

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION I

Report No. 50-289/86-04

Docket No. 50-289

License No. DPR-50 Priority -- Category C

Licensee: GPU Nuclear Corporation  
P.O. Box 480  
Middletown, PA 17057

Facility Name: Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1

Inspection At: Middletown, Pennsylvania

Inspection Conducted: February 25-27, and March 5-6 and 12-13, 1986

Inspectors: *D. Haverkamp* 4/23/86  
D. Haverkamp, Reactor Licensing Engineer date  
Region I

Accompanying NRC Personnel:

G. Dick, Project Manager, PWR Project  
Directorate #6, NRR

Approved by: *ABH* 4/23/86  
A. Blough, Chief, Reactor Projects Section date  
No. 1A, Division of Reactor Projects

Inspection Summary: Region-based special safety inspection (38 hours) of performance of a licensee employee, Mr. Charles E. Husted, in support of the NRC staff's preparations for a hearing requested by the employee.

Results: The results of review of Mr. Husted's performance of his responsibilities with GPU Nuclear Corporation and with its predecessor, Metropolitan Edison Company, reflected favorably upon his attitude and professional integrity. No specific indicators or characteristics of past poor performance or demeanor were identified through personal interviews or a review of the records that should cause Mr. Husted to continue being restricted from assignment to any positions with GPU Nuclear Corporation.

8605020044 860423  
PDR ADOCK 05000289  
G PDR

## DETAILS

### 1. Persons Contacted

C. Adams, Special Projects Assistant, Nuclear Safety Assessment Department  
P. Bickford, Instructor, Maintenance Training, TMI  
S. Bobsack, Administrator III, Human Resources, Administration  
N. Brown, Senior Emergency Planner, Emergency Planning  
D. Galletly, Support Services Supervisor, Training, TMI  
H. Hukill, Vice President and Director, TMI-1  
C. Husted, Special Projects Assistant, Nuclear Safety Assessment Department  
B. Leonard, Operator Training Manager, Training, TMI  
R. Neff, Instructor, Non-licensed Operator Training, TMI  
L. Noll, Shift Supervisor, TMI-1  
M. Ross, Plant Operations Director, TMI-1  
C. Smyth, Supervisor TMI-1 Licensing, Technical Functions  
D. Spath, Instructor, Non-licensed Operator Training, TMI  
R. Zechman, Technical Training Manager, TMI

### 2. Introduction

In early February 1986 the inspector was instructed by Region I management to conduct a special inspection of the performance of Mr. Charles Husted, who had been assigned to various positions at the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station since 1974. Since Mr. Husted was not in a position where he would interact routinely with NRC personnel, and since as a result the NRC staff did not have an opportunity to observe routinely Mr. Husted's performance, this special inspection was initiated to assist the NRC staff in developing a full record for a hearing that had been requested by Mr. Husted, as ordered by the Commission in a Notice of Hearing, issued September 5, 1985. In preparation for this inspection, the inspector reviewed the Commission's Notice of Hearing and various NRC and licensee documents and correspondence related to the hearing. In addition, the inspector attended as an observer the initial prehearing conference held by the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board on February 19, 1986.

The Commission had directed the hearing to consider specifically four issues concerning Mr. Husted, including his (1) alleged solicitation of an answer to an exam question, (2) lack of forthrightness of his testimony before the Special Master, (3) poor attitude toward the hearing on the cheating incidents, and (4) lack of cooperation with NRC investigators. During the prehearing conference other factual issues were discussed for potential consideration during the hearing. These other issues included: (5) What does Husted's performance of his responsibilities with GPIU reflect about his attitude and integrity?; (6) In light of the answers to (1) through (5), is any remedial action required with respect to Husted?; and (7) If remedial action is required, what is it? These issues and other rulings regarding the Husted proceeding are described further in the Administrative Law Judge's (M. Margulies) Report and Order on Initial Prehearing Conference, issued February 27, 1986.

This inspection was limited to developing the staff's record regarding Issue No. 5, "What does Husted's performance of his responsibilities with GPU reflect about his attitude and integrity?" The inspection included a review of various personnel records and licensee documents regarding the performance of Mr. Husted, as well as interviews with various licensee personnel who have worked with Mr. Husted, as described in the sections that follow.

### 3. Document Review

The inspector reviewed numerous letters, memoranda, evaluations and other records regarding Mr. Husted's performance as an employee with GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUNC) and with its predecessor, Metropolitan Edison Company. The documents were maintained in TMI-1 employee personnel files, Nuclear Assurance Division files, training department files and operations department files.

Based on his review of the data contained in TMI-1 personnel file records the inspector determined Mr. Husted's employment and license history as shown in the tables below.

Table 3.1 Met Ed/GPU Employment History of C. Husted

| <u>Period</u>      | <u>Job Classification</u>                            |
|--------------------|--|
| 2/26/74 - 5/20/74  | Auxiliary Operator - "A" - Nuclear<br>(Probationary) |
| 5/20/74 - 8/15/77  | Auxiliary Operator - "A" Nuclear                     |
| 8/15/77 - 11/14/77 | Control Room Operator - Nuclear (Probationary)       |
| 11/14/77 - 7/10/78 | Control Room Operator - Nuclear                      |
| 7/10/78 - 7/1/82   | Administrator - Nuclear Technician Training          |
| 7/1/82 - 3/14/83   | Administrator Senior - Training                      |
| 3/14/83 - 6/18/84  | Supervisor - Non-licensed Operator Training          |
| 6/18/84 - Present  | Engineering Assistant Senior III - Nuclear           |

Table 3.2 - License History of C. Husted

Operator License No. OP-4741, Docket No. 55-6398, effective 6/23/78 (TMI-1)

Senior Operator License No. SOP-3704 Docket No. 55-6398  
effective 7/2/80 (TMI-1); cold shutdown  
-- amended 7/1/81; cold shutdown except hot functional testing  
-- amended 12/9/81; no plant operating limitations  
-- renewal 7/2/82; no plant operating limitations  
-- terminated 7/8/83; H. Hukill, GPU, letter to D. Beckham, NRC dated 7/8/83

The specific documents reviewed by the inspector are listed below. The inspector's comments and summary of information discussed within each document, as applicable to the performance or attitude of Mr. Husted, follow the listed document, where appropriate.

