

LT

June 17, 1977

Jim O'Hanlon,

Since taking the required exams the past February, I have not been in a single training lecture or received any guidance as to what course of study to pursue to best fulfill the NRC requirements thoroughly.

Also I do not believe that sending out a casual memo or demonstrating on green sheets that an E.P. was read on back shift constitutes good training practice.

Like all else the SIF & SPS have become the backbone of 60 hrs. required training per year. It's time to put training back in its training department and in a responsible fashion. This means more training space, people and expertise. This also means 6 shifts for CDO's, SIF and SPS's.

Attachment 1 Page 1

A-3

Radio Training Program for Ops Personnel

While I fully realize that there is no pat answer for our complex training problems, I like many other operation people, have made suggestions to various training personnel. However it seems as though these fall on deaf ears or end up in the circular file. We have been told, "write up your suggestions and someone or call us." We did! Nothing happened!

Besides being just plain frustrated over all of this, it is my opinion that it is somewhat erroneous to say we fulfill the NRC requirements when they are based on documentation of subject matter supposedly covered on shift. Many times more hours are documented than were actually used for training.

I am willing to listen to or discuss anything on the topic with anybody. I am willing to help solve the problem if I can help in a meaningful way.

Something must be done!!!

*Thank you,
J. L. Birt.*

STATEMENT
(typed copy of original)

I, Theodore L. Book, hereby make the following voluntary statement to R. K. Christopher and P. J. Connolly who have identified themselves to me as Investigators 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 Connolly is writing this statement for me at my request.

I am presently employed with Babcock and Wilcox, Lynchburg Virginia as Product Developer in Training Services. I have been employed with Babcock and Wilcox since March 1978. I was previously employed by Metropolitan Edison at Three Mile Island (TMI). I was licensed as a Reactor Operator in 1974 and received my senior operators license in 1976. I was a shift foreman for approximately 2 1/2 years until I resigned in March 1978 and accepted employment with B & W. I resigned from TMI out of personal family considerations and a desire to get out of plant operations work. I did not leave TMI under adverse conditions or differences of opinion. While employed at TMI I was solely assigned to Unit I except for 3 days at Unit 2. My first line supervisor at Unit I was Joe Chwastyk and above him was George Kunder. The Unit I Plant Superintendent was James P. O'Hanlon and Joe Colitz. (sic)

I have reviewed a copy of a memo addressed to O'Hanlon dated June 17, 1977 and signed by myself. I was the author of this document. In paragraph (1) page (1) of this memo, I made a comment about not being in a single training lecture or receiving any guidance as to how to study to fulfill NRC training requirements. What I was referring to in this paragraph was my preception at the time of the letter that I was totally on my own when it came to training to meet the NRC requirement for 60 hours per year of various subject matters (which I cannot specifically recall at this time). In 1977 (I believe) (sic) Nelson Brown who was in the Training Department was documenting the training I and other operators were receiving during the year to meet the 60 hour requirement. It is the best of my knowledge neither Brown or anyone else was falsifying operator training records. (sic) The records accurately recorded the material we received for study and testing and there were no records indicating training topics that were not actually covered by the operators. My concern was that I felt as well as many of the other operators that the training program relied too much on a self-taught method and not enough on formal classroom instruction. In other words, while we were actually studying the required materials, it was in my opinion, a less than adequate method to complete the training requirements. This was because we did not have an adequate training staff to perform formalized training. Too much responsibility was being placed on shift supervisors and shift foremen to ensure that the training was completed. At no time did anyone suggest that we should not read the required training documents and take the required test.

The material we were required to study was distributed to the operators and supervisors. While on shift we would study the material and take the accompanying exam. A green sheet was signed indicating we had received the material and had

completed the training curriculum. This green sheet would be used to document our training time during the year in computer readout. I felt this was an inadequate way to conduct a training program. This is what I was referring to in the second paragraph, page (1) of my memo. To the best of my knowledge we never turned in any training material that we did not actually do.

I, as well as other operations personnel addressed this problem of the lack of training staff to George Kunder and R. Zechman. Zechman was in charge of training. Both individuals indicated their desire to hire additional staff for training but in my opinion they were unable to do anything about it because of an apparent mentality in upper management to minimize expenses. I sent this memo to O'Hanlon because I thought he would listen to my concerns and would have the horsepower to take corrective actions. Subsequent to this memo and up to the time I left TMI, as far as I was aware little action was taken to improve the training process. The system remained the same which resulted from a lack of an adequate training staff and operating personnel.

