CASE No. 4-2000-054

United States
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Report of Investigation

SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION:

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LABORER BY MANAGEMENT FOR REPORTING SAFETY CONCERNS

Office of Investigations

Reported by OI: **RIV**

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions 7C
FOIA- 2001-0303

Title: SAN ONOFRE NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION:

DISCRIMINATION AGAINST LABORER BY MANAGEMENT FOR REPORTING SAFETY CONCERNS

Licensee:

Southern California Edison Co.
San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station
P.O. Box 128
San Clemente, California 92674-0128

Docket No.: 50-361/362

Case No.: 4-2000-054

Report Date: May 2, 2001

Control Office: OI:RIV

Status: CLOSED

Reported by:

Jonathan Armenta, Jr.
Senior Special Agent
Office of Investigations
Field Office, Region IV

Reviewed and Approved by:

E. L. Williamson, Director
Office of Investigations
Field Office, Region IV

WARNING

DO NOT DISSEMINATE, PLACE IN THE PUBLIC DOCUMENT ROOM, OR DISCUSS THE CONTENTS OF THIS REPORT OF INVESTIGATION OUTSIDE NRC WITHOUT AUTHORITY OF THE APPROVING OFFICIAL OF THIS REPORT. UNAUTHORIZED DISCLOSURE MAY RESULT IN ADVERSE ADMINISTRATIVE ACTION AND/OR CRIMINAL PROSECUTION.

SYNOPSIS

This investigation was initiated on October 3, 2000, by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Office of Investigations, Region IV, to determine if a Bechtel Construction, Inc. (Bechtel), [redacted] who worked at Southern California Edison's (SCE) San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station was the subject of employment discrimination by Bechtel management for reporting concerns.

Based on the evidence developed, testimony, documents, and a review of the allegations by the technical staff, the allegation that the [redacted] was the subject of employment discrimination by Bechtel management for reporting concerns was not substantiated.

~~NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV~~

Portions 7C

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
SYNOPSIS	1
LIST OF INTERVIEWEES	5
DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION	7
Allegation (Discrimination Against Laborer by Management for Reporting Safety Concerns)	7
Applicable Regulations	7
Purpose of Investigation	7
Background	7
Coordination with NRC Staff	8
Interview of Alleger	9
Additional Coordination with NRC Staff	14
Review of Documentation	15
Testimony/Evidence	17
Agent's Analysis	19
Analysis of Evidence	20
Conclusions	23
LIST OF EXHIBITS	25

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

LIST OF INTERVIEWEES

	Exhibit
BLUE, Sharon L., Supervisor, Fitness-For-Duty, SCE.....	26
SCE.....	25
Bechtel.....	12
Bechtel.....	13
Bechtel.....	24
Bechtel.....	27
Bechtel.....	18
Bechtel.....	19
Bechtel.....	14
Bechtel.....	15
Bechtel.....	20
Bechtel...	23
Bechtel.....	22
Bechtel.....	16
Bechtel.....	17
Bechtel.....	4
SCE.....	28
Bechtel.....	21

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Potions 7C

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

DETAILS OF INVESTIGATION

Allegation

Discrimination Against Laborer by Management for Reporting Safety Concerns

Applicable Regulations

10 CFR 50.5: Deliberate Misconduct (2000 Edition)

10 CFR 50.7: Employee Protection (2000 Edition)

Purpose of Investigation

This investigation was initiated on October 3, 2000, by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), Office of Investigations (OI), Region IV (RIV), to determine if [redacted] Bechtel Construction, Inc. (Bechtel), [redacted] at Southern California Edison's (SCE) San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station (SONGS), was the subject of employment discrimination by Bechtel management for reporting concerns (Exhibit 1).

Background

On September 22, 2000, Gregory WERNER, Operations Engineer, NRC:RIV, received a telephone call from [redacted] expressing concerns about his safety when working inside containment with his supervisor, [redacted] Bechtel. [redacted] stated he had smelled alcohol on [redacted] breath on several occasions and believed [redacted] had the potential to make bad decisions. [redacted] said he had notified [redacted] Nuclear Oversight, SONGS, on [redacted] about his concern, and later that day, [redacted] SCE, discussed alcohol use with Bechtel supervisors, including their responsibility to report individuals suspected of using alcohol and possible disciplinary actions for not reporting suspected users. [redacted] stated he believed he would be fired after [redacted] for refusing to [redacted] with [redacted] further alleged that he had not been promoted to a [redacted] in the past because he spoke out and reported concerns [NFI]. He said he was [redacted] in the control room.

~~NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV~~

Portions 7C

On October 2, 2000, the RIV Allegation Review Board (ARB) discussed the information provided by and decided to refer the fitness-for-duty issue, i.e., possible alcohol use, to SCE for review. The RIV:ARB requested that Project Branch C, Division of Reactor Projects (DRP), NRC:RIV, with assistance from OI:RIV, call to obtain additional information regarding his allegation that he was denied because he reported safety concerns. was the subject of a previous OI:RIV investigation, which was closed as unsubstantiated.

Coordination with NRC Staff

On October 5, 2000, Charles S. MARSCHALL, Chief, Project Branch C, DRP:RIV, and OI:RIV called in an effort to obtain additional information regarding his allegation. On this same day, MARSCHALL reported the results of the conversation with to Harry FREEMAN, Allegations Coordinator, NRC:RIV. MARSCHALL stated believed Bechtel had not promoted him to the based on his previously reported concerns. Additionally, stated that new employees typically were promoted to within a year, whereas, he had worked for several years. MARSCHALL also stated in his report that specifically indicated his main concern pertained to nuclear safety because he alleged that his on several occasions, had the smell of alcohol on his breath while on duty. According to MARSCHALL's memorandum, related that could affect nuclear safety because he might In addition, stated that could impact safety-related equipment by providing incorrect work instructions or improper oversight while under the influence of alcohol (Exhibit 2).

On October 12, 2000, the RIV:ARB discussed the information provided by DRP and OI, RIV, on October 5, 2000, and recommended OI:RIV interview and obtain additional information regarding his allegation that he was denied because he reported safety concerns (Exhibit 3).

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions

Interview of Alleger

On was interviewed at his residence in California, by OI:RIV. Initially OI:RIV was informed that would be attending this interview; however, at the request of was not present, and stated substantially as follows.

> AGENT'S NOTE: On reported safety concerns to the Nuclear Safety Concerns Program (NSCP) alleging that an by Bechtel of a was conducted prior to On raised additional allegations that he had been retaliated against by then Bechtel, for raising nuclear safety concerns to management and the NSCP.
>
> On reported his concerns to the NRC. was the subject of OI:RIV's 1998 investigation, Case No. which was closed as unsubstantiated.

explained that after the investigation in his relationship with management turned from favorable to unfavorable. said was reprimanded by Bechtel management for his personal conduct towards a subordinate.

According to and Bechtel, have continued to discriminate against him because of concerns raised to the NRC in said he felt he was being blackballed by and because they did not want him to return to work is currently on provided the following additional information regarding his concern as it related to nuclear safety concerns.

said that on he witnessed an incident that occurred in the involving another whose a Bechtel was angered by the incident and scolded calling him in front of other fellow employees. said a but nothing else happened. He said

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

the next day nobody talked about the incident, but he said he believed management had already learned about it. He said he questioned why management had not brought it to his attention.

said that on out in front of him and just missed hitting him. He said

reported had been damaged, indicating somebody made a which appeared to have been made by a stated told that he was responsible for the and that claimed was afraid for safety due to his potential violence. According to the incident was investigated by SONGS Corporate Security as a result of a complaint filed by insisted that influenced to go to management and file a complaint against him

AGENT'S NOTE: In an interview with OI:RIV on provided information that was with and had been during the aforementioned incident.

said that in reported to management that he while passing in the hallway at the said into him deliberately. According to the incident was investigated by Bechtel's union representative, Jim FORAL.

said that in reported to and other top BECHTEL management [NFI] that he "stared" [evil glance] at at the public telephone booth outside the According to the following day reported a second incident in which

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

alleged that [redacted] again "stared" [evil glance] at [redacted] at the [redacted] said SONGS Corporate Security looked into this matter because [redacted] alleged that although he [redacted] had not issued any verbal threats to harm [redacted] continued to feel unsafe in [redacted] work environment, knowing that he worked at SONGS. [redacted] was adamant that [redacted] had been behind all these incidents just to get him to quit and leave Bechtel.