TMI-1 Personnel File Miscellaneous Records

- Application for Employment for Charles Husted dated January 15, 1974.
- Letter from Charles E. Husted (undated) to Mr. E. Zubey Director of Personnel, Met Ed (received January 17, 1974) re: employment interview
- Resume of Charles Husted (undated) received January 18, 1974 by Met Ed

NOTE: Resume included the following information.

Previous Employment

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| Aug 72 - Present | Zausner Food Corporation, New Holland<br>Project Director - R&D<br>Aseptic Production             |
| Jan 67 - Aug 72  | U.S. Navy/USS Sam Houston SSBN 609<br>Engineering Watch Supervisor<br>Assistant Leading Machinist |
| Oct 66 - Jan 67  | Defoe Shipbuilding Co.<br>Bay City, Michigan<br>Electrician                                       |
| Sep 65 - Sep 66  | Granzo's Standard Service<br>Midland, Michigan<br>Mechanic  |

- Interview Report of Mr. Charles Husted dated February 5, 1974 (report stated possible position: Mechanical Maintenance)
- Various initial employment records/forms
- Met Ed letter dated February 19, 1974 from E. M. Zubey, Division Director of Personnel to Mr. Charles Husted re: offer of employment as an Auxiliary Operator - "A" - Nuclear
- Metropolitan Edison Company (Met Ed) letter dated August 27, 1974 from R. C. Arnold, Vice President - Generation and W. M. Creitz, President, to employees listed on August 30, 1974 re: appreciation for contribution toward TMI Unit No. 1 commencement of commercial operation (form letter).

- Operator License No. OP-4741, Docket No. 55-6398 effective June 23, 1978; licenses Mr. Charles E. Husted to manipulate control of TMI-1.
- GPU Nuclear letter dated August 21, 1981 from R. C. Arnold, Chief Operating Executive, to Mr. Charles E. Husted re: re-examination of all those operators who were examined in April 1981.
- GPU Nuclear memorandum dated August 4, 1982 from Art Brinkmann, Human Resources Department, to C. E. Husted re: congratulations on promotion to position of Administrator Senior - Training.
- Report of Absence records for 1974 - 1982
- Corporate Stress Control Services, Inc. Employment Screening Report dated November 18, 1982 from William W. Jenkins, Ph.D., Director, Middletown Office, to Personnel Department, GPU Service Corporation re: Employee Recommendation for Charles Husted.

The report stated the following regarding Mr. Husted:

xx Acceptable for nuclear plant employment at this time. Employee was, at the time of examination, mentally alert and coherent and without gross aberrant behavior. Our best judgement based upon the information available to us, is that this applicant is acceptable for nuclear plant employment.

- Resume of Charles Husted dated May 7, 1984

NOTE: Resume included the following information.

Education:

Graduated from Midland High School, Midland, Michigan 6/8/66

Navy Nuclear Power Schools 1967 - 1968

Elizabethtown College - 27 credits  
Certificate of Management Program

Job-related courses:

Auxiliary Operator training program - 9 mo. 1975  
Reactor Operator License Training Program - 9 mo. 1978  
Sr. Reactor Operator License Training Program - 3 mo. 1980

Certificates/Licenses:

Present: N/A  
Past: Senior Reactor Operator License  
Reactor Operator License, replaced by SRO license

Metropolitan Edison Company Employee Appraisal Reports for Charles E. Husted

| <u>Date of Evaluation</u> | <u>Period of Evaluation</u> | <u>Purpose of Evaluation</u> | <u>Supervisor (Evaluator)</u> |
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|
|---------------------------|-----------------------------|------------------------------|-------------------------------|

|         |                |  |             |
|---------|----------------|--|-------------|
| 3/28/74 | 2/26 - 3/27/74 | Aux. Oper. "A" - Nuclear<br>(Probationary) - Eval. 1 | N. E. Derks |
|---------|----------------|--|-------------|

Inspector Comments: Average (satisfactory) marks; no written comments by supervisor.

|         |                |  |             |
|---------|----------------|--|-------------|
| 4/25/74 | 3/28 - 4/27/74 | Aux. Oper. "A" - Nuclear<br>(Probationary) - Eval. 2 | N. E. Derks |
|---------|----------------|--|-------------|

Inspector Comments: Good marks (improvement since initial evaluation); no written comments by supervisor.

|         |                |  |             |
|---------|----------------|--|-------------|
| 5/17/74 | 4/28 - 5/17/74 | Aux. Oper. "A" - Nuclear<br>(Probationary) - Eval. 3 | N. E. Derks |
|---------|----------------|--|-------------|

Inspector Comments: Good marks (minor improvement since last evaluation); Supervisor recommended that Husted be taken off probation.

|         |                |   |            |
|---------|----------------|---|------------|
| Undated | 8/15 - 9/13/77 | Control Rm. Oper. - Nuclear<br>(Probationary) - Eval. 1 | L. G. Noll |
|---------|----------------|---|------------|

Inspector Comments: Above average to good marks; supervisor stated that Husted met standards of job.

|         |                 |   |             |
|---------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| Undated | 9/14 - 10/13/77 | Control Rm. Oper. - Nuclear<br>(Probationary) - Eval. 2 | M. L. Beers |
|---------|-----------------|---|-------------|

Inspector Comments: Good marks (improved since initial evaluation); Supervisor stated that Husted was progressing well in qualification, no apparent problems.

|         |                  |   |             |
|---------|------------------|---|-------------|
| Undated | 10/14 - 11/12/77 | Control Rm. Oper. - Nuclear<br>(Probationary) - Eval. 3 | M. L. Beers |
|---------|------------------|---|-------------|

Inspector Comments: Very good marks (improved since last evaluation); Supervisor stated that Husted progressed at above average rate in qualification, recommended that Husted be taken off of probation.