In the second paragraph, page two of my memo, I commented that "it was somewhat erroneous to say we fulfilled the NRC requirements when they are based on documentation of subject matter supposedly covered on shift. Many times more hours are documented than were actually used for training." What I meant by this paragraph was if they, meaning training, sent out material that said it was to be covered in a one hour time period we did not always expend a full hour on the topic.

T. L. Book is writing this portion of the statement to more accurately reflect what he thinks are the facts:

The reason for this is because quite often during the time we were going over the training material in the control room, off normal or plant upsets would occur requiring us to lay the training aside. After attending to the problem and then regrouping to continue, our track of time was lost. Therefore, we may have spent less time or more time than was indicated we should spend. We did, however, attempt to address the material prescribed in as much as we were able. In keeping with a conservative attitude, I thought it was quite possible that less hours could have been documented than were actually used for training. My statement on page (2) paragraph (2) was a reflection of my frustration at the time and while I believed it was possible for some hours to be documented that were not used, I do not believe that was the norm or that it was done blatantly or irresponsibly. I merely wanted to point out a flaw in the system. However, there was no training documented that was not actually received or covered.

What I was addressing to O'Hanlon in my memo was the need for a more formalized training program. I felt that the system of self-taught (on shift) training left alot to be desired and did not reflect the most meaningful method available. My objection was this less than meaningful and informal methodology.

To my knowledge, no supervisors at my level or above condoned or suggested that the training records be falsified. I am not aware of any falsification of NRC required training records or any other records.

After I had submitted my memo, I do not recall any management personnel discussing with me the concerns I had addressed in my memo. There may have been action taken, but I am not aware of them. I did not formally discuss my concerns with anyone else in management beyond the submission of my memo.

I have no information at this time relevant to any falsification of records or other improprieties at TMI.

I have read the foregoing statement consisting of 5 handwritten 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 5-26-83 at 7:10 p.m.

INTERVIEWEE: Original signed by Theodore L. Book, Sr.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26th day of May, 1983, at Lynchburg, Virginia.

INVESTIGATOR: Original signed by R. Keith Christopher

WITNESS: Original signed by Peter J. Connolly

Date: May 26, 1983

STATEMENT

1. Theodore L. Brook, hereby make the following voluntary statement to R. K. Christopher 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 Connolly is writing/typing this statement for me at my request.

I am presently employed with Babcock & Wilcox, Lynchburg Va. ^{as} ~~in~~ Product Development/Training Services. I have been employed with Babcock & Wilcox since March 1978. I was previously employed by Metropolitan Edison at Three Mile Island (TMI). I was licensed as a Reactor Operator in 1974 & received my senior Operator license in 1976. I was shift foreman for approximately 2 1/2 years until I resigned in March 1978 and accepted employment with B & W. I resigned from TMI out of personal family considerations and a desire to get out of plant operations soon. I did not leave TMI under adverse conditions or differences of opinion. While employed at TMI I was solely assigned to Unit 1 except for 3 days at Unit 2. My first line supervisor at unit 1 was Joe Chwaszkyk and above him was George Kunder. The Unit 1 Plant Superintendent was James P. O'Hanlon & Joe Colby, Jr.

I have reviewed a copy of a memo addressed to O'Hanlon dated June 17, 1977 and signed by myself. I was the author of this document. In paragraph (1) page (1) of this memo I made a comment about not being in a single training lecture or receiving ^{no guidance} ~~a my knowledge~~ of ^{no} ~~as to~~ how to fulfill NRC training requirements. What I was referring to in this paragraph was my perception at the time of the

Theodore L. Brook Sr. 5/26/83

letter that I was totally on my own when it
 came to training to meet the NRC requirement for
 60 hours span of various subject matters (which
 I cannot specifically recall at this time). In 1977
 Nelson Brown who was in the Training ^{my} ^{Department}
 was documenting the training & other operators
 were receiving during the year to meet the 60
 hour requirement. ^{For the best of my knowledge}
 neither Brown or anyone else ^{was} ^{was} ^{was} fulfilling
 operator training records. The records accurately
 recorded the material we received for study &
 testing and there were no records indicating
 training ^{topics} ^{we} ^{were} ^{not} actually covered by the
 operators. My concern was that I felt as well as
 many of the other operators that the training program
 relied too much on a self-taught method and
 not enough on formal classroom instruction.
 Another words while we were actually
 studying the required materials it was in
 my opinion a less than adequate method to
 complete the training requirements. This was
 because we did not have an adequate training staff
 to perform formalized training. Too much responsibility
 was being placed on shift supervisors ^{no} ^{and off shift formal} to ensure
 that the training was completed. At no time
 did anyone suggest that we should not read
 the required training documents and take the
 required test.

The material we were required to study was
 distributed to the operators and supervisors.
 While on shift we would study the material and
 take the accompanying exam. A Green sheet
 was signed indicating we had received the
 material and had completed the training curriculum.

5/26/83

Theodore L. Bood Jr.

no
believe)

These green set words we use to document our training time during the year in computer mode. I felt this was an inadequate way to conduct a training. This is what I was referring to in the second paragraph, page 1 of my memo.

To the best of my knowledge we never turned in any training material that we did not actually do.

As well as other operations personnel addressed this problem of the lack of training staff to ~~George~~^{George} Kunder and R. ZechmanTM ~~who~~^{Drumman} was in charge of training. Both individuals indicated their desire to hire additional staff for training, but in my opinion they were unable to do anything about it because of an apparent unwillingness to appear unorganized to minimize expenses. I sent ~~over~~TM this memo to O'Hanlon ~~because~~TM I thought he would listen to my concerns and would have "the horsepower" to take corrective actions.

Subsequent to this memo and up to the time I left TMT, as far as I was aware ^{little} ~~no~~ action was taken to improve the training process. The system remained the same which resulted from a lack of an adequate training staff and operating personnel.

I the ^{1053 second} ~~first~~ paragraph, page two of my memo
I commented that it was somewhat erroneous to say
we fulfilled the NRC requirements when they are
based on documentation of subject matter supposedly
covered on shift. Many times more hours are documented
than were actually used for training "What I
meant by this paragraph was if they meaning training,
sent out material that said ^{it was not} to be covered in a one hour
time period we did not always expend a full hour on the
topic. As an ^{my} example, if we document ^{our} fire emergency ^{RN}

1.6-1300N

writing this portion of the statement

to more accurately reflect what I think are the facts:

The reason for this is because ^{quite often} during the time we were going over the training material in the control room, off normal or plant upsets would occur requiring us to ~~long~~ the training aside. After attending to the problem and then regrouping to continue, our track of time was lost. Therefore, we may have spent less time or more time than was indicated we should spend. We did however attempt to address the material ~~for the~~ ^{as} prescribed in as much as we were able. In keeping with a conservative attitude I thought it was ~~quite~~ ^{possible} that some ~~people~~ ^{hours} could have been documented that were actually used for training. My statement ~~on~~ on page (2) paragraph (2) was a reflection of my frustration at the time and ~~may~~ ^{while} I believed it was possible for some hours to be documented that were not used, I do not believe that was the ~~norm~~ ^{norm} or that it was done ~~blatantly~~ ^{blatantly} or ~~irresponsibly~~ ^{irresponsibly}. I merely wanted point out a flaw in the system. However, there was no training documented that was not actually received or covered.

What I was addressing to O'Hanlon ^{was} in my memo was the need for a more formalized training program. I felt that the system of self-taught (on shift) training left a lot to be desired and did not reflect the most meaningful method available. My objection was this less than meaningful and ~~on~~ ^{on} informal methodology.

To my knowledge no supervisor at ~~my~~ ^{my} level or above condoned or suggested that the

Therese L. Bock Sr. 5/26/83

5 training records be falsified. I am not aware of any falsification of ABC required training records or any other records.

After I have submitted my memo, I do not recall any management ⁷³ ~~personnel~~ personnel discussing with me the concerns I have addressed in my memo. There may have been actions taken, but I am not aware of them. I did not formally discuss my concerns with anyone else in management beyond the submission of my memo.

I have no information at this time relevant to any falsification of records or other improprieties at TMI.

TLB

TLB

I have read the foregoing statement consisting of 5 handwritten/^{RLS} 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 5/26/83 at 7:10 PM.
date time

INTERVIEWEE: Theodore L. Book Sr. 5/26/83 7:10 PM
NAME:

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 26TH day of MAY, 1983,
at 7:11 PM

INVESTIGATOR: W Keith Christopher 5/26/83 7:11 PM
NAME:

WITNESS: Peter J. Connelly
NAME: