

EXHIBIT 17A

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions b1
FOIA- 2004-0191

B/16

Notes from Meeting Between [REDACTED] on 8/19/02

[REDACTED] met on Monday, August 