

DOCKETED
USNRC

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY 2003 MAR -4 PM 3: 18

Office of the Inspector General

RECORD OF INTERVIEW

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Name: Ben G. Easley
Position: Human Resource Officer
Office: Corporate
Chattanooga, Tennessee
Work Tel.: 423-751-2234
Residence: [REDACTED]
Home Tel.: [REDACTED]
SSN/DOB: [REDACTED]

Easley was contacted at his office, advised of the identity of the interviewing agent, and reinterviewed concerning an issue involving the basis for the selection of a vacancy position announcement (VPA 10703-Program Manager, Chemistry) (PWR) PG-8. Easley furnished the following the information:

Easley was present during the selection process to fill the vacancies for the program managers in the chemistry department in July 1996.

The selection board met on July 18, 1996 to select the program managers for the vacancy position announcements 10702 and 10703. The VPA #10702 was for the program manager in chemistry (BWR) at Browns Ferry. The VPA #10703 was for the program manager, chemistry (PWR) position for Sequoyah and Watts Bar.

The selection board consisted of Charles Kent, Manager of Radiological and Chemistry Control at Sequoyah; John Corey, Manager of Radiological and Chemistry Control at Browns Ferry; and H. R. Roger, Manager of Technical Support/Operations Support.

Just prior to conducting the interviews of the applicants, Easley provided the selection board a binder containing the resumes, background, PHRs, applications, and other pertinent information concerning each applicant. The selection board was also provided a list of questions prepared by Wilson McArthur, Manager of Radiological and Chemistry Control at Corporate. The selection board chose specific questions from the list provided to

Investigation On: 10/29/96

At: Chattanooga, Tennessee

By: David V. VanBockern, SA:GKT

File: 2D-169 -34

28108

EE000348

OIG-02 (10/93)

Template = SECY-028

SECY-02

REGULATORY COMMISSION

Case No. 50-390 OTHER NO. Joint 41

In the matter of TVA

IDENTIFIED

RECEIVED

REJECTED

WITHDRAWN

Witness

5/11/62

BHM

50-390

50-390-41

50-390-41

be asked each applicant. The same questions were asked each applicant for each vacancy.

During the selection process, the selection board graded each applicant's response to each question and the score for each question/response was recorded. The review board based the rating response on one through ten, ten being the highest ranking.

Easley said he sat in on all of the interviews except the ones involving VPA #10703 because he had previous knowledge of a Department of Labor (DOL) complaint filed by Gary L. Pfiser, one of the applicants. Melissa Westbrook, Human Resource Officer at corporate sat in during the interviews for the PWR position and she took notes.

At the conclusion of the interviews for each position, the rating response from each review board member was tabulated and a total score for each candidate was calculated. Easley said he personally recorded the rating response from each review board member and totaled up each score.

Easley said E. S. Chandrasekaran received the highest rating from the selection board for VPA #10702, the (BWR position at Browns Ferry). Chandrasekaran had the most experience at the BWR plant and had previously worked at Browns Ferry. Sam L. Harvey also had experience with the BWR plant and was ranked a close second by the selection board. Based on the results of the interview scores, Chandrasekaran was ranked the highest and was selected to fill the BWR position at Browns Ferry.

Easley also tabulated the scores for the PWR position VPA #10702. Easley's initial calculations reflected that Chandrasekaran also received the highest total score from the selection board for the PWR position. Even though Chandrasekaran ranked the highest for both positions, he was more qualified for the BWP position therefore, he was selected to fill that position. Sam L. Harvey came in second in the ratings by the review board for the PWR position therefore, he was selected the PWR position. Gary L. Pfiser only applied for the PWR position. Based on his responses, Fiser was was ranked third by the review board.

A close review of the tabulation for the PWR position, reflected that the total scores as recorded on the tabulation sheet prepared by Easley reflect that Sam L. Harvey actually had a higher score for the PWR position. Harvey's score totaled 235.7 to Chandrasekaran's 235.5. Easley recalculated and tabulated all the scores for the PWR rating and did note that he possibly could have made an error in his initial tabulation and came upn with a total score of 236.5 for Chandrasekaran. Easley noted his error and said the score should have been 235.5. Even though Easley said this was probably a mathematical error on his part, it does not effect the selection of the candidates for the two positions.

Easley said he informed Wilson McCarther of his totals at the end of the interviews. McCarther concurred with the review boards selections and prepared a memo dated July 31, 1996, advising Chandrasekaran and Harvey of their selection. Easley said even though there was a 2/10 of 1% mathematical error in the tabulation of the rating response by the selection board, it had absolutely no effect on the outcome of the selection. As it stands, Sam Harvey received the highest rating by the review board for the PWR position and was selected to fill that position.

Easley said the selection committee did consider merit, efficiency, and experience for each candidate however, the selection for each positin was based on the responses provided by each applicant during the interview process. The individual with the highest score during the interview process was selected to fill the vacant positions.