



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

OFFICIAL USE ONLY

(Contains material  
from unreleased IE  
Investigative Report  
HQS-81-003)

September 30, 1981

OFFICE OF THE  
COMMISSIONER

MEMORANDUM FOR CHAIRMAN PALLADINO  
COMMISSIONER BRADFORD  
COMMISSIONER AHEARNE  
COMMISSIONER ROBERTS

SUBJECT: OPERATOR CHEATING AT TMI-1

I would like to draw your attention to improprieties discovered in the licensed operator requalification program at TMI during the course of the IE investigation into recent cheating on operator exams. I am not satisfied with the staff's position that "no rules were violated and no changes to the rules are necessary."

The bare facts are these: the operations supervisor for TMI-2

asked a subordinate, to prepare answers to technical questions which were a part of take-home exam (given by Met Ed) for requalification in 1979. apparently not realizing that the questions were part of exam, provided the answers to who then submitted them to the company examiners. successful completion of these Met Ed assignments formed part of the basis for NRC's renewal of his license. Met Ed discovered cheating in July, 1979 and made him redo the assignment. It may also have taken disciplinary action against him (one week off without pay), although that is not clear. In any case, Met Ed did not report this cheating incident to NRC. After had successfully repeated the examination, Met Ed applied for renewal of senior operator license. After reviewing the renewal application, which made no mention of the incident, NRC issued a license. is not now engaged in performing licensed duties. The relation of this to the cheating incident is unclear.

I believe the improprieties discovered by Met Ed should have been reported to the NRC. If the rules don't require this then we should change the rules.

The current regulations (10 CFR 55.41a) require NRC notification of an operator's removal from licensed duties due to physical disabilities. Similar notification should be required for operator's removal due to dishonesty.

I am surprised that the staff took all this as casually as it did.

Information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions 6 & 7C

*V. Gilinsky*  
Victor Gilinsky

9501170069 940411  
PDR FOIA  
GILINSKY92-436 PDR

FF/1

VG,

I spoke with Peter Baci this morning. Contrary to my previous note, there is no clean cut requirement to report cheating on assignments for license requalification.

Successful completion of requalification results in the operator's license being renewed. The training department at the facility submits a renewal application containing information required by NUREG-0094 (see attachment (1)).

In [redacted] case, the utility made notification to the NRC in accordance with NUREG-0094 on 7/27/79 after the cheating had been discovered and "corrected". However, there is no indication in [redacted] renewal letter from Met Ed to the Operator Licensing Branch that [redacted] had cheated during the requalification or that corrective action had been taken by Met Ed (e.g. removal from license duties). In addition, Paul Collins (according to Baci) sees no reason why [redacted] cheating should have been reported. In fact, Collins issued a recertification (cold shut-down license on Unit 2) to [redacted] on 8/3/79 based on [redacted] renewal letter. Until the recent IE investigation of cheating on the NRC exam, no one other than Met Ed knew about the incident.

I believe improprieties in requalification resulting in an individual's removal from license activities should be reported.

EA 9/1/81

*Documentation - Credit Ed [redacted]  
① Lack of staff involvement in [redacted] incident*





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

OFFICE OF THE  
COMMISSIONER

VG,

I spoke with Peter Baci, Senior Investigator with IE, about the incident. During the initial phase of the investigation a meeting was held between Stello and Arnold. During the meeting Arnold mentioned the previous (1979) problem with Arnold felt it might be important to the investigation. Stello, in turn, passed the information on to Baci. Baci followed-up on it and discovered it really didn't relate to the investigation of . . . It is, therefore, mentioned in the report for completeness.

At the time of the incident, was removed from licensed activities by Met-Ed. This should have been reported to the Operating Licensing Branch. Baci is looking further through his file for more information and will get back to me.

EA  
8/31/81



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

OFFICE OF THE  
COMMISSIONER

VG,

The connection in 1979 appears irrelevant to the case of cheating against in 1981.

It seems to discredit more than it incriminates. That may be the purpose in mentioning the incident in the IE report.

EA  
8/28/81

1) Is he not reported - did NRC know about it? Discussion between Collins & Met-Ed

2) why is the incident mentioned in the report?

possible incident - possibly -

↳ nothing, incident would incriminate

?  
B. & would - brought it up - in connection  
w/ Stella want person to investigate  
Shock - didn't know about