General Public Utilities Employee Performance Evaluations for  
Charles E. Husted (Continued)

| <u>Date of<br/>Evaluation</u>                 | <u>Approximate<br/>Period of<br/>Evaluation</u>  | <u>Purpose of<br/>Evaluation</u>  | <u>Supervisor<br/>(Evaluator)</u> |
|---|--|---|-----------------------------------|
| 11/4/81<br>(also undated<br>draft evaluation) | 10/1/80 - 9/30/81  | Administrator - Nuclear<br>Technician Training<br>Annual Evaluation               | N. D. Brown                       |
| Inspector Comments:                           | Slight downward trend compared to previous evaluation; Supervisor noted that Husted was a competent instructor on the way to becoming an excellent instructor; draft evaluation noted that adverse conditions of last year had their effect (projected attitude), but this was overcome by NRC exam preparation, pursuit of college credits and turbine-generator training arrangements. |   |                                   |
| 6/29/82                                       | 10/1/81 - 6/29/82  | Administrator - Nuclear<br>Technician Training<br>Promotion (review)              | N. D. Brown                       |
| Inspector Comments:                           | Substantial improvement since last evaluation; Supervisor noted that Husted was more effective as an instructor, diligent and professional to prepare for classroom, and showed initiative in completing courses, also noted that since restart hearings there was noticeable improvement in enthusiasm and morale.  |   |                                   |
| 11/2/82                                       | 7/1/82 - 9/30/82   | Admin. Senior - Nuclear<br>Technician Training<br>Annual Evaluation               | N. D. Brown                       |
| Inspector Comments:                           | Average to good marks overall; Supervisor noted attitude of "quality", positive feedback from requalification participation.   |   |                                   |
| 3/11/83                                       | 10/1/82 - 3/11/83  | Admin. Senior - Nuclear<br>Technician Training<br>Promotion (reassign/reclassify) | N. D. Brown                       |
| Inspector Comments:                           | Good to very good marks overall; Supervisor noted ongoing improvement in his abilities   |   |                                   |

General Public Utilities Employee Performance Evaluations for Charles Husted (Continued)

| <u>Date of Evaluation</u> | <u>Approximate Period of Evaluation</u> | <u>Purpose of Evaluation</u>  | <u>Supervisor (Evaluator)</u> |
|---------------------------|---|---|-------------------------------|
| 7/13/83                   | 3/14/83 - 7/13/83                       | Supervisor - Non-licensed Operator Training<br>Merit Evaluation   | B. Leonard                    |
| Inspector Comments:       |   | Very good to excellent marks overall; Supervisor noted that Husted rapidly took charge, replacement/retraining programs were effective, classroom performance was excellent and attitude was professional.  |                               |
| 10/28/83                  | 7/13/83 - 9/30/83                       | Supervisor - Non-licensed Operator Training<br>Annual Evaluation  | B. Leonard                    |
| Inspector Comments:       |   | Excellent marks overall; supervisor noted that Husted maintained excellent morale even though SRO license was terminated; good attitude noted by Husted in his acknowledgement of areas for improvement.  |                               |
| 6/26/84                   | 10/1/83 - 6/18/84                       | Supervisor - Non-licensed Operator Training<br>(reason not specified)   | B. Leonard                    |
| Inspector Comments:       |   | Evaluation not reviewed by C. Husted; excellent to outstanding marks overall; Supervisor noted that Husted was an excellent example for subordinates, he maintained an excellent attitude; exhibited dedication to maintain and improve quality of classroom instruction, had positive attitude and professional approach to training programs, and he maintained high morale in the section. |                               |
| 10/29/84                  | 6/18/84 - 9/30/84                       | Engineering Assistant<br>Senior III - Nuclear<br>Annual Evaluation  | *K.R. Goodard                 |
| Inspector Comments:       |   | Good to excellent marks overall; Supervisor noted that Husted was a valuable member of the TMI-1 probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) team, showed good progress learning risk and reliability analysis techniques, showed very positive enthusiastic attitude about project, and does more than asked.  |                               |

\*Manager Risk Analysis, Technical Functions

General Public Utilities Employee Performance Evaluations for Charles E. Husted (Continued)

| <u>Date of Evaluation</u> | <u>Approximate Period of Evaluation</u> | <u>Purpose of Evaluation</u>                                       | <u>Supervisor (Evaluator)</u> |
|---------------------------|---|--|-------------------------------|
| 10/14/85                  | 10/1/84 - 9/30/85                       | Engineering Assistant<br>Senior III - Nuclear<br>Annual Evaluation | K. R. Goodard                 |

Inspector Comments: Good to excellent marks overall; Supervisor noted Husted's excellent performance in support of simulator development (input by D. Boltz)

Instructor Performance Monitoring Reports for Charles E. Husted

| <u>Date of Evaluation</u> | <u>Lesson Title</u>   | <u>Evaluator</u> |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|
| 12/16/81                  | Low Power Natural Circulation Testing   | R. Knief         |
| Evaluator Comment:        | Good interaction with trainees  |                  |
| 9/8/82                    | Operating Procedure (OP) 1102-1<br>Plant Heatup   | R. Harbin        |
| Evaluator Comments:       | Got operators involved, productive lecture, well prepared, good job   |                  |
| 9/14/82                   | OP 1102-1 Plant Heatup  | S. Newton        |
| Evaluator Comment:        | High professional attitude (good to outstanding marks)  |                  |
| 10/11/82                  | Unit 1 Requalification - Thermo-<br>dynamics Problem Session  | R. Knief         |
| Evaluator Comments:       | Regarding attitude, noted that Husted handled himself well in discussion on quality of NRC exam questions, provided reasonable guidance on how to answer vague questions. |                  |
| 3/30/83                   | Unit 1 Licensed Operator Requalifi-<br>cation - Annual Requalification Exam<br>Review   | S. Newton        |
| Evaluator Comments:       | Good content  |                  |

