19 SRO 17	RO 23 SRO 19	RO 58 SRO 64								
7. Between 50 and 60 percent of the questions on the exam (including 10 new questions) are written at the comprehension/analysis level; enter the actual question distribution at right	<table border="1"> <tr> <td>Memory</td> <td>C/A</td> </tr> <tr> <td>RO 41 SRO 40</td> <td>RO 59 SRO 60</td> </tr> </table>	Memory	C/A	RO 41 SRO 40	RO 59 SRO 60	PB	✓	gHW		
Memory	C/A									
RO 41 SRO 40	RO 59 SRO 60									
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers	PB	✓	gHW							
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	PB	✓	gHW							
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines	PB	✓	gHW							
11. The exam contains 100, one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet	PB	✓	gHW							
Printed Name / Signature a. Author <u>Philip G. Balzano</u> b. Facility Reviewer (*) <u>Thomas R. Markowski</u> c. NRC Chief Examiner (#) <u>Julian H. Williams / Julian H. Williams</u> d. NRC Regional Supervisor <u>Richard J. Conte</u>		Date 6/27/01 6-27-01 7/20/01 7/26/01								
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.										

Facility: <u>SSES</u>		Date of Exam: <u>8/10/01</u>		Exam Level: <u>RO/SRO</u>	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading	<u>EWS</u>	<u>REC</u>	<u>gHW</u>		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	<u>EWS</u>	<u>REC</u>	<u>gHW</u>		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check > 25% of examinations)	<u>EWS</u>	<u>REC</u>	<u>gHW</u>		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80% +/- 2%) reviewed in detail	<u>EWS</u>	<u>REC</u>	<u>gHW</u>		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	<u>N/A</u> <u>EWS</u>	<u>REC</u>	<u>N/A</u>		
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>EWS</u>	<u>REC</u>	<u>gHW</u>		
Printed Name / Signature		Date			
a. Grader	<u>Edwin E. Bowden</u>	<u>8/10/2001</u>			
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Rich E. Chi</u>	<u>8-13-01</u>			
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>Julian H. Williams / Julian H. Williams</u>	<u>9/12/01</u>			
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>R. J. Carter / R. J. Carter</u>	<u>9/14/01</u>			
(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.					