

February 25, 2004

Note to: Tom Stetka, Chief Examiner
Operations Branch

From: Anthony Gody, Chief
Operations Branch
Division of Reactor Safety



ORIGINAL

SUBJECT: EXAMINATION ASSIGNMENT

You have been assigned as Chief of the River Bend examination. The operating test has been scheduled to be completed by September 24, 2004. Please contact the River Bend facility to finalize the details of the examination by March 28, 2004. You are reminded that the RPS/IP system must be maintained to ensure that the examiners and numbers of candidates are accurate. Please contact me if you need assistance with RPS/IP.

Assignment Tickler: **Tom Stetka, RB IN EX**

Replaces NUREG-1021, Revision 8, Supplement 1 ES Forms 201-1 and 501-1

Due Date	Chief	Facility/ Task	Description	Date Complete	Notes
3/28/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Exam/Inspection Schedule Agreement (C.1.a;C.2.a&b)	2/19/04	
3/28/04	TFS	RB IN EX	NRC Staff & Fac. Contact Assigned (C.1.c;C.2.e)	2/19/04	
3/28/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Facility contact briefed on security & other issues (C.2.c)	3/23/04	
3/28/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Corp. Notification Letter Sent (C.2.d) (Exams only)	3/25/04	
8/10/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Inspection Announcement Letter Sent (PIR & LORT if req'd)	N/A	
6/26/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Task Expectations, Issues, & Standards Discussed w/ BC	3/25/04	
5/27/04	TFS	RB IN EX	[Reference Material Due (C.1.d;C.3.c)	5/29/04	
5/27/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Integrated Exam Outlines Due (C.1.d&e;C.3.d)	5/29/04	
6/10/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Outlines reviewed by NRC & Feedback Sent (c.2.h;C.3.e)	6/8/04	
8/25/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Preliminary Applications Due (C.1.j;C.2.g;ES202)	8/23/04	
7/26/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Draft Exams w/ Doc./Ref. Due (C.1.d/e/f;C.3.d)	7/26/04	
8/5/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Peer Reviewer Initials As Reviewed All Parts*	8/2/04	
8/5/04	TFS	RB IN EX	NRC Supervisor. Initials Approving for Fac. Rev. (C.2.h;C.3.f)*	8/26/04	AT
8/5/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Exams Reviewed w/ Fac. (C.1.h;C.2.f&h;C.3.g)	8/27/04	
9/10/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Final Appl. Due & Assign. Sheet Prepared (C.1.j;C.2.h;ES202)	9/7/04	
9/17/04	TFS	RB IN EX	NRC Supervisor Approved Final Exams (C.2.i;C.3.h)*	9/15/04	AT
9/3/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Director debrief (PIR Only)	N/A	
9/17/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Final Appl. Rec'd & Waivers Sent (C.2.g)	9/14/04	
9/17/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Proctor Rules Reviewed w/ Fac. & Written Authorized (C.3.k)	9/15/04	






Assignment Tickler: **Tom Stetka, RB IN EX**

Replaces NUREG-1021, Revision 8, Supplement 1 ES Forms 201-1 and 501-1

9/17/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Exam/Insp Material to Team (C.3.i)	N/A	whole exam team attended prep week
10/6/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Fac. graded exam & Comments Rec'd	9/29/04	
9/24/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Administer Exam/Conduct Inspection	9/17-23/04	
10/9/04	TFS	RB IN EX	NRC Written Grading Completed	9/30/04	
10/9/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Examiners Finished Grading Op. Tests	9/30/04	
10/19/04	TFS	RB IN EX	NRC Ch. Ex. Review Completed	9/30/04	
10/20/04	TFS	RB IN EX	NRC BC Review Completed*	9/30/04	
10/25/04	TFS	RB IN EX	RPS/IP # Examinees Updated Before Report Issued	10/25/04	
10/25/04	TFS	RB IN EX	License/Denials Signed & Report Issued	9/30/04	
11/15/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Package Closed Out	2/17/05	
12/23/04	TFS	RB IN EX	Chief QA of ADAMS	2/17/05	

