

TO: The Region I Smiths (Karla and Greg)

FROM: D. Vito

SUBJECT: Allegation RI-94-A-0185, Oyster Creek

I need both of you to review the attached investigation report from GPU and provide your assessment as to whether you think there are violations and/or wrongdoing involved.

Background:

We received an anonymous allegation on 9/8/94 stating that [redacted] a General Employee Instructor at Oyster Creek was passing people that should not pass. After referring the issue to the licensee for review, GPU provided their response in the attached letter dated 10/27/94. You will note that the GPU investigation implicated another individual. Specifically, an instructor [redacted] was terminated for 1) providing improper assistance to an individual taking a GET exam and 2) post-altering a test answer sheet for a respirator protection exam. Also, a GET Instructor was counseled, but not terminated, for altering a GET exam score. So it isn't too confusing, the person referred to as T11 in Enclosure 1 and T12 in Enclosure 2 is the same person [redacted]. The individual listed as T11 in Enclosure 2 is Mr. Dan Arbach who is a retired GPUN employee who had agreed to come back to provide outage training. EY  
7(c)

*1/17/95*  
The issue was initially paneled on 9/23/94 and it was decided that it should be referred to the licensee. John Rogge was later informed by John Barton (the Site VP at Oyster Creek) that he had already been informed of the problem by Joe Kowalski, the OC Training Manager two weeks earlier. From the GPU response, it looks like they did a pretty thorough evaluation of the issue, and DRP Branch 4 wanted to close the issue out based on the licensee review. However, after I read it, I questioned whether OI would have any interest in it from a wrongdoing standpoint. I met with John Rogge and Barry Letts during the week of 1/16/95 and they asked me to get copies of the GPU evaluation to both of you for review. To put it as simply as I can, OI needs to know if a regulation was actually violated because there needs to be a violation of an NRC regulation before they can take any action on suspected wrongdoing. So, first, I need Greg S. to assess whether there is an NRC violation here, and if so, I need Karla S. to assess whether there is wrongdoing involved. We can discuss this at another panel after you folks have finished your reviews. Your help is sincerely appreciated.

D. Vito  
1/30/95

*Background,  
return to allig  
file.*

*Mmt Flyb*

K. Smith Kennew

\* 0.5 (a) (5)

Am 12 advice

TO: The Region I Smiths (Karla and Greg)

FROM: D. Vito

SUBJECT: Allegation RI-94-A-0185, Oyster Creek

I need both of you to review the attached investigation report from GPU and provide your assessment as to whether you think there are violations and/or wrongdoing involved.

Background:

We received an anonymous allegation on 9/8/94 stating that [redacted] a General Employee Instructor at Oyster Creek was passing people that should not pass. After referring the issue to the licensee for review, GPU provided their response in the attached letter dated 10/27/94. You will note that the GPU investigation implicated another individual. Specifically, an instructor [redacted] was terminated for 1) providing improper assistance to an individual taking a GET exam and 2) post-altering a test answer sheet for a respirator protection exam. Also, a GET Instructor was counseled, but not terminated, for altering a GET exam score. So it isn't too confusing, the person referred to as TI1 in Enclosure 1 and TI2 in Enclosure 2 is the same person [redacted]. The individual listed as TI1 in Enclosure 2 is Mr. Dan Arbach who is a retired GPUN employee who had agreed to come back to provide outage training.

training

EX 7C

The issue was initially paneled on 9/23/94 and it was decided that it should be referred to the licensee. John Rogge was later informed by John Barton (the Site VP at Oyster Creek) that he had already been informed of the problem by Joe Kowalski, the OC Training Manager two weeks earlier. From the GPU response, it looks like they did a pretty thorough evaluation of the issue, and DRP Branch 4 wanted to close the issue out based on the licensee review. However, after I read it, I questioned whether OI would have any interest in it from a wrongdoing standpoint. I met with John Rogge and Barry Letts during the week of 1/16/95 and they asked me to get copies of the GPU evaluation to both of you for review. To put it as simply as I can, OI needs to know if a regulation was actually violated because there needs to be a violation of an NRC regulation before they can take any action on suspected wrongdoing. So, first, I need Greg S. to assess whether there is an NRC violation here, and if so, I need Karla S. to assess whether there is wrongdoing involved. We can discuss this at another panel after you folks have finished your reviews. Your help is sincerely appreciated.

D. Vito  
1/30/95

requirement to assess with

0.5 (a) (5) - [redacted] Administrator

look at rules

violated?

his not part of security of instructor - Respiratory Protection GET Training Temp Outage Worker

requirements to [redacted]

F/47  
1/31/95  
had GET the [redacted]

Allegation Receipt Report

(Use also for staff suspected wrongdoing)

Date/Time Received: \* 2/6/95 (Referred from NRR) Allegation No. RI-95-A-0026  
(leave blank)

Employee Receiving Allegation or suspecting wrongdoing (first two initials and last name): B. J. Travers

Name of Allegor: \* [Redacted] Home Address: \* \_\_\_\_\_

Home Phone: \* \_\_\_\_\_ City/State/Zip: \* \_\_\_\_\_

Allegor's Employer: \* GPW (former) Allegor's Position/Title: \* Site Protection Officer (former)

Facility: Oyster Creek Docket No. or Materials License No.: 50-219

Was allegor informed of NRC identity protection policy? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
If a licensee employee or contractor, did they raise the issue to their management? Yes \_\_\_ No \_\_\_  
Was confidentiality requested? Yes \_\_\_ No ✓  
Was confidentiality initially granted? Yes \_\_\_ No ✓  
Individual Granting Confidentiality: \_\_\_\_\_

Criteria for determining whether the issue is an allegation:

Is it a declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy? (Yes) No  
Is the impropriety or inadequacy associated with NRC regulated activities? (Yes) No  
Is the validity of the issue unknown? (Yes) No

If No to any of the above questions, the issue is not an allegation and should be handled by other appropriate methods (e.g. as a request for information or an OSHA referral).

Allegation Summary or staff suspected wrongdoing (brief description of concern(s)):

- See attached referral from NRR -  
Allegor feels that there have been "several" security violations @ OEC that are routinely covered up

Number of Concerns: \_\_\_\_\_

Type of Regulated Activity (a) X Reactor (d) \_\_\_ Safeguards  
(b) \_\_\_ Vendor (e) \_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_  
(c) \_\_\_ Materials (Specify)

Functional Area(s): (a) Operations (e) Emergency Preparedness  
(b) Construction (f) Onsite Health and Safety  
X (c) Safeguards (g) Offsite Health and Safety  
(d) Transportation (h) Other: \_\_\_\_\_

\* These sections are not completed for instances of potential wrongdoing identified by NRC staff.

Distribution: SAC OI

F/18

Title Radiological Work Process	Revision No. 3
------------------------------------	-------------------

E  
X  
A  
M  
P  
L  
E

ATTACHMENT 10.3

RWP NUMBER 950096  
Page 1 of     

OYSTER CREEK RADIATION WORK PERMIT ATTACHMENT SHEET

--- STATEMENT ---

By my signature below, I acknowledge that I have read, understand and will comply with the Radiological Requirements specified in this Radiation Work Permit (RWP) for the work to be performed. I have been briefed and/or participated in discussions as specified in this RWP.

NAME (PRINT)	SOCIAL SECURITY NUMBER	SIGNATURE	DATE
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	3-9-95
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	3-9-95
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	3/9/95
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	3/9/95
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	3-9-95

Fy 7(c)

F/49

# CONVERSATION RECORD

TIME  
3:00 pm

DATE  
3/24/95

TYPE

VISIT

CONFERENCE

TELEPHONE

INCOMING

OUTGOING

Location of Visit/Conference:

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH

ORGANIZATION (Office, Dept., Branch, etc.)

TELEPHONE NO.

SUBJECT

DT-95-A-0026

DC Security  
(Formerly)

ROUTING

NAME/SYMBOL

INIT

SUMMARY

The alleged was calling to find out the status of his concerns. I told him that his issues had been referred to Region I from NRK and that we had done an initial assessment of his issues. I told him we had no results to give him at this time.

ACTION REQUIRED

Place in Allegation File

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION

D. J. Vth

SIGNATURE

*D. J. Vth*

DATE

3/24/95

ACTION TAKEN

F/50

SIGNATURE

TITLE

DATE