[redacted] said none of the investigations conducted by SONGS and/or Bechtel found sufficient evidence to support [redacted] complaints about the aforementioned incidents, including concern for [redacted] safety from him [redacted] in the work environment. [redacted] said he believed all the aforementioned incidents were linked to [redacted] retaliation against him [redacted] for having reported the safety concerns in [redacted]

[redacted] said he was denied [redacted] for reporting safety concerns. Currently a [redacted] said he had been employed by Bechtel since [redacted] and was qualified to work alone without supervision on any task. Although he said he trusted management to promote whom they felt was best suited for the job, he [redacted] could not help but feel "left out" of the promotion circle. He said he felt "left out" because he knew of [redacted] who had been [redacted] hired. He said they were [redacted] like him, but management promoted them instead of him. However, [redacted] said that early in his career with Bechtel, management did give him an opportunity to take [redacted] which is required in order to qualify to take a [redacted] said he felt [redacted]'s choice to promote other [redacted] and bypass him was evidence of continued retaliation against him. He indicated [redacted] did not want to promote him based on previous raised concerns and because of the aforementioned incidents. [redacted] said he ranked high in Bechtel's [redacted] "force ranking" when he received a high score [redacted] from [redacted] (Exhibit 5).

AGENT'S NOTE: Force ranking is a method by which Bechtel evaluates an employee's performance by assigning a numerical grade based on the sum total of points assigned to six categories. The final number is used by management to determine who will be laid off during off peak times or when economic conditions warrant a reduction in force.

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

specifically stated the main concern he reported to the NRC pertained to nuclear safety. [redacted] said that he and other Bechtel [redacted] such as [redacted] had also smelled alcohol on [redacted] and [redacted] breath while at work. [redacted] said that was the reason he did not want to work with [redacted] during the [redacted] He further said he made it known to his coworkers that he was not going to work [redacted] during the [redacted] because he was afraid [redacted] could potentially have an immediate impact on nuclear safety while under the influence of alcohol.

AGENT'S NOTE: During the conduct of this investigation, [redacted] and [redacted] were interviewed by OI:RIV from [redacted] was not available at the time. All of these individuals stated they had never observed [redacted] under the influence of alcohol while on duty at SONGS, nor had they smelled alcohol on his [redacted] breath. The transcripts of interview of [redacted] and [redacted] are included as exhibits to this report for review as deemed appropriate (Exhibits 12, 15, and 17).

[redacted] related that during [redacted] he, [redacted] and [redacted] placed anonymous calls to SONGS security and reported that a Bechtel [redacted] by the name of [redacted] "had the smell of alcohol on his breath." [redacted] said after they called security, he saw [redacted] observing [redacted] from a distance and afterwards they [redacted] engaged in a conversation with [redacted] said he believed they [redacted] were attempting to determine if [redacted] was under the influence of alcohol. In addition, [redacted] said he later observed security personnel around [redacted] an indication to him [redacted] that Bechtel and SONGS management had reacted to the telephone calls he and his coworkers made to security. Asked what happened to [redacted] as a result of his anonymous tip to security personnel, [redacted] said an investigation was conducted by the licensee and Bechtel; however, according to [redacted] the investigations did not disclose that [redacted] was under the influence of alcohol or that his breath smelled like alcohol. [redacted] said had [redacted] been under the influence of alcohol, he [redacted] could have provided misguided and/or improper oversight.

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

also stated that prior to the licensee's investigation into fitness-for-duty issue had asked to let him during the said he talked with and he told him that he would talk to about it. According to the were his and he felt good that had allowed him to work the said the next day he checked with and he told him that it was fine. at this point, said he thought it was all set and he would not have to work in

Resultantly, said things did not work out like he thought they would. He said he did not work the nor did he work because he said placed him on

When asked why he left his job prior to the commencement said he told and that if they made him work during the outage, he was going to quit. He said it was when told him they had changed his work assignment and he was going to have to work He said he felt that the assignment was essentially a punishment for reporting to security for having alcohol on his breath. Asked why he felt that way, said during the same time frame [on or about met with all the Bechtel as part of the weekly staff meetings between SONGS and Bechtel management, and addressed issues regarding fitness-for-duty requirements. who attended the meeting, told him that advised the at the meeting that if an individual had direct knowledge or had a reason to believe that someone was unfit for duty [i.e., smell of alcohol on his breath] and did not come forward with that information, it would be

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

considered as a fitness-for-duty issue on that employee also. added, the day before met with Bechtel management, he told that he and his colleagues had on previous occasions smelled alcohol on their said must have informed SONGS security personnel and about this conversation. Resultantly, said SONGS security personnel responded to information and subsequently advised Bechtel management about it. said he believed punished him for reporting to SONGS security.

said he had not returned to work because of his status, adding that he would still be working at the plant had it not been for his Asked if he was taking any said the When asked if he walked out from his job on voluntarily, said he walked away from his job because he could not take the harassment at work anymore, adding that it was something he had to do.

Additional Coordination with NRC Staff

On February 1, 2001, Russ WISE, Senior Allegations Coordinator, RIV, was provided a copy of transcript of interview. WISE was requested to provide the transcript to the RIV technical staff for review of any potential safety/health issues and provide OI:RIV with a written response (Exhibit 6).

On February 15, 2001, MARSCHALL reported the results of the review of transcript (Exhibit 4). MARSCHALL reported that based on the review of the information provided (1) no additional safety/technical concerns were identified that were not already captured by the concerns summarized in the acknowledgment letter to (2) no new safety/technical concerns were identified that warranted additional review by the NRC; and (3) no information was identified that indicated violations of NRC requirements may have occurred (Exhibit 7).

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

Review of Documentation

During the course of this investigation, documents provided by SONGS, Bechtel, and the NRC:RIV staff were reviewed. The documents deemed pertinent to this investigation are delineated in this section.

Bechtel's Compiled Force Ranking Report, dated (Exhibit 5)

This document showed the consolidated results for the force ranking of Bechtel total score was reflected as on page of this exhibit.

Verbal Counseling Notes, dated (Exhibit 8)

This documentation confirmed verbal counseling session from regarding an inappropriate and unprofessional behavior towards another during work.

Bechtel's Verbal Counseling Notice, (Exhibit 9)

This documentation confirmed Bechtel's verbal counseling session of inappropriate and unprofessional behavior towards another during work on refused to sign this document.

Personal Handwritten Notes, (Exhibit 10)

This handwritten note was documented by after engaging in a conversation with on According to felt that his assignment to the containment during the upcoming outage was due to his reporting to security for allegedly having alcohol on his breath. In addition, said indicated that he would not be a because of his temperament.

Bechtel Construction-SONGS Exit Interview of dated (Exhibit 11)

This document reflects voluntary separation from Bechtel on [Voluntary Reduction-in-Force].

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Pathas 7C

NSC Program Investigation Summaries

On January 26, 2001, SONGS responded to the NRC's January 19, 2001, verbal request for an inspection and/or review of the case files, infra, regarding [redacted], allegation that he was the subject of employment discrimination by Bechtel management for reporting concerns. These NSC documents identify specific information regarding incidents related to this investigation; however, these documents are not included as exhibits to this report due to the sensitivity and personal privacy information contained in these files.

NSC File No. [redacted]

Allegation: The concernee alleged that [redacted] was being harassed and intimidated by [redacted] In addition, the concernee expressed concern for [redacted] safety [redacted] in the work environment.

Conclusion: The allegation that the concernee was harassed and/or intimidated by [redacted] was not substantiated. In addition, there was insufficient evidence to validate [redacted] concern for her safety in the work environment.

NSC File No. [redacted]

Allegation: A Bechtel [redacted] was reporting to work under the influence of alcohol and was making bad decisions as a result of the alleged intoxication.

Conclusion: The allegation that a Bechtel [redacted] was reporting to work under the influence of alcohol was not substantiated. In addition, no information was developed to support that the Bechtel [redacted] made bad decisions as a result of being under the influence or related to any other fitness-for-duty issue.

NSC File No. [redacted]

Allegation: The concernee alleged [redacted] did not feel safe in the work place because [redacted] feared violence against [redacted]

Conclusion: It was determined that this concern did not fall within the NSC Program's criteria and would be more appropriately handled by the Site Investigator. A review by the [redacted] revealed no information was developed from any available source that [redacted] was a threat to the work place.

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

NSC File No.

Allegation: The concernee reported that nothing had been done by NSC about his concern regarding Reportedly, had no problem working but he refused to work with who was sometimes unfit for his assignment.

Conclusion: It was determined that did not wish to continue pursuit of his NSC concern, instead he wished no further action be taken at this time.

Testimony/Evidence

The testimony was provided by the following individuals during the investigation regarding Bechtel management's discrimination against for reporting concerns. All the individuals interviewed during this investigation, from stated they had at one time or another worked with, or interfaced with [directly or indirectly] and knew to be a competent and knowledgeable Bechtel

Testimony from Bechtel (Exhibits 12-17)

All of the (six) Bechtel interviewed stated they had direct knowledge of work habits and/or had worked with him on a day-to-day basis. On (Exhibit 12); (Exhibit 13); (Exhibit 14); (Exhibit 15); (Exhibit 16); (Exhibit 17) were interviewed and stated they did not feel that management discriminated against for reporting concerns. All indicated would not make a good because he liked to "horseplay" a lot and almost everybody who worked or had worked with him did not take him seriously. For these reasons, the believed management's reason for was because the painters did not take him seriously. All but one of the indicated progression to supervisor had not been adversely impacted because he reported safety concerns. All the indicated that they had never smelled alcohol on breath while on duty and had no reason to believe that he was under the influence of alcohol while at work; however, said that about smelled like alcohol on two occasions while off duty.

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Patrons JC

Testimony from Bechtel Management (Exhibits 18-24)

On Bechtel (Exhibit 18), (Exhibit 19), (Exhibit 20), (Exhibit 21), (Exhibit 22), (Exhibit 23), and Bechtel at SONGS (Exhibit 24), indicated that liked to play jokes on his colleagues and "act like a kid and horseplay" to the extent they did not feel he was taken seriously by his coworkers. In addition, all but one of the indicated was not supervisory material, and for these reasons, he had not been promoted to Only indicated that management had discriminated against for reporting safety concerns in

> AGENT'S NOTE: On was interviewed by OI:RIV and stated he overheard a discussion involving SCE; SCE; and wherein the phrase "we got him, he'll be gone Monday" was conveyed. admitted that while he did not actually see the individuals, he heard their voices, and based on his familiarity with both he was certain it was who made the comment. further stated he did not know whom they were speaking of; however, during a conversation with SCE, said told him there were who raised nuclear safety concerns and management was going to weed them out. said did not identify the but he surmised that was talking about and former Bechtel

All of the supervisors indicated they had never smelled alcohol on breath, and they did not believe had ever been under the influence of alcohol while at work at SONGS.

Additional Testimony from SONGS Management

(Exhibit 25), who had oversight of all Bechtel was interviewed on by OI:RIV and said that on or about he held a weekly staff meeting with Bechtel management and talked about fitness-for-duty issues.

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Partial TC

said a week after the meeting, told him he was being intimidated by Bechtel management because he was the one who had reported to SONGS security alleging that he was under the influence of alcohol. said it was the first time he had heard about allegation. When asked if had talked to him about this matter, said he had not. He said he became concerned and documented the conversation between him and on (Exhibit 10). said told him that he was leaving [Bechtel] because he had told one of the Bechtel that he would quit if they assigned him to work during adding that they [Bechtel management] were punishing him for reporting said he had no reason to believe would be under the influence of alcohol while on duty. advised that he tried to explain to that was the primary focus during and he had just asked to add three more people per shift for the said also told him he knew he would not make a good because of his temperament, but that he was a good and they [management] knew it. said he did not believe was discriminated against by management for reporting safety concerns.

Additional Testimony from Bechtel and SONGS Personnel

Three individuals interviewed by OI:RIV during this investigation (from provided testimony not deemed pertinent to the specific allegations mentioned above. These interviewees' transcripts are included as exhibits to this report for review as deemed appropriate:

Sharon BLUE, Fitness-For-Duty Supervisor, SONGS (Exhibit 26);
Bechtel (Exhibit 27); and
SONGS (Exhibit 28).

Agent's Analysis

Regarding concern that allegedly worked under the influence of alcohol, an internal investigation was conducted by SCE Corporate Security at the request of NSCP. That investigation developed no information to substantiate the allegation that reported to work smelling like alcohol or that made bad decisions as a result of being under the influence, or because of any other fitness-for-duty concern.

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Patrini 7C

There were no observations, comments, or suspicions that related to any unprofessional conduct or questionable [redacted] on [redacted] part. In addition, OI:RIV interviewed 15 management and nonmanagement personnel from Bechtel and SONGS, and none of the individuals interviewed indicated they had ever smelled alcohol on [redacted] breath nor had they at any time observed [redacted] to be under the influence of alcohol while on duty at SONGS. Also, [redacted] (Exhibits 14 and 23) testified that when they were sent by [redacted] to observe [redacted], they "absolutely" did not smell any alcohol on [redacted]s breath nor did they observe any abnormal behavior by [redacted] [according to SONGS' Access Authorization records, both [redacted] and [redacted] had been [redacted] at the [redacted] On [redacted] successfully participated in an SCE random drug and alcohol screening. For these reasons, the evidence did not support the allegation that [redacted] worked on several occasions under the influence of alcohol.

Analysis of Evidence

An analysis of evidence was performed to examine the factors involved to determine if [redacted] was the subject of employment discrimination by management for reporting safety concerns.

1. Protected Activity

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.7, an employee engages in protected activity if he/she raises an issue within NRC jurisdiction.

[redacted] said his management bypassed him for [redacted] because he previously reported safety concerns and management continued to harass and intimidate him. He added he was the subject of a previous OI:RIV investigation in which he alleged he was discriminated against by management for reporting safety concerns. He said his career progression had been adversely impacted by raising safety concerns. [redacted] indicated that [redacted] while working [redacted] reported to work smelling like alcohol and potentially could make bad decisions as a result of being under the influence or because of any other fitness-for-duty concern. It appeared [redacted] was engaged in protected activity.

Patrick 71

2. Management's Knowledge of Protected Activity

reported his concerns to his , that he did not want to work with by his own testimony, admitted he was aware of s reported concerns (Exhibit 23). According to told him he could work the and was supposed to have informed about it. It appeared that management was aware of protected activity.

3. Adverse Action

claimed he was punished by for reporting to SONGS security and for that reason was reassigned to work said reassigned him only after he learned that it was him who reported to SONGS security. said management continued to harass him and single him out for reporting concerns. On voluntarily left SONGS and went because of a He said he was placed on and had not returned to work because he had to have the that he was to return. Although was not laid off, according to Bechtel's dated was classified as a "RIF" (reduction-in-force) because he was on (Exhibit 5).

4. Did the Adverse Action Result from Engaging in Protected Activity?

conduct in the work environment, according to individuals interviewed, was considered According to and foremen, he liked to horseplay a lot, causing distrust among his peers and supervisors. On documented in his personal notes (Exhibit 8) that was verbally counseled by about his conduct. In addition, on that same day, verbally counseled about horseplay involving and a (Exhibit 9). Although admitted his involvement in that incident, he refused to sign the said told him that he knew he would never be a because of his temperament, adding that he admitted to

Portions TC

that he [redacted] "knew how he was, and for this reason he knew that he would not be [redacted] material in this environment" [redacted]

According to [redacted] lacked leadership skills, as far as being able to interact with other craftsmen on a professional level and earn their respect and trust. said that was the main reason why he never promoted to a [redacted] indicated he never based his decision not to promote [redacted] to [redacted] because he [redacted] had reported safety concerns in the past, stating "absolutely not."

AGENT'S NOTE: During the conduct of this investigation, OI:RIV learned that [redacted] planned to resign from Bechtel. His reason for leaving was that he was [redacted] something he had been thinking about for some time. Asked if his departure from Bechtel had anything to do with management's dissatisfaction over the NRC investigation(s) regarding the allegations by [redacted] that he [redacted] retaliated against him for reporting safety concerns, he said "no." The licensee provided OI:RIV with [redacted] exit interview (Exhibit 11).

[redacted] indicated [redacted] approached him about [redacted] and asked to be assigned to the [redacted] detail because he did not want to work [redacted] said he told [redacted] it would not be a problem. About a week before the [redacted] began, [redacted] informed [redacted] that he had been assigned to work [redacted] because of the tremendous work load. [redacted] said he did not have the manpower to address all the work scheduled for the [redacted] said Bechtel had to subcontract a lot of the work because Bechtel did not have enough [redacted] said [redacted] responded saying he was not going to [redacted] and that he [redacted] would have to fire him. [redacted] told [redacted] if he did not work [redacted] he would have to go to the "mesa" [where final body counts were taken] and he would have to discuss that with human relations personnel. [redacted] said [redacted] turned around, walked away, and he never saw [redacted] again. [redacted] said [redacted] did not tell anyone he was leaving; the next thing he knew, [redacted] was placed on [redacted] When asked if he would rehire [redacted] after the [redacted]

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions

him, said, although was a very good and delivered a good product, he would not rehire because he was very confrontational and had a tendency to disrupt the work environment. said he never based his decision to assign to work in containment because he reported safety concerns or because he reported to security, stating "absolutely not." said he assigned to work because he needed the experienced to work adding that he did not have enough It appears that was assigned to work for legitimate, nondiscriminatory purposes.

Conclusions

Based on the evidence developed, testimony, documents, and a review of the allegations by the technical staff, the allegation that was the subject of employment discrimination by management for reporting concerns was not substantiated.

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Pahm, 7C

THIS PAGE LEFT BLANK INTENTIONALLY

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

LIST OF EXHIBITS

Exhibit No.	Description
1	Investigation Status Record, dated October 3, 2000.
2	NRC Memorandum, dated October 5, 2000.
3	NRC Allegation Assignment Form, dated October 12, 2000.
4	Transcript of Interview with ( ) dated
5	Bechtel's Compiled dated(
6	NRC Memorandum, dated February 1, 2001.
7	NRC Memorandum, dated February 15, 2001.
8	Bechtel, Personal Counseling Notes, dated ( )
9	Bechtel's Verbal Counseling Notice, dated
10	) Personal Handwritten Notes, dated)
11	Bechtel Construction-SONGS Exit Interview, dated (
12	Transcript of Interview with (dated ( )
13	Transcript of Interview with (dated
14	Transcript of Interview with dated

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Portions 7C

15 Transcript of Interview with dated

16 Transcript of Interview with dated

17 Transcript of Interview with dated

18 Transcript of Interview with dated

19 Transcript of Interview with dated

20 Transcript of Interview with dated

21 Transcript of Interview with dated

22 Transcript of Interview with dated

23 Transcript of Interview with dated

24 Transcript of Interview with dated

25 Transcript of Interview with dated

26 Transcript of Interview with BLUE, dated

27 Transcript of Interview with dated

28 Transcript of Interview with dated

NOT FOR PUBLIC DISCLOSURE WITHOUT APPROVAL OF FIELD OFFICE DIRECTOR, OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS, REGION IV

Case No. 4-2000-054