Facility: RIVER BEND STATION		Date of Examination: 9/20/04		
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.	RP	RP	RP
	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.	RP	RP	RP
	c. Assess whether the outline over-emphasizes any systems, evolutions, or generic topics.	RP	RP	RP
	d. Assess whether the justifications for deselected or rejected K/A statements are appropriate.	RP	RP	RP
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.	RP	RP	RP
	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 on subsequent days.	RP	RP	RP
	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.	RP	RP	RP
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.	RP	RP	RP
	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) 4 - 6 (2 - 3 for SRO-U) 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.	RP	RP	RP
	c. Verify that the required administrative topics are covered.	RP	RP	RP
	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 subsequent days.	RP	RP	RP
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.	RP	RP	RP
	b. Assess whether the 10 CFR 55.41/43 and 55.45 sampling is appropriate.	RP	RP	RP
	c. Ensure the K/A importance ratings (except for plant-specific priorities) are at least 2.5.	RP	RP	RP
	d. Check for duplication and overlap among exam sections.	RP	RP	RP
	e. Check the entire exam for balance of coverage.	RP	RP	RP
	f. Assess whether the exam fits the appropriate job level (RO or SRO).	RP	RP	RP
Printed Name / Signature		Date		
a. Author	<u>Roger L. Parsons / Roger L. Parsons</u>	<u>5/21/04</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Gary H. Huston / Gary H. Huston</u>	<u>5/21/04</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>Thomas F. Stetka / Thomas F. Stetka</u>	<u>8/26/04</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>DAN E. LANTZ / DAN E. LANTZ</u> <u>ANTHONY T. GOODY / ANTHONY T. GOODY</u>	<u>8/26/04</u> <u>9/6/04</u>		
NOTE: * Not applicable for NRC-developed examinations. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.				

Facility: RIVER BEND STATION		Date of Exam: 9/20/2004		Exam Level: RO/SRO		
Item Description				Initials		
				a	b*	c#
1. Questions and answers technically accurate and applicable to facility.				AP	AP	IT
2. a. NRC K/As referenced for all questions b. Facility learning objectives referenced as available				AP	AP	IT
3. SRO questions are appropriate per Section D.2.d of ES-401				AP	AP	IT
4. Question selection and duplication from the last two NRC licensing exams appears consistent with a systematic sampling process						IT
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 exams were developed independently; or <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> the licensee certifies that there is no duplication; or <input type="checkbox"/> other (explain)				AP	AP	IT
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 RO / SRO-only question distribution(s) at right	Bank	Modified	New	AP	AP	IT
	13/3	9/8	53/14			
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	AP	AP	IT
	36/8		39/17			
8. References/handouts provided do not give away answers				AP	AP	IT
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				AP	AP	IT
10. Question psychometric quality and format meet ES, Appendix B, guidelines				AP	AP	IT
11. The exam contains the required number of one-point, multiple choice items; the total is correct and agrees with value on cover sheet				AP	AP	IT
Printed Name / Signature				Date		
a. Author	ROGER L. PERSONS			9/13/04		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	GARY H. HUSTON II			9/13/04		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	THOMAS F. STELKA			9/14/04		
d. NRC Supervisor	ANTHONY T. GORY			9/15/04		
NOTE: * The facility signature is not applicable for NRC-developed tests. # Independent NRC reviewer initial items in Column "c;" chief examiner concurrence required.						

Facility: RIVER BEND STATION		Date of Exam: 9/20/2004		
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).	P	MM	H
b.	There is no day-to-day repetition between this and other operating tests to be administered during this examination.	P	MM	H
c.	The operating test shall not duplicate items from the applicants' audit test(s) (see Section D.1.a).	P	MM	H
d.	Overlap with the written examination and between different parts of the operating test is within acceptable limits.	P	MM	H
e.	It appears that the operating test will differentiate between competent and less-than-competent applicants at the designated license level.	P	MM	H
2. WALK-THROUGH 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 	P	MM	H
b.	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.	P	MM	H
c.	At least 20 percent of the JPMs on each test are new or significantly modified.	P	MM	H
3. SIMULATOR CRITERIA				
a.	The associated simulator operating tests (scenario sets) have been reviewed in accordance with Form ES-301-4 and a copy is attached.	P	MM	H
Printed Name / Signature		Date		
a. Author	<u>ROGER L. PERSONE</u> / 	<u>7/26/04</u>		
b. Facility Reviewer(*)	<u>Gary H. Horton II</u> / 	<u>7/26/04</u>		
c. NRC Chief Examiner (#)	<u>Thomas F. Stetka</u> / 	<u>8/26/04</u>		
d. NRC Supervisor	<u>R. Schmitz</u> /  <u>ANTHONY T. Goss</u> / 	<u>8/24/04</u> <u>9/6/04</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: RIVER BEND STATION		Date of Exam: 9/20/2004		Scenario Numbers: 1 / 2 / 3 [BU]		
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.					
2.	The scenarios consist mostly of related events.					
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) 					
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.					
5.	The events are valid with regard to physics and thermodynamics.					
6.	Sequencing and timing of events is reasonable, and allows the examination team to obtain complete evaluation results commensurate with the scenario objectives.					
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.					
8.	The simulator modeling is not altered.					
9.	The scenarios have been validated. Pursuant to 10 CFR 55.46(d), any open simulator performance deficiencies have been evaluated to ensure that functional fidelity is maintained while running the planned scenarios.					
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.5 of ES-301.					
11.	All individual operator competencies can be evaluated, as verified using Form ES-301-6 (submit the form along with the simulator scenarios).					
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).					
13.	The level of difficulty is appropriate to support licensing decisions for each crew position.					
TARGET QUANTITATIVE ATTRIBUTES (PER SCENARIO; SEE SECTION D.5.d)		1	2	3 [BU]	Actual Attributes	
1.	Total malfunctions (5-8)	7	7	8		
2.	Malfunctions after EOP entry (1-2)	1	2	2		
3.	Abnormal events (2-4)	2	2	2		
4.	Major transients (1-2)	1	1	1		
5.	EOPs entered/requiring substantive actions (1-2)	2	2	2		
6.	EOP contingencies requiring substantive actions (0-2)	1	1	0		
7.	Critical tasks (2-3)	3	2	2		


