

DOCKETED
USNRC

TENNESSEE VALLEY AUTHORITY
Office of the Inspector General
RECORD OF INTERVIEW

2003 MAR 11 AM 11:56

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
RULEMAKINGS AND
ADJUDICATIONS STAFF

Name: Wilson C. McArthur
Position: Manager, RADGon
Office: Chemistry Control
Chattanooga, Tennessee
Work Tel.: (423) 751-8715
Residence: [REDACTED]
Home Tel.: [REDACTED]
SSN/DOB: [REDACTED]

McArthur was contacted at his office, advised of the identity of the interviewing agent, and reinterviewed concerning one specific issue involving a Department of Labor (DOL) complaint filed by Gary L. Fiser. McArthur furnished the following information.

McArthur was contacted to get specific information concerning the selection process used by the review board to fill two vacancies for program managers in the Chemistry Department. The vacancy position announcements (VPA) were numbers 10702 and 10703; 10702 was for the BWR Program Manager position at Browns Ferry Nuclear Plant (BFN) and PWR was for the Program Manager position to handle Sequoyah (SQN) and Watts Bar Nuclear Plants (WBN).

McArthur advised that the review board met on July 18, 1996, to conduct the interviews of the qualified applicants. The review board consisted of Charles Kent, Manager of Radiological and Chemistry Control at SQN; John Corey, Manager of Radiological and Chemistry Control at BFN; and H.R. Rogers, Manager of Technical Support/Operations Support.

There were four qualified applicants for VPA 10702 and three applicants interviewed for VPA 10703.

Investigation On: October 29, 1996

At: Chattanooga, Tennessee

By: David V. VanBockert

File: 2D-169 - 33

28204
OIG-02 (10/93)

This document contains neither recommendations nor conclusions of the OIG. It is the property of the OIG and is loaned to you. It and its contents should not be distributed outside of TVA without the permission of the Inspector General.

Template = SECY-028

SECY-02

CLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

License No. 50-390 Official Exh. No. Staff 93

In the matter of TVA

Staff ✓ IDENTIFIED ✓

Applicant _____ RECEIVED ✓

Intervenor _____ REJECTED _____

Other _____ WITHDRAWN _____

DATE 5/2/02 Witness _____

Clerk BHM

Vertical text on the right margin, possibly a date stamp or filing information, including the number 115.

McArthur advised that he prepared a series of questions that were used during the interview process by the review board. The review board was given the questions prior to conducting the interviews and selected anywhere from six to ten questions from the list of questions to be asked of each applicant. The same questions were asked of each applicant for each position.

McArthur said that he sat in during the interviews, however, he did not ask any questions and had no input during the interview process. Human Resource Officers (HRO) Ben Easley and Melissa Westbrook served as facilitators during the interview process.

At the end of the interview process, the HROs tabulated the scores from the review board members on the questions asked each applicant. They used a rating response of one to ten, ten being the highest rating to be given each applicant on the responses to the questions.

After all scores were tabulated, at the end of the interview process it was determined that E.S. Chandrasekaran received the highest rating by the review board for VPA 10702 which was the BWR position at BFN. Sam L. Harvey received the second highest rating for this position by the review board. Chandrasekaran had previously served in this position at BFN and had the most experience in the BWR plant.

McArthur was also told that Chandrasekaran received the highest score for VPA 10703, the PWR position at SQN and WBN. Harvey was ranked second by the review board for this position. Fiser was ranked third by the review board.

Chandrasekaran had received the highest ranking for the BWR position and was the most qualified. The best choice was to keep Chandrasekaran at BFN. Because Harvey placed a close second for the PWR position, he was selected to fill the PWR position at SQN/WBN.

It was pointed out to McArthur that in reviewing the tabulations for the rated response for each question by the review board it was determined that an error had been made and Harvey actually received a slightly higher score than Chandrasekaran for the PWR position. It was pointed out to McArthur that Harvey actually received a score totaling two-tenths of 1 percent higher than Chandrasekaran for the PWR position. McArthur was unaware of this error and felt it might have been an adding error performed during the tabulation of the scores. McArthur said that it did not affect the selection of Harvey to fill the PWR position.

McArthur said that the review board based the selection process on the responses provided by each applicant during the interview process. McArthur concurred with the rankings of the review board and requested that an offer be extended to both Harvey and Chandrasekaran for the vacant positions.