



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

OCT 28 1981

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

REPORT OF INVESTIGATION

LETTER DESIGNATIONS

TITLE: Three Mile Island Nuclear Generating Station,
Unit 1/Investigation of Alleged Improprieties
on Operator Examinations

CASE NUMBER: HQS-81-005

SUPPLEMENTAL: Docket Number 50-289

PERIOD OF INVESTIGATION: October 19, 20 and 22, 1981

STATUS OF INVESTIGATION: Closed

INVESTIGATORS:

Peter E. Baci 10/28/81
Peter E. Baci, Senior Investigator
Investigations Branch, EI Staff
Office of Inspection and Enforcement

Edward C. Gilbert 10/28/81
Edward C. Gilbert, Investigator
Investigations Branch, EI Staff
Office of Inspection and Enforcement

REPORT REVIEWED BY:

Peter E. Baci 10/28/81
In William J. Ward, Chief
Investigations Branch, EI Staff
Office of Inspection and Enforcement

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

SUMMARY

An investigation conducted by the Office of Inspection and Enforcement revealed that cheating had occurred during the course of the April 1981 NRC Operator Licensing Examinations given at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station (see Report of Investigation No. HQS-81-003, dated August 11, 1981). As a result of this revelation, the licensee (Met-Ed) conducted its own investigation to determine whether the scope of the cheating went beyond that identified by the NRC. The licensee's enquiry included interviews by senior management of selected Met-Ed/GPU personnel, including each individual who had taken the NRC examinations.

The interviews yielded certain new information which was promptly made available to the NRC. Specifically, one interviewee related an incident which occurred during the KELLY examinations given in the Spring of 1980. The individual recalled having received a telephone call while the examinations were ongoing; he stated that the caller asked him a question (that he answered) which he later learned had appeared on the exam.

The individual was interviewed by the NRC on October 19, 1981 concerning his recollection of the call. He could neither identify the caller nor provide any other information which would enable the NRC investigators to further investigate the allegation. While he did recall the question he was asked, he said it concerned an area which was stressed heavily in the training program. Based on the lack of any logical leads, this allegation remains unresolved.

A second interviewee (interviewed by Met-Ed/GPU management) advised that while taking the NRC examinations in April 1981, he had a chance encounter with another examinee at the coffee machine. He stated that while obtaining a cup of coffee, he was asked a question by the other party which he believed was on the NRC exam; further, the individual stated that he answered the question although he recognized at the time that it was improper conduct on his part. This information was verified by the NRC investigators who interviewed the individual on October 19, 20 and 22, 1981; however, the interviewee maintained that he could not recall either the name of the person who asked the question or the question that was asked. He told the investigators that it (his answering the question) was a spontaneous act which he knew was improper. At the time, however, he did not consider his actions "significant enough to constitute a cheating incident."

Both individuals provided signed sworn statements to the investigators documenting their actions as described above. Lacking any logical leads, the NRC anticipates no further investigative action in this matter.

BACKGROUND

The NRC Office of Inspection and Enforcement (IE) recently conducted an investigation which disclosed that cheating had occurred during both the "mock" and NRC administered Operator Licensing Examinations at Three Mile Island in April 1981 (See IE Report of Investigation No. HQS-81-003, dated August 11, 1981). This investigation resulted in the resignation of two individuals who admitted cheating during these examinations. The investigation also surfaced rumors of additional cheating and established that conditions conducive to cheating existed; however, no substantive evidence of other instances of cheating was obtained.

In view of the results of the aforementioned IE investigation, the licensee (Met-Ed) initiated its own investigation in an attempt to determine whether additional instances of cheating had occurred. These enquiries consisted in part of interviews by senior licensee management of certain licensee personnel, including all individuals who had taken the NRC examinations. These interviews produced two additional incidents indicative of cheating. The disclosures were promptly provided to the NRC by John WILSON, an attorney representing GPU/Met-Ed; however the licensee requested that an investigation by the NRC be held in abeyance until management representatives had concluded their interviews. These interviews were completed on October 19, 1981.

Both of the new allegations pertained to unidentified and/or unrecalled individuals, presumably examinees, orally asking questions which apparently appeared on examinations while the exams were in process. The first allegation was elicited by Richard WILSON, Vice President for Technical Functions, GPU/Met-Ed, during his interview of W/W, shift technical advisor. Reportedly, W/W claimed he received a telephone call while the KELLY examinations were ongoing in the Spring of 1980. W/W advised he answered a question posed by the unidentified caller, and he subsequently learned the question had appeared on the KELLY exams. The other allegation was made to Henry HUKILL, Director, TMI-1, during his interview of FF, operations engineer. Reportedly, FF revealed he had a chance encounter with an unrecalled individual at the coffee stand while he was taking the NRC examinations in April 1981. FF related he answered a question asked by the individual. Further, he assumed the other individual was concurrently taking the NRC exam (in another classroom) and the question appeared on the exam they were taking.

PURPOSE OF INVESTIGATION

This investigation was conducted to obtain all available facts and circumstances of two additional reported instances of cheating during examinations at Three Mile Island.

INTERVIEW OF W W

On October 19, 1981, W W was interviewed by NRC Investigators Peter E. Baci and Edward C. Gilbert at the NRC Office at Three Mile Island (TMI). W W, who resides at [redacted] has been employed by Met-Ed/GPU since June 1977. W W is currently assigned as a shift technical advisor (STA) working at TMI Unit 1.

W W was interviewed concerning a telephone call he allegedly received during the time of the contractor administered (KELLY) requalification exams in the Spring of 1980. W W stated that he received the call while he was in the Unit 1 shift supervisor's office and was asked a question concerning the DNB curve. The caller, who did not identify himself, asked W W what the indices on the DNB (departure from nucleate boiling) curve were, and W W told him that the "Y" axis was the heat flux and the "X" axis was the Delta "T."

W W told the investigators that he frequently was asked technical questions and that he did not attach any special significance to this one. He later learned that the question had appeared on the KELLY exams and this made him suspicious that perhaps the caller had been seeking the answer for someone who was taking the test. Nevertheless, he did not report his suspicions to anyone until he discussed it with his boss, SO, and with Richard WILSON (Vice President for Technical Functions) some time after the September 1981 NRC investigation.

W W explained that while the question had reportedly been on the KELLY exam, it was the type of question which was stressed in the training program and one which he felt most operators could answer. He added that he inferred the caller was an operator because of the nature of the question; he did not know this to be the case. W W continued that he did not ask who the caller was and the caller did not identify himself. According to W W, the voice was familiar, but he could not put a name to it, either then or now. W W stated that the caller knew who he was because he answered the phone by giving his name.

W W indicated that he had no knowledge of other cheating beyond the rumors which he related to NRC investigators during an earlier interview.

W W provided a signed sworn statement which is included as Enclosure (1).

Investigator's Note: W W tape-recorded the interview with the NRC. A copy of the tape was not requested by or provided to the NRC.

INTERVIEW OF FF

FF was interviewed on October 19 and 20, 1981 by NRC Investigators Edward C. Gilbert and Peter E. Baci at the NRC Office at Three Mile Island (TMI). FF advised he has been employed by Met-Ed/GPU since June 1974; that he is _____ and he is a licensed Senior Reactor Operator (SRO) assigned to Unit 1. He related he resides at _____

FF was informed that his interview was necessitated as a result of a question which he was reportedly asked and which he allegedly answered during the course of the NRC administered reactor operator (RO) or SRO examinations in April 1981. FF stated he took the NRC RO and SRO exams in the non-smoking classrooms on the first two days they were administered (April 21 and 22, 1981). He revealed that on one of these two days he left the classroom briefly to go to the coffee stand; that while he was obtaining coffee, another individual asked him a question which he answered. FF averred he could not recall the identity of the individual, the question posed or his response. However, he conceded that at the time he assumed the individual was concurrently taking the same examination in the smoking classroom and that the question presumably appeared on the exam they were taking. He remarked there were no witnesses to this incident and they each returned to their respective classrooms following the brief exchange.

FF described the incident as an unpremeditated encounter. He further explained that he had responded to the question spontaneously since TMI personnel regularly ask each other questions for general information and when preparing for examinations. He also suggested he may have reacted out of compassion for his co-worker in the prevailing atmosphere of a close-knit group. FF stated that at the time he considered this an insignificant event which did not constitute a cheating incident; accordingly he had not previously reported the situation to Company management or the NRC.

He related that he first brought this incident to management's attention during a discussion he had with Henry HUKILL, Director, TMI-1, on October 7, 1981. He explained he provided this information in response to specific questions by HUKILL concerning his participation in, knowledge of or facilitation of cheating during any examinations. FF reiterated that he acknowledged to HUKILL that although he had reservations regarding the propriety of the incident, he did not consider it significant enough to constitute cheating.

FF concluded that after discussing the episode with HUKILL and Investigators GILBERT and BACI, he recognizes that in view of current events, he acted improperly by answering the question and failing to consider the incident of significant importance to be reported. He averred that he will never be a participant in a similar situation and agreed to make available to the NRC any additional information which comes to his attention or recollection. Further, he denied knowledge of any other cheating incidents which had not already been reported to the NRC. At the conclusion of the interview on October 19, 1981,

FF agreed to swear to and sign a written statement containing the details of the interview, which would be prepared by Investigator GILBERT.

Investigator's Note: At FF request, he was allowed to tape-record his interview with the NRC on October 19, 1981. A copy of the tape was neither requested by nor provided to the NRC.

During the interview of October 20, 1981, FF was provided with the written statement incorporating the information he had furnished on October 19, 1981. After reading the statement and making minor corrections, FF orally concurred with its accuracy. However, he declined to sign or swear to the statement at this time; explaining that he wished to further review the contents and compare them with his tape recording of the interview. Accordingly, a copy of the statement was provided to FF.

REINTERVIEW OF FF

On October 22, 1981, FF was reinterviewed by Investigators Gilbert and Baci at the NRC Office at Three Mile Island for the purpose of obtaining a signed sworn statement detailing his previous disclosures. FF advised that rather than swearing to and signing the written statement which had been prepared by Investigator Gilbert, he preferred to submit a statement regarding the incident which he had written. FF's unsigned statement is Enclosure (2) and his signed sworn statement is Enclosure (3).

Investigator's Note: The statement executed by FF is similar in contents to the unsigned statement with the exception of his admitting in the signed statement that he realized at the time of the incident that he was acting improperly by answering the question, whereas the unsigned statement indicates he was not sure that there was anything wrong in his or the other individual's actions.

CONCLUSIONS OF REPORTING INVESTIGATORS

This investigation was conducted to determine the facts and circumstances surrounding reported irregularities in the examination of licensed operators at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station (Unit 1).

The first irregularity concerned a phone call made to a shift technical advisor (STA) during the course of the requalification (or KELLY) examinations given in the Spring of 1980. Received by STA WW in the shift supervisor's office, the telephone call consisted of a question concerning the "indices on the DNB curve" and WW's answer to the caller. The caller did not identify himself and WW could not provide any clues as to his identity.

While WW later learned that the question asked of him had appeared on the KELLY exam, he stated that it dealt with an area which is stressed in the Company training program and he could not say that the caller was improperly seeking assistance while taking the examination. Lacking any logical leads to pursue, and considering the time which has elapsed since the KELLY exams, the NRC plans no further investigative action and this allegation must be considered unresolved.

The second irregularity concerned FF who took the NRC RO/SRO examinations given on April 21-22, 1981, told NRC investigators that during a chance encounter at the coffee stand, he was asked (and answered) a question which he assumed was on the NRC exam; further, this action took place while FF and the other individual were concurrently taking the license examination. FF acknowledged to the investigators that he recognized (at the time) that answering the other individual's question was improper conduct on his (FF's) part.

Beyond FF's acknowledgement of his misconduct, he maintained that he was unable to recall either the identity of the other individual or the specific question he was asked. Lacking any logical leads, the NRC plans no further investigative action in this matter.

STATUS OF INVESTIGATION

Based upon the information gathered during this investigation, and lacking any logical leads, the Director, Enforcement and Investigations Staff, IE:HQ, has determined that no further investigative effort is warranted. Accordingly, this investigation is closed.

ENCLOSURES

- (1) Statement of W W
- (2) Unsigned Statement of FF
- (3) Statement of FF

STATEMENT

I, W W, hereby make the following voluntary statement to PETER E. BACI who has identified himself to me as an Investigator with the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I make this statement freely with no threats or promises of reward having been made to me. Investigator BACI is writing/~~typing~~ this statement for me at my request.

This statement summarizes the information which I provided to NRC Investigators Baci and Gilbert during an interview held on Oct. 19, 1981 at the NRC Office at Three Mile Island. I am currently employed by Met-Ed/GPU Nuclear as a shift technical advisor (Unit 1) at the Three Mile Island Plant. I have worked as an STA since 9/17/79; prior to that, I worked as a nuclear engineer for both Units 1 and 2. I am not a licensed operator.

The information I am providing has to do with a telephone call I received while in the shift supervisor's office. The call came during the time of the operator requalification or "KELLY" examinations. These were contractor administered exams which were given in the Spring of 1980. I answered the phone by giving my name and spoke to an individual who did not identify himself. The caller asked me: "What are the indices on the DNBR curve?" I answered the question and didn't think much of it at the time. It wasn't unusual for people to call up and ask questions.

I later heard some of the operators talking about the test and found out that the question put to me by the caller had appeared on the "KELLY" exam. I became suspicious that someone had asked me to answer the question

* and with Richard Wilson, Vice President Tech Functions

so as to help someone else who was taking the test. While I was suspicious, I did not tell anyone about the call until I discussed it with my boss, 50 *re about the time of the present NRC investigation (Sept. 1981). The question I was asked was a relatively simple one which is stressed in the Company Training Program. It is a common enough question which I feel most operators could answer.

I recall that the caller's voice was familiar but I could not then and cannot now put a name to it. No one approached me afterwards to discuss the call nor did I make any effort to find out who the caller was. I may have inferred from the question that an operator had made the call but I do not know that for sure. I also do not know that the caller was asking the question for anything but legitimate reasons.

I did not discuss this matter during my last interview with the NRC (9/23/81) because the investigator had directed his questions to cheating or irregularities on the April 1981 NRC exams. If he had asked me about the other tests, I would have told him about the call. Mr. Basi asked me if I was aware of any cheating on any of the exams - company, contractor or NRC - and I told him that aside from the people who were to go, I have no knowledge of cheating here at TMI. I told him that I have heard rumors concerning cheating ever since I began working at TMI in 1978, but that I cannot put names to the rumors. The rumors involved "crib" sheets

and also people leaving exam rooms to seek
answers to questions. I told the investigators
that aside from these rumors and the phone
call already discussed, I am also aware
that STA C KK received a telephone
call during the April 1981 NRC exams which
was
aff. similar in nature to the one I received.
My knowledge concerning KK's call
comes from this having told me about it.

I have read the foregoing statement consisting of 3 handwritten/~~typed~~
pages. I have made and initialed any necessary corrections and have signed my
name in ink in the margin of each page. This statement is the truth to the best
of my knowledge and belief. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing
is true and correct. Executed on 10/20/81 at 1024.
date time

INTERVIEWEE

NAME: W W

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 20th day of October, 1981,
at 1025

INVESTIGATOR:

NAME: [Signature] 1025

WITNESS:

NAME: Edward C. Miller 1026

STATEMENT

I, FF, hereby make the following voluntary statement to Edward C. GILBERT who has identified himself to me as an Investigator with the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I make this statement freely with no threats or promises of reward having been made to me. Investigator GILBERT is writing/typing this statement for me at my request.

This statement contains the information which I orally provided to Investigator GILBERT and Senior Investigator Peter E. BACI on October 19th 1981 at the NRC office at Three Mile Island.

I am for Met-Ed/CPV and have been employed here since June 1974. I am a licensed Senior reactor operator (SRO) for Unit 1 at Three Mile Island. In April 1981 I took and passed both the reactor operator (RO) and senior reactor operator (SRO) examinations which were administered by the NRC. I believe I took these exams on the first two days and I sat in the non-smoking rooms. I also took the RO and SRO mock exams which were given in early April 1981.

Two weeks ago this Wednesday (October 7, 1981), Mr. HUKILL, Director TMI-1, had a private discussion with me at his request. During this conversation Mr. HUKILL asked me two questions. He asked me if I had ever cheated on an examination; to which I answered, "no". He then asked me if I knew of anyone who had cheated on an examination. I told him that while I was taking the NRC exam in April 1981 someone asked me a question from the exam while I was at the coffee stand, and I answered the question. I told Mr. HUKILL I could not recall who asked me the question, what the question was or what my answer consisted

I pointed out to Mr. HUKILL that at the time this occurred I did not think it was significant; that it was a spontaneous infraction which was not premeditated. By this I mean we had not planned to meet at the coffee stand and I answered the individual's question automatically since we are always asking each other questions prior to examinations and at other times just to keep current and fully informed to perform our jobs effectively. Although I wasn't sure that there was anything wrong with asking this question or providing the answer, I felt someone at Mr. HUKILL's level of management should be aware of this incident. Mr. HUKILL appeared very concerned when I told him about this incident and, frankly, I was surprised at his reaction since I did not think either of us had done anything wrong.

I do not know which of the two days that this incident occurred and I do not know whether I was taking the RC or the SRO examination at the time. I'm quite sure it was the NRC exams rather than the mock exams which were administered earlier in the month of April 1981. Since I was in the non-smoking classroom, the other individual must have been in the smoking classroom since only one person is allowed out of a room at a time. No one else was present at the coffee stand when this brief exchange between us occurred. This was not a prolonged discussion between us. It last only long enough for us to pour our two cups of coffee and then we each returned to our respective classrooms where we were taking the exam.

I have no recollection of how the question was posed to me or how I responded to it. However, I do ^{assume} ~~know~~ that the question asked me appeared on the test I was taking that day and I was evidently sure of the answer since I did provide what I considered the proper answer. I do not believe I would recognize the question if I had an opportunity to review the NRC SC and SRC examinations which I took. Also, as I previously told Mr. HUKILL, I cannot recall the identity of the person who asked me the question. The entire incident was so brief and insignificant to me at the time that I have completely forgotten the details since it occurred over five months ago. After my discussion with Mr. HUKILL I realized how important these details would be. I have tried to reconstruct the incident in my mind but I can't remember additional facts. I realize that my inability to recall who the individual was or what the question consisted of is very important, but I am simply unable to recall either of these facts. I can only explain that since I attached no significance to the incident at the time and did not think I had done anything wrong, I had no reason to commit this information to my memory.

I was aware of the recent NRC investigation concerning cheating on examinations at Three Mile Island which resulted in the terminations of two employees. However, since I still did not believe my actions constituted cheating, I did not think about this incident and, accordingly, I did not previously bring it to the attention of the company or

the NRC.

I now recognize that in today's light what I considered insignificant at the time is now very serious and important to both the Company and the NRC. In some respects, I feel that I have been entrapped. By this I mean that what I considered a very innocent incident is interpreted by others as a significant situation which should have been reported by me. I still do not believe I cheated or participated in cheating by answering this individual's question. My actions may have resulted from my compassion for my co-workers and the "team effort." We are a very close-knit group and we strive to help each other. This was my attitude at the time I answered the question. Someone would have to "be in my shoes" to realize how I felt at the time. I cannot offer any further explanation as to why I did not feel that anything wrong had occurred at the time.

After talking with Mr. HUKILL and Investigator GILBERT and BACI, I now realize that I should not have answered an examination question during the examination. I definitely will not do this again. I do not want my character or integrity questioned or jeopardized. I now have a better understanding of what constitutes cheating. If I can recall who the individual was who approached me at the coffee stand during the examination, I will make this information available to the NRC.

After discussing this information with Mr. HUKILL, I also told my supervisor, EE

5 and my family who had occurred. ~~It is signed and~~
5 ~~attested by these individuals~~

I wish to point out that I have never
cheated on a Company, Contractor or NRC
administered examination by receiving,
utilizing or soliciting any information
during the examination from anyone else
or from "crib sheets." Further, except as I
have stated above, I have never aided or
facilitated cheating by others in any of
these examinations. Also, I am aware of no
rumors concerning the above.

I have read the foregoing statement consisting of _____ handwritten/typed
pages. I have made and initialed any necessary corrections and have signed my
name in ink in the margin of each page. This statement is the truth to the best
of my knowledge and belief. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing
is true and correct. Executed on _____ at _____
date time

INTERVIEWEE: _____
NAME: _____

Subscribed and sworn to before me this _____ day of _____, 19____,
at _____.

INVESTIGATOR: _____
NAME: _____

WITNESS: _____
NAME: _____

10/22/81

I, FF, hereby make the following voluntary statement to Edward C. Gilbert who has identified himself to me as an investigator with the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I make this statement freely with no threats or promises of reward having been made to me.

10/22/81
This statement contains information which I orally provided ~~provided~~^{10/22/81} to Investigator Gilbert and Senior Investigator Peter E. Baei on October 19, 20 1981 at the NRC office at Three Mile Island.

FF
I am FF for Met-Ed/GPU and have been employed with Met-Ed/GPU since June 1974. I am a licensed senior reactor operator (SRO) for Unit 1 at Three Mile Island. In April 1981 I took and passed both the reactor operator (RO) and senior reactor operator (SRO) examinations which were administered by the NRC. I believe I took these exams on the first two days and I sat in the non-smoking room. I also took the RO and SRO mock exams

which were given in early April 1981.

Two weeks ago this Wednesday (October 7, 1981) Mr. Hukill, Director TMI-1, had a private discussion with me at his request. During this conversation

Mr. Hukill asked me two questions. He asked me if I had ever cheated on an examination to which I answered "no." He then asked me

if I knew of any... ^{I'm not certain of the exact wording of the question now, however, I responded by saying that while I was taking the NRC exam in April 1981, someone asked me a question ~~see~~ at the coffee stand, and I answered the question. I pointed out to Mr Hukill that at the time this occurred, I realized it was improper on my part but I did not think it was significant enough to constitute a cheating incident. It was a spontaneous incident which was not premeditated. By this I mean we had not planned to meet at the coffee stand and I answered the individual's question automatically, since we are always asking each other questions prior to examinations}

FF

and at other times just to keep current and fully informed to perform our jobs effectively. Mr. Hukill appeared very concerned when I told him about this and I was surprised that he considered this to be such a serious incident.

I do not know which of the two days that this incident occurred and I do not know whether I was taking the RO or SRO examination at the time. I told Mr. Hukill I can not recall who asked me the question, what the question was or what my answer consisted of. I believe it was during the NRC exams rather than the mock exams which were administered earlier in the ~~month~~ month of April 1981. Since I was in the non-smoking classroom, the other individual must have been in the smoking classroom since only one person was allowed out of a room at a time. No one else was present at the coffee stand when this brief exchange between us occurred. This was not a prolonged discussion between us. It lasted only long enough for us to pour out two cups of

Page 4 of 7

coffee and then we each returned to our respective classrooms where we were taking the exam.

I have no recollection of how the question was posed to me or how I responded to it. However I assume that the question asked me appeared on the test I was taking that day. I do not recognize the question even though I have reviewed the WRC RO and SRO examinations which I took. Also, as I previously told Mr. Hukill, I cannot recall the identity of the person who asked me the question. The entire incident was so brief and insignificant to me at the time that I have completely forgotten the details since it occurred over five months ago. After my discussions with Mr. Hukill, I realized how important these details would be. I have tried to reconstruct the incident in my mind but I can't remember additional facts. I realize that my inability to recall who the individual was ^{or what the question was} does not reflect favorably on me. I am simply unable to recall either of these facts. I can only explain that

10/22/01

F
H

since I attached no significance to the incident at the time, I had no reason to commit this information to my memory.

10/22/81
I was aware of the recent NRC investigation concerning cheating on examinations at Three Mile Island which resulted in the terminations of two employees. However, since I still did not believe my actions constituted a cheating incident, I did not think about this incident and accordingly, I did not previously bring it to the attention of the company or the NRC.

I now recognize that in today's light, what I considered insignificant at the time is now very serious and important to both the company and the NRC. In some respects, I feel that I have been entrapped by my own waiver. By this I mean that what I considered a very innocent incident is interpreted by others as a significant situation which should have been

18/22/01
reported by me. My spontaneous action may have resulted from compassion for my co-worker. We were a very close-knit group. This was my attitude at the time I answered the question and I cannot offer any further explanation as to why I did not feel that it was significant enough at the time to report.

After talking with Mr. Hukill and Investigators Gilbert and Baer, I realize that what occurred can be classified as a cheating incident. I definitely will not participate in this again. I do not need to have my personal character or integrity questioned or jeopardized. If I can recall who the individual was who approached me at the coffee stand during the examination, I will make this information available to the NRC.

After discussing this information with Mr. Hukill, I also told my supervisor, EE and my family what had occurred.

10/22/81
I wish to point out that I have never cheated on a company, contractor or NRC administered examination by receiving, utilizing or soliciting any information during the examination from anyone else or from "crib sheets". Further, except, as I have stated above, I have never aided or facilitated cheating by others in any of the examinations, nor do I know of any other incidents.

10/22/81
I have read the foregoing statement, written by me, consisting of seven (7) pages. I have made and initialed ~~IT~~ any necessary corrections and have signed my name in ink in the margin of each page.

This statement is the truth to the best of my knowledge and belief. I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct. Executed on October 22, 1981 at 1220 hrs.

FF

10/22/81

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 22 day of October 1981 at Three Mile Island.

INVESTIGATOR: Edward C. Gilbert, Investigator, NRC

WITNESS: Peter E. Gari, Investigator, NRC 10/22/81 1223