OPERATING TEST for RIVER BEND STATION, 9/20/04

Applicant Type	Evolution Type	Minimum Number	Scenario Number							
			1		2		3 (BU)			
			RO	BOP	RO	BOP	RO	BOP	RO	BOP
RO	Reactivity	1*	1		5		4			
	Normal	1*				1		1		
	Instrument / Component	4*	2, 3, 4, 5	2, 4, 7	3, 5	2, 4, 7	2, 4	3, 7		
	Major	1	6	6	6	6	5, 6	5, 6		
As RO	Reactivity	1*	1		4		5			
	Normal	0								
	Instrument / Component	2*	2, 3, 4, 5		3, 5		2, 4			
	Major	1	6		6		5, 6			
SRO-I										
As SRO	Reactivity	0	1		5		4			
	Normal	1*			1		1			
	Instrument / Component	2*	2, 3, 4, 5, 7		2, 3, 4, 5, 7		2, 3, 4, 7			
	Major	1	6		6		5, 6			
SRO-U										
SRO-U	Reactivity	0	1		5		4			
	Normal	1*			1		1			
	Instrument / Component	2*	2, 3, 4, 5, 7		2, 3, 4, 5, 7		2, 3, 4, 7			
	Major	1	6		6		5, 6			


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.5.d) but must be significant per Section C.2.a of Appendix D. *Reactivity and normal evolutions may be replaced with additional instrument or component malfunctions on a one-for-one basis.
- (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:



NRC Reviewer:



Facility: **RIVER BEND STATION**Date of Exam: **9/20/2004**

Competencies	SRO-U or SRO-I as SRO			RO or SRO-I as RO			BOP		
	SCENARIO			SCENARIO			SCENARIO		
	1	2	BU	1	2	BU	1	2	BU
Interpret / Diagnose Events and Conditions	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 8	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	2, 3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4, 6, 7	3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4, 6, 7	3, 6, 8	2, 5, 6, 7
Comply With and Use Procedures (1)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4, 5, 6, 7	3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4, 6, 7	1, 3, 6, 8	1, 2, 5, 7
Operate Control Boards (2)				1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4, 5, 6, 7	3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4, 6, 7	1, 3, 6, 8	1, 2, 5, 7
Communicate and Interact	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6	2, 4, 5, 6, 7	2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	2, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 3, 6, 8	1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7
Demonstrate Supervisory Ability (3)	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8	1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7						
Comply With and Use Tech. Specs. (3)	2, 3	2, 3	2, 3						

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: NRC Reviewer: 

Facility: RIVER BEND STATION		Date of Exam: 9/17/2004		Exam Level: RO	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading.	RP	NW	H		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	RP	NW	H		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check >25% of examinations)	RP	NW	H		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 +/- 2% overall and 70 +/- 4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	RP	NW	H		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	RP	NW	H		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	RP	NW	H		

	Printed Name / Signature	Date
a. Author	<u>Roger L. Persons</u> / <u>[Signature]</u>	<u>9/30/04</u>
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>Mike Wagner</u> / <u>Mike Wagne</u>	<u>9/30/04</u>
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>Thomas F. Stetka</u> / <u>Thomas F. Stetka</u>	<u>2/17/05</u>
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>A.T. Gory</u> / <u>AT Gory</u>	<u>2/18/05</u>

(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.

Facility: RIVER BEND STATION		Date of Exam: 9/17/2004		Exam Level: SRO	
Item Description	Initials				
	a	b	c		
1. Clean answer sheets copied before grading.	RP	NW	H		
2. Answer key changes and question deletions justified and documented	RP	NW	H		
3. Applicants' scores checked for addition errors (reviewers spot check >25% of examinations)	RP	NW	H		
4. Grading for all borderline cases (80 +/- 2% overall and 70 +/- 4% on the SRO-only) reviewed in detail	RP	NW	H		
5. All other failing examinations checked to ensure that grades are justified	RP	NW	H		
6. Performance on missed questions checked for training deficiencies and wording problems; evaluate validity of questions missed by half or more of the applicants	RP	NW	H		

	Printed Name / Signature	Date
a. Author	<u>Robert L. Parsons</u> 	<u>9/30/04</u>
b. Facility Reviewer (*)	<u>Mike Waggoner</u> 	<u>9/30/04</u>
c. NRC Chief Examiner (*)	<u>Thomas F. Stetka</u> 	<u>2/11/05</u>
d. NRC Supervisor (*)	<u>A.T. Gory</u> 	<u>2/18/05</u>

(*) The facility reviewer's signature is not applicable for examinations graded by the NRC; two independent NRC reviews are required.

10/25/2004

09:32:50

Report 21

Operator Licensing Exam Schedule

From 09/01/2004 To 09/30/2005

Region: 4 Phase Code: 5 Operational

Exam Week	Site/Docket No./Insp Rpt #	# Candidates	Type	Exam Author	Chief Examiner	Examiners Assigned
09/06/2004	River Bend / 05000458 / 2004301 TAC #: X02267		Prep		STETKA, THOMAS F.	HAIRE, MARK S. SANCHEZ, ALFRED STETKA, THOMAS F.
09/20/2004	River Bend / 05000458 / 2004301 TAC #: X02267	RO - 4 SROU - 4	Admin	FFF	STETKA, THOMAS F.	HAIRE, MARK S. SANCHEZ, ALFRED STETKA, THOMAS F.

ES-201

Examination Security Agreement

Form ES-201-3

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the **NRC licensing examinations scheduled for September 17, 2004 and the week of September 20 – 24, 2004** 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 examination 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 examination administered September 17, 2004 and during the week of September 20 – 24, 2004**. 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
ROGER L. PERSONS	Exam Developer	<i>[Signature]</i>	3/31/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	9/27/04	
HAILE TESFAY	Sr. soft ware Eng.	<i>[Signature]</i>	3/31/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/10/04	
GARY DEGRAW	Supervisor, Sim Support	<i>[Signature]</i>	3/31/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	9/27/04	
GLYNIS BERGERON	Training Support	<i>[Signature]</i>	3/31/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	9/27/04	
BARBARA BARNES	Training Support	<i>[Signature]</i>	3/31/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	9/27/04	
ERIC WOLFENBUTER	Exam Developer	<i>[Signature]</i>	3/31/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	9/27/04	
LOU GARRAWAY	Training Support	<i>[Signature]</i>	4/12/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/13/04	
DALLAS J. BALKMER	Simulator Support	<i>[Signature]</i>	5-10-04	<i>[Signature]</i>	9-27-04	
GARY H. HUSTON	Facility Reviewer	<i>[Signature]</i>	5/21/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	10/6/04	
TIFFANY ALEY	VALIDATOR / OPS	<i>[Signature]</i>	7/7/04	<i>[Signature]</i>	10-28-04	
KEA HIGGINBOTHAM	VALIDATOR / CRS	<i>[Signature]</i>	7-8-04	<i>[Signature]</i>	10-21-04	
FRANK J. McLEAN	NCO Validator	<i>[Signature]</i>	7-8-04	<i>[Signature]</i>	10-22-04	





















NOTES:

1. Pre-Examination

I acknowledge that I have acquired specialized knowledge about the NRC licensing examinations scheduled for September 17, 2004 and the week of September 20 - 24, 2004 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 examination 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 examination administered September 17, 2004 and during the week of September 20 - 24, 2004. 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. Timothy C Manry	Validator / NCO		07/08/2004		10-19-2004	
2. MICHAEL A. HURST	DEVELOPER-SME/RXEN4		7/12/04		10-19-04	
3. JEFFERY R GORDON	DEVELOPER SME RP		7-14-04		9-29-04	
4. Thomas Naylor	Sim Instructor/ CRS		9-7-04		9-28-04	
5. Glenn Krause	Sim Instructor / CRS		9-7-4		9-28-4	
6. RICKY MAYeux	Validator / OSM		9-7-04		10/19/04	
7. JOEY A. CLARK	ADM - P		9/29/2004		9/28/04	
8. John Fralick	Sim Instructor		9/29/04		9/28/04	
9. Sam Becker	OPS MANAGER		9/21/04		10/17/04	
10. Mike Wagoner	Supervisor Ops Trng		9/29/04		9/28/04	
11.						
12.						

NOTES: