

18 September 1981, 0918 hrs

I, Bruce A. Wilson, hereby make the following voluntary statement to Mr. William J. Ward 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. Mr Ward is typing this with my permission.

I am employed as Section Leader, Power and Research Reactor Group, Operator Licensing Branch, USNRC. I have been employed by NRC/AEC since October, 1973.

Mr Ward has indicated that he would like me to discuss my perceptions of the possibility that licensee officials at TMI may have deliberately distracted me from my proctoring duties during the administration of the reactor operator (RO)/ senior reactor operator (SRO) examinations at TMI during the period of April 21 through 24, 1981.

*Bruce A. Wilson*

I of course had several contacts with TMI prior to the examinations, both telephonic and written correspondence, <sup>for</sup> in order to arrange for the examinations. For the most part these contacts were of the same nature as those in setting up examinations at other facilities. One slight difference was the involvement of my Branch Chief, Paul Collins, in these negotiations. According to my records this was at the request by TMI for a conference call to discuss the examinations. The call took place on April 7, 1981, and during it, the TMI officials requested that we administer two sets of examinations due to their operational requirements. They indicated at that time <sup>that</sup> they would need to use two classrooms. The TMI officials who took part in the call were Mike Ross, Sam Newton, Nelson Brown. We agreed to this arrangement and I noted at the time the probable need for a second proctor.

Page 2 of 4

ON April 10, 1981, I called the IE contingent at TMI and asked for proctoring assistance. Tony Fasano, IE, indicated that they should be able to provide some assistance, but it might be only a secretary.

On April 20, Collins and I had another conference call with Mike Ross regarding the review of the examinations. We discussed options as to how the exam could be reviewed such as by having persons scheduled for the "B" section review the "A" and vice versa. We ~~vetoed that idea~~<sup>BAW</sup>, - I do not recall the specific outcome of the discussion, but I arrived on site with the expectation that there would be technically competent people available to review the "A" examination.

At this point I will describe what I mean by review the examination. It is ~~our practice~~<sup>BAW</sup> our practice to sit down with one or more (normally three or less) technically competent licensee personnel just after the examination is initiated. The purpose is to identify any ambiguities ~~in the question~~<sup>BAW</sup> or conflicts with site characteristics in either the questions or the answer keys. If there is agreement between the reviewers and the NRC examiners, this information is provided to the persons then taking the examination. In other words, we make an appropriate modification in the examination while it is ongoing. I must emphasize that this is a standard practice done every time we administer RO/SRO examinations.

When we started the RO "A" examination on April 21, I found that the licensee had sent three nonlicensed, non applicants to conduct the exam review. They were Sam Newton, Ron Toole, and Charles Pardee. Pardee was a consultant. The reviews that we conducted with these personnel took about an hour and a half each day for the first two sessions. Although we were in an office ~~adjacent to the session that I was proctoring~~<sup>BAW</sup> within the training facility, the non-smoking session that I was proctoring was essentially unproctored during those times, at least by me. It is possible that IE may have done some proctoring them, but I just do not recall.

Gina A. Wilson

Page 524

I was not entirely satisfied with the reviewing arrangement <sup>of the 'A' exams</sup> as I had expected Mike Ross or <sup>Nelson</sup> ~~Newton~~ Brown to be available, both of whom had much greater expertise in these technical areas. They were not as they were taking the "A" session themselves. As a result I had to pull Mike Ross out of the exam to have him resolve at least one technical issue that the others could not. This in part made me wish to have a more thorough review done of the "A" examinations.

My desire to have this done was also influenced by the fact that a senior operator who had failed the 1980 SRO exam <sup>had</sup> ~~had~~ requested a hearing regarding his failure. Therefore it seemed to behoove us to ensure that we had a consensus

as to the fairness and accuracy of the examinations in general and the answer keys in specific. ~~Consequently, I had decided to go over the "A" as well as the "B" exams the next two days (April 23 and 24).~~ <sup>we decided, in addition to TMI personnel requesting that we should review</sup>

On those two days, I met with Mike Ross, <sup>Nelson</sup> ~~Newton~~ Brown and Dennis Boltz to review the "B" exams <sup>after the applicants began taking them.</sup> ~~That was the first thing we did each day.~~ This review took about three hours for the RO"B" and about <sup>two</sup> ~~two~~ to two and a half hours for the SRO "B". These reviews took much longer than on the previous days because of their greater technical competency which in turn allowed them to argue more forcibly and knowledgably concerning the allocation of credit on answers. After we finished the <sup>exam</sup> ~~exam~~ "B" exam reviews, we broke for lunch. After lunch, we reconvened and went back over the "A" exams. These reviews took about two and a half hours each <sup>we</sup> ~~we~~ <sup>for lunch</sup> ~~did not break~~ on Friday, April 24).

During these reviews, I was in an office adjacent to the <sup>smoke</sup> ~~room~~ in which the session that I was monitoring was located. For most of <sup>the</sup> ~~the~~ April 23 and 24, the room <sup>that I was proctoring</sup> ~~that I was proctoring~~ was essentially unproctored although <sup>smoke</sup> ~~smoke~~ stepped into the room on numerous occasions. Additionally, I could observe a portion of the room through the open door from where I was working, and I could listen as well.

I did not gain the impression at that time that any of the three TMI reviewers were attempting to keep me out of the room. Indeed they did not interfere with

Time A. Nelson

my periodic checking of the room. By the same token, I did not feel that any of these persons would have been disposed to have attempted such an action. I particularly felt that Mike Ross, whom I have <sup>3aw</sup> dealt with for over seven years, would not have been a party to such an action. Even having had an opportunity to reflect back upon the review sessions, I have no reason to change my mind. I still do not believe that there was any attempt to keep me out of the room that I was proctoring.

I <sup>3aw</sup> believe the tour that Ron Maines took on April 24, with my approval, <sup>3aw</sup> ~~to my recollection~~ was as a result of an offer from either Ross or Brown. They were aware that Maines' tour of the night before was incomplete. I <sup>believe</sup> ~~have~~ <sup>3aw</sup> this was offered in good faith and did not represent any attempt to lure Maines from his proctoring assignment.

~~3aw~~ ~~3aw~~

I have read the foregoing statement consisting of \_\_\_ typewritten/handwritten pages. I have made any necessary corrections and have initialed them. I signed my name 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 18 Sept 81 at 1149.

James A. Wilson

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 18 day of Sept, 1981 at Bethesda, Md

WITNESSED:

[Signature]

Wm J. [Signature]  
Chell, Washington Branch

ENCLOSURE 3