Instructor Performance Monitoring for Charles E. Husted (Continued)

| <u>Date of Evaluation</u> | <u>Lesson Title</u>   | <u>Evaluator</u> |
|---------------------------|---|------------------|
| 4/25/83                   | Licensed Operator Requalification - Unit 1 CRDM (Control Rod Drive Mechanism) Mechanical  | B. Leonard       |
| Evaluator Comment:        | Well presented  |                  |
| 5/9/83                    | Unit 1 Licensed Requalification CRD (Control Rod Drive) Mechanical  | S. Newton        |
| Evaluator Comments:       | None (good evaluation of instruction, no significant weaknesses)  |                  |
| 7/19/83                   | Auxiliary Operator Requalification ESAS (Emergency Safeguards Actuation System)   | S. Newton        |
| Evaluator Comments:       | Outstanding delivery, enthusiasm, mannerisms (good to outstanding marks)  |                  |
| 11/30/83                  | Plant Tour Instruction  | R. Knief         |
| Evaluator Comments:       | All areas satisfactory, very professional attitude and demeanor, excellent organization, solid presentation, generated significant student interest                         |                  |
| 11/30/83                  | Plant Tours   | B. Leonard       |
| Evaluator Comments:       | Good attitude toward subject and class, good lecture, able to convey valuable information, one area (questioning students) needs improvement, all other areas satisfactory. |                  |
| 3/20/84                   | Auxiliary Operator Requalification - Unit 1 Reactor Protection and Safety Systems   | B. Leonard       |
| Evaluator Comments:       | None  |                  |
| 4/18/84                   | System Functions (Spent Fuel)   | J. McAllister    |
| Evaluator Comments:       | None  |                  |

Documents Prepared/Authored by C. Husted

- Paper for college course Expository Writing (EN 102) dated December 5, 1983 for Professor L. Van Valkenburgh; Subject: "Motivation" (9 pages)

Inspector Comment: Thoughtful and intelligently written

- Training Content Record for Lesson Plan Title "ATP 1210-1 Reactor Turbine Trip" Number 11.2.01.210, dated January 12, 1984
- Training Content Record for Lesson Plan Title "ATP 1210-2 Loss of Subcooled Margin," Number 11.2.01.211 dated January 12, 1984

Inspector Comment: Lesson plans logical and clearly written

Training Department Personnel File Records

- GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum dated January 8, 1981 (incorrectly dated, actual date was January 8, 1982) from R. A. Knief (Manager Plant Training) to C. E. Husted; Subject: Tour of TMI-1 for Senior Management (regarding commendation for efforts in conducting tour of TMI-1 for members of GPU Nuclear senior management on January 4, 1982; noted Husted's professional manner)
- Various employee performance evaluations for Charles E. Husted (see comments above)
- Miscellaneous correspondence regarding initial and renewal licensing applications for C. Husted.
- GPU Nuclear Employee Performance Evaluation for Charles E. Husted - Accountabilities Review for Supervisor, Non-Licensed Operator Training, dated May 3, 1983.

Nuclear Assurance Division Personnel File Records

- Various hearing-related and Commission briefing/meeting documents (docketed correspondence)
- Confidential draft memorandum prepared by R. L. Long and R. A. Knief dated August 30, 1982; Subject: C. Husted Evaluation (regarding June 4, 1982 meeting between Messrs. Long, Knief and Newton to develop plan of action for ongoing assessment of Husted's attitude and performance as a licensed operator instructor)
- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from M. J. Ross (Manager, Plant Operations TMI-1) to H. D. Hukill (Director, TMI-1) dated October 8, 1982; Subject: Evaluation of C. Husted (regarding Mr. Husted's performance as an Operator Training Instructor during the period July - September 1982)

Memorandum states that Mr. Husted presented a more professional and thorough approach to his training participation than he had demonstrated previously, he appears interested and cooperative; no signs of a deterioration in his attitude and his desire as a training instructor.

- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from R. A. Knief (Manager Plant Training) to R. L. Long (Vice President Nuclear Assurance) and H. D. Hukill (Vice President TMI-1) dated October 27, 1982; Subject: Evaluation of C. E. Husted (regarding formal classroom evaluation on October 11, 1982)

Memorandum states that Husted handled session in a very professional manner in terms of both technical ability and attitude, also positive attitude in post-evaluation discussion; during informal observations actions and words reinforced classroom observations. The author also talked with Husted on October 20, 1982 and October 22, 1982 before and after a session with E. Blake of Shaw Pittman and stated "he (Husted) appreciated and learned from the opportunity to gain a better understanding of the ASLB's perceptions of his attitudes toward training and NRC requirements."

- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-office Memorandum from S. L. Newton (Operator Training Manager) to R. L. Long (Vice President Nuclear Assurance) and H. D. Hukill (Vice President TMI-1) dated October 27, 1982; subject: Evaluation of C. E. Husted (regarding instructor evaluations in September and October).

Memorandum stated there were no problems pertaining to his (Husted's) attitude and demeanor and that he acted in a professional manner. The author of the memorandum was present in the classroom area during breaks when Husted was teaching and gave special attention to conversations in Husted's cubicle (work space) and at no time overheard anything out of line.

- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-office Memorandum from M. J. Ross to H. D. Hukill dated January 7, 1983; subject: Evaluation of C. Husted (regarding his performance during the period October - December 1982).

Memorandum states that Mr. Husted continues to present a professional and thorough approach to his training participation; he continues to be interested and cooperative; no signs of a deterioration in his attitude and desire as an instructor.

- Operator Training Instructor Qualification Card (TMI Training Department Administrative Manual Procedure No. 6210-ADM-1340.05, Attachment 1) for Charles Husted started December 12, 1982 with following Manager Plant Training (R. A. Knief) certification dated March 22, 1983:

"I have interviewed this instructor and hereby certify that the importance of the instructor's role in affecting student's attitudes and behavior towards rules, regulations and regulatory bodies is understood and that this individual is ready in all respects to commence instruction."

Inspector comment: Above discussion was coincident to Husted's assignment as Supervisor, Non-Licensed Operator Training

- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from M. J. Ross to H. D. Hukill dated April 13, 1983; subject: Evaluation of C. Husted (regarding performance during the period January - March 1983)

Memorandum stated the same comments as the M. J. Ross memorandum dated January 7, 1983. The author also stated that since Mr. Husted's recent promotion to Supervisor Non-Licensed Training Mr. Ross had many opportunities to deal with him on the A.O. (auxiliary operator) Training Program and he has been most cooperative.

- Handwritten notes by R. A. Knief dated April 25, 1983 after meeting with S. Newton, E. Frederick and C. Husted re: status of operator training for restart; subject: C. E. Husted

The notes stated that Mr. Husted was observed to be confident in describing programs, take justifiable pride in the quality of the activities included in current and planned A.O. Requal Training cycles, and be concerned about supporting the plant as much as possible (as opposed to doing what is most convenient for the training department) in moving toward restart. Dr. Knief discussed approaches for A.O. Requal Training and stated that, overall, he was very pleased with the positive attitude Mr. Husted exhibited toward doing all jobs well and in accordance with applicable rules and regulations.

- GPU Nuclear Inter-office Memorandum from S. L. Newton to Dr. R. L. Long dated June 3, 1983; subject: C. E. Husted Evaluation (regarding special evaluations during the period from November 1982 to January 1983).

Memorandum stated that although there were no formal classroom evaluations of Mr. Husted during the above period, his performance was still closely evaluated. In Husted's involvement in the preparation of sections of the written requalification examination he did a superb job. Also noted was his good performance during his simulator requalification training.

- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from M. J. Ross to H. D. Hukill dated July 18, 1983; subject: Evaluation of Mr. C. Husted (regarding performance during the period April - June 1983)

Memorandum stated the same comments as the M. J. Ross memorandum dated April 13, 1983. In addition, the author stated that Mr. Husted seems better versed as an Auxiliary Operator Instructor than a Licensed Operator Instructor, and that he (Husted) continues to be cooperative and shows great interest in the Auxiliary Operator Program.

- GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from Robert L. Long (Vice President - Nuclear Assurance) to John Stolz (NRC) dated December 2, 1983; subject: GPUN Evaluation of Mr. DD's Performance (regarding summary of evaluations conducted).
- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from M. J. Ross to H. D. Hukill dated December 15, 1983; subject: Evaluation of Mr. C. Husted (regarding performance during the period July - November 1983)

Memorandum stated similar comments as the M. J. Ross memorandum dated July 18, 1983.

- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from R. L. Long (Vice President - Nuclear Assurance) to H. D. Hukill (Vice President & Director TMI-1) dated December 20, 1983; subject: Special Performance Monitoring of C. E. Husted (regarding intent to discontinue special performance monitoring)
- Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge letter from D. Bauser to R. L. Long (GPU Nuclear) dated January 17, 1984, with draft supplement to December 20, 1983 memorandum to H. Hukill on performance monitoring of Mr. C. E. Husted.
- Confidential GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from R. L. Long to H. D. Hukill dated January 20, 1984; subject: Special Performance Monitoring of C. E. Husted.

Memorandum states that the instructor evaluation program permits continued monitoring of attitude and performance of Mr. Husted.

- GPU Nuclear Inter-Office Memorandum from B.P. Leonard (Operator Training Manager) to C.E. Husted dated January 3, 1984; subject: Quality Assurance Shift Engineer Training Program (regarding appreciation for support in implementing and presenting training program recently provided for QA Shift Engineers).
- GPU Nuclear memorandum from B. P. Leonard (Operator Training Manager) to C. E. Husted (Supervisor, Non-Licensed Operator Training) dated January 24, 1984; subject: ATOG Training Program (regarding commendation for contributions to Unit 1 ATOG training program)

- GPU Nuclear (H. D. Hukill) letter to NRC (J. Stolz) dated March 7, 1984; subject: "Training Observation" (regarding 1983 monitorings of DD performance)
- GPU Nuclear memorandum from R. N. Whitesel (NSAD Director) to C. E. Husted (Engineering Asst. Sr. III - Nuclear Safety) dated July 18, 1984; subject: Temporary Assignment to TMI-1 PRA Project (regarding assignment, administration, arrangements and position accountabilities)

The inspector concluded, based on a review of the documents listed above, that Mr. Husted's performance as an employee of GPU Nuclear Corporation, or its predecessor Metropolitan Edison Company, was maintained at an acceptable or satisfactory level. During most of his employment, particularly while assigned as an operator instructor or supervisor of instructors, his performance appeared to be good to excellent. The many documents regarding Mr. Husted's performance reflected favorably on his attitude and integrity.

#### 4. Personnel Interviews

The inspector interviewed ten GPU Nuclear Corporation employees who had worked with Mr. Husted in various supervisor/employee/co-worker relationships. The purpose of these interviews was to determine whether any of these individuals had concerns regarding Mr. Husted's attitude, integrity or forthrightness, based on their observations of his performance and demeanor. The questions asked of these individuals are listed in Attachment A. The persons interviewed, their Met-Ed/GPU employment history and information regarding their knowledge of and past relationships with Mr. Husted are identified in Table 4.1. Based on these interviews, the inspector determined the following information:

- 4.1 All but one person was aware of the NRC hearing requested by Mr. Husted. Most of these individuals were made aware of the hearing during conversations generally with co-workers and in some cases with Mr. Husted. Two individuals had become aware of the hearing by reading docket correspondence that had been routed to them. All of these individuals were aware generally of the issues that led to the hearing requested by Mr. Husted.
- 4.2 None of the individuals had been interviewed either formally or informally interviewed by GPU Nuclear or other organization/person regarding their knowledge of Mr. Husted.
- 4.3 None of the individuals had ever observed any actions or heard of any incidents (other than the incidents that led to the Husted hearing) that would lead them to believe that Mr. Husted has a bad, negative, indifferent or otherwise improper attitude toward the NRC or toward reactor safety.

4.4 The individuals stated the following opinions of Mr. Husted's current and past attitude toward the NRC.

- Mr. Husted tries to interact professionally with the NRC.
- There was a brief slump (following the NRC exam cheating incident) but afterwards there has been a marked improvement in his overall attitude toward the NRC.
- Mr. Husted has always demonstrated a positive attitude toward the NRC in the work place.
- Mr. Husted is cooperative toward the NRC and does not have a bad attitude.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward the NRC is normal; nothing adverse.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward the NRC is very positive.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward the NRC was not significantly different from the norm following the NRC exam cheating incident, although he is more outspoken than most persons.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward the NRC is not negative, but also he is not a firm supporter.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward the NRC indicated a natural animosity when he was removed from the job as supervisor, non-licensed operator training.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward the NRC was not observed.

The inspector determined that the opinions regarding Mr. Husted's attitude toward the NRC were mixed. Although no specific examples or instances had been identified which indicate Mr. Husted had a bad or negative attitude, one individual had mentioned a brief slump (followed by marked improvement) and another individual mentioned a "natural animosity" (when removed from a job). However, the majority opinion was that Mr. Husted had demonstrated an attitude toward the NRC that ranged from normal to very positive.

4.5 The individuals stated the following opinions of Mr. Husted's current and past attitude toward reactor safety.

- Mr. Husted's attitude toward reactor safety is very good.
- Mr. Husted has had a generally continuing positive attitude toward reactor safety; he has provided constructive criticism on lesson plans.

- Mr. Husted has always had a positive attitude toward reactor safety; he studied hard for exams.
- Mr. Husted has a good attitude toward reactor safety.
- Mr. Husted has a very positive attitude toward reactor safety.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward reactor safety is very positive.
- One individual stated that he had never observed a problem regarding Mr. Husted's attitude toward reactor safety.
- Mr. Husted has a good attitude toward reactor safety.
- Mr. Husted emphasized the importance of reactor safety and never downplayed safety.
- Mr. Husted's attitude toward reactor safety was not observed.

The inspector determined that the opinions regarding Mr. Husted's attitude toward reactor safety were consistently favorable; his attitude was described as good or positive to very good or very positive.

- 4.6 Mr. Husted's professional competence as a reactor operator was described as: (1) high knowledge level, (2) worked hard preparing for exams and conscientious on duty (based on limited observation), or (3) above average (stated by two individuals).

Mr. Husted's overall performance as a reactor operator was described as: (1) above average or (2) no problems noted based on very limited (one week) observation. [One individual stated that Mr. Husted's professional competence as an auxiliary operator was excellent and that his overall performance as an auxiliary operator was above average].

Seven of the individuals had not observed, or had observed only on a limited basis, Mr. Husted's professional competence as a reactor operator; and nine individuals had not observed, or had observed only on a limited basis, Mr. Husted's performance as a reactor operator.

The inspector determined, based on the limited comments from individuals interviewed, that Mr. Husted's professional competence and overall performance as an operator were acceptable; no adverse opinions were stated.

- 4.7 Mr. Husted's professional competence as an instructor was described as:

- extremely competent, concerned about presentation getting through to students;
- detail was thorough, concerned that students understood, priority was given to quality vs. quantity;
- very competent, work done well;
- very high competence;
- very competent;
- very good with systems topics;
- very good;
- very competent and knowledgeable;
- good to excellent; and
- no comments from one individual (not observed).

Mr. Husted's overall performance as an instructor was described as:

- thorough, concerned, good;
- good rapport with class;
- worked hard on theory lessons (mostly not observed);
- very good, among the best at TMI;
- adequately prepared, eager to help students learn;
- responsive to students needs and questions, very adequate lectures when given advance notice of assignment, not happy about unplanned or prompt assignments;
- very good;
- very thorough;
- good to excellent; and
- no comments from one individual (not observed).

The inspector determined, based on the many positive comments from individuals interviewed, that Mr. Husted's professional competence and overall performance as an instructor was very good, or better; no adverse opinions were stated.

4.8 Mr. Husted's professional competence and overall performance as a supervisor of instructors was described as:

- very good supervisor, best ever had by the individual;
- handled people well;
- good administrator, reliable;
- performed very well, concerned for quality of instruction, used constructive criticism;
- very good;
- instructor evaluations were done properly and were constructive; and
- no comments from four individuals (not observed/limited observation).

The inspector determined, based on the several positive comments from individuals interviewed, that Mr. Husted's professional competence and overall performance as a supervisor of instructors was very good; no adverse opinions were stated.

4.9 None of the individuals was aware of any aberrant behavior displayed by Mr. Husted either on or off the job.

4.10 Four of the individuals had officially evaluated Mr. Husted's performance. These evaluations were for various reasons, including control room operator probationary review, annual performance reviews as an instructor/supervisor of instructors, instructor evaluation monitoring, and special quarterly performance monitoring. The individuals stated that these performance evaluations were generally positive, favorable and complimentary. The inspector reviewed all of these evaluations, and others, as discussed in paragraph 3.

4.11 The individual's opinions of Mr. Husted's integrity, forthrightness and demeanor were described as:

- very trustworthy, mature;
- very good integrity, forthright, demeanor professional and was maintained steady as he matured in his job (slight improving trend);
- normal, nothing adverse;

- average, no specific faults or strengths;
- very analytical and straightforward, average integrity, no problems as an operator, outspoken demeanor, takes job seriously;
- honest, sometimes shows bad judgement in what he says in oral discussions;
- high integrity, forthright, on first appearance may appear to be flippant but was truly serious;
- in any relationship always had good integrity, forthrightness and demeanor; and
- high integrity (stated by two individuals).

The inspector determined, based on the generally positive or favorable comments from individuals interviewed, that Mr. Husted's integrity, forthrightness and demeanor were normal to very good. A few comments regarding his demeanor expressed a view that Mr. Husted may be outspoken or unusually candid in his discussions. This willingness to express himself freely was perceived differently by the individuals interviewed as either a positive or negative characteristic. None of the individuals stated that this trait adversely affected Mr. Husted's overall performance.

4.12 None of the individuals were aware of any performance awards or disciplinary actions regarding Mr. Husted, except the transfer from assignment as supervisor of non-licensed operator training due to the stipulation between the licensee and the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania.

4.13 Other comments or opinions regarding Mr. Husted included:

- extremely valuable asset to organization, would like to see him back in training, a real professional;
- seemed very accommodating to training requests from plant operations personnel;
- as an operator was one of the better individuals for performing on-the-job training;
- very competent individual, extremely knowledgeable, removal was loss to the training department; and

- comments from his supervisors regarding Mr. Husted's performance as an instructor were very positive.

Five individuals declined to state any other comments or opinions. No individuals expressed unfavorable or adverse comments or opinions regarding Mr. Husted when asked by the inspector at the conclusion of each interview. The inspector determined, based on the generally positive nature of the comments that were offered, that training department personnel would like to have Mr. Husted back as an instructor or supervisor of instructors.

- 4.14 The inspector concluded, based on the results of these interviews, that none of the individuals had concerns regarding Mr. Husted's attitude, integrity or forthrightness. Rather, positive statements from these individuals regarding their past observations of Mr. Husted's performance and demeanor indicated a consensus opinion that Mr. Husted was above average, or better, as an operator instructor and supervisor of instructors.

## 5. Conclusion

The inspector concluded, based on a review of documents and personnel interviews as described above, that Mr. Husted's performance of his responsibilities with GPU Nuclear Corporation and with its predecessor, Metropolitan Edison Company, reflected favorably upon his attitude and professional integrity. No specific indicators or characteristics of past poor performance or demeanor were identified through personnel interviews or a review of the records that should cause Mr. Husted to continue being restricted from assignment to any positions with GPU Nuclear Corporation.

## 6. Exit Interview

During the entrance interview with licensee representatives on February 25, 1986 and during an interview with Mr. H. Hukill, Vice President and Director of TMI-1, during the course of the inspection, the inspector stated that no exit interview was planned regarding the staff's position on Mr. Husted's performance as it reflects on his attitude and integrity, due to the special nature of this inspection and its relationship to a pending hearing requested by Mr. Husted. The inspector stated, however, that any safety concerns or potential enforcement matters that may be discovered during the course of this inspection would be identified immediately to appropriate licensee representatives. No such safety concerns or enforcement matters were identified.

The numerous documents identified in this report were reviewed in GPUNC offices. The inspector received working copies of certain of these documents as an aid to preparing this report, however, all of the documents identified (except for docketed correspondence with the NRC) remain in the custody of GPUNC.

Table 4.1 - Personnel Interviewed

| <u>Name</u>       | <u>Met-Ed/GPU Employment History</u>                        |               | <u>Has Known Husted Since</u> | <u>Husted's Positions During Time Known</u>  | <u>Relationship with Husted</u>        |
|-------------------|---|---------------|-------------------------------|--|--|
|                   | <u>Position/Title</u>                                       | <u>Period</u> |                               |  |  |
| Charles D. Adams  | Shift Foreman, TMI-2  | 10/75 - 4/80  | 1976                          | Auxiliary Oper.<br>Instructor (no classes)<br>Special Projects Assist.<br>NSAD                         | Close co-worker                        |
|                   | Quality Assurance Auditor                                   | 4/80 - 7/82   |                               |  |  |
|                   | Safety Engineer, Independent Onsite Safety Review Group     | 7/82 - 9/83   |                               |  |  |
|                   | Special Projects Assistant, Nuclear Safety Assessment Dept. | 9/83 - 3/86   |                               |  |  |
| Paul S. Bickford  | Instructor, Non-Licensed Operator Training                  | 4/81 - 4/83   | 1981                          | Licensed Operator<br>Instructor<br>Non-Licensed Operator<br>Instructor<br>Supv., Non-Licensed Training | Close co-worker                        |
|                   | Instructor, Maintenance Training                            | 4/83 - 3/86   |                               |  |  |
| Nelson D. Brown   | Auxiliary Operator "A"- Nuclear                             | 7/70 - 6/74   | 1977                          | Control Room Operator<br>Instructor  | Personal friend<br>Supv./employee      |
|                   | Control Rm. Operator- Nuclear                               | 6/74 - 6/75   |                               |  |  |
|                   | Administrator - Nuclear & Technical Training                | 6/75 - 9/80   |                               |  |  |
|                   | Supervisor, Licensed Operator Training                      | 9/80 - 3/83   |                               |  |  |
|                   | Senior Emergency Planner                                    | 3/83 - 3/86   |                               |  |  |
| Donna R. Galletly | Clerical Services, Various Departments                      | 8/74 - 4/78   | 1978                          | Instructor<br>Supv., Non-Licensed Operator Training<br><br>Special Projects Assist.<br>NSAD            | Close co-worker                        |
|                   | Clerk Junior, Training                                      | 4/78 - 11/79  |                               |  |  |
|                   | Administrative Clerk "A" Training                           | 11/79 - 3/82  |                               |  |  |
|                   | Administrative Assist. Operator Training                    | 3/82 - 4/85   |                               |  |  |
|                   | Support Services Supervisor, Training                       | 4/85 - 3/86   |                               |  |  |
| Bruce P. Leonard  | Technical Program Specialist, Training                      | 11/82 - 5/83  | 1982                          | Licensed Operator<br>Instructor<br>Supv., Non-Licensed Operator Training                               | Close co-worker<br>Supv./employee      |
|                   | Operator Training Manager                                   | 5/83 - 3/86   |                               |  |  |
| Robert E. Neff    | Security Guard  | 1/77 - 3/78   | 1978                          | Control Room Operator<br>Instructor<br><br>Supervisor, Non-Licensed Operator Training                  | Co-worker<br>Student<br>Employee/supv. |
|                   | Auxiliary Operator, TMI-1                                   | 3/78 - 1/84   |                               |  |  |
|                   | Instructor, Non-licensed Operator Training                  | 1/84 - 3/86   |                               |  |  |

Table 4.1 - Personnel Interviewed

-2-

| Name               | Met-Ed/GPU Employment History   |   | Has Known Husted Since | Husted's Positions During Time Known   | Relationship With Husted                             |
|--------------------|---|---|------------------------|--|--|
|                    | Position/Title  | Period  |                        |  |  |
| Larry G. Noll      | Auxiliary Operator - "A"<br>Control Rm. Operator  | 10/69 - 11/72<br>12/72 - 5/75   | 1974                   | Auxiliary Operator<br>Control Rm. Operator<br>Instructor<br>Supv., Non-Licensed<br>Operator Training | Personal Friend<br>Supv./employee                    |
|                    | Shift Foreman<br>Shift Supervisor   | 6/75 - 6/79<br>7/79 - 3/86  |                        |  |  |
|                    | Operator/Instructor<br>(Saxton)   | 1968 - 1970   |                        |  |  |
| Michael J. Ross    | Shift Supervisor<br>Supv. Plant Operations,<br>TMI-1 (currently<br>Plant Operations<br>Director, TMI-1)   | 1970 - 10/78<br>10/78 - 3/86  | 1974                   | Auxiliary Operator<br>Control Rm. Operator<br>Instructor<br>Supv., Non-Licensed<br>Operator Training | Supv./employee<br>Co-worker                          |
|                    | Auxiliary Oper. TMI-1<br>& TMI-2<br>Instructor, Non-licensed<br>Operator Training   | 1974 - 3/83<br>3/83 - 3/86  |                        |  |  |
| Douglas F. Spath   | Administrator - Nuclear<br>Technician Trng.<br>Group Supv, Non-<br>licensed Training<br>Acting Supv., Training<br>Supv., TMI Training<br>Technician Trng. Manager | 9/69 - 11/76<br>11/76 - 11/77<br>11/77 - 9/78<br>9/78 - 8/80<br>8/80 - 3/86 | 1974                   | Auxiliary Oper.<br>Instructor<br>Supv., Non-Licensed<br>Operator Training                            | Personal Friend<br>Close co-worker<br>Employee/Supv. |
| Richard W. Zechman |   |   |                        | Auxiliary Oper.<br>Control Rm. Operator<br>Instructor<br>Supv., Non-Licensed<br>Operator Training    | Close co-worker<br>Supv./employee                    |

Interview with: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_ Time: \_\_\_\_\_

Met Ed/GPU Employment History

| <u>Position/Title</u> | <u>Years</u> |
|-----------------------|--------------|
| _____                 | _____        |
| _____                 | _____        |
| _____                 | _____        |
| _____                 | _____        |
| _____                 | _____        |

1. Are you aware of the NRC hearing requested by Charles Husted? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes, how were you made aware?)  
\_\_\_\_\_
2. Have you been either formally or informally interviewed by GPU Nuclear or other organization/person regarding your knowledge of Mr. Husted? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes, please elaborate.)  
\_\_\_\_\_
3. How long have you known Mr. Husted? \_\_\_\_\_
4. What positions has Mr. Husted had during the time you have known him?  
\_\_\_\_\_
5. How would you describe your relationship with Mr. Husted?  
Close personal friend? \_\_\_\_\_  
Close co-worker? \_\_\_\_\_  
Employee/supervisor? \_\_\_\_\_  
Professional acquaintance? \_\_\_\_\_  
Other? \_\_\_\_\_
6. Have you ever observed any actions or heard of any incidents that would lead you to believe Mr. Husted has a bad, negative, indifferent, or similar attitude toward the NRC? \_\_\_\_\_  
-- toward reactor safety? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes, please elaborate.)  
\_\_\_\_\_

7. How would you describe your opinion of Mr. Husted's current and past attitude toward the NRC? \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
-- toward reactor safety? \_\_\_\_\_
8. How would you describe Mr. Husted's professional competence  
-- as a reactor operator? \_\_\_\_\_  
-- as an instructor? \_\_\_\_\_  
-- as a supervisor of instructors? \_\_\_\_\_
9. How would you describe Mr. Husted's overall performance  
-- as a reactor operator? \_\_\_\_\_  
-- as an instructor? \_\_\_\_\_  
-- as a supervisor of instructors? \_\_\_\_\_
10. Are you aware of any aberrant behavior displayed by Mr. Husted either on or off the job? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes, please elaborate.)  
\_\_\_\_\_
11. Have you ever officially evaluated Mr. Husted's performance? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes, how would you summarize this/those evaluation(s), and what were the reasons for your evaluation(s)?)  
\_\_\_\_\_
12. What are your opinions of Mr. Husted's integrity, forthrightness, demeanor?  
\_\_\_\_\_
13. Are you aware of any performance awards or disciplinary actions regarding Mr. Husted? \_\_\_\_\_  
(If yes, please elaborate.)  
\_\_\_\_\_
14. Do you want to state any other comments or opinions regarding Mr. Husted?  
\_\_\_\_\_ (If yes, please elaborate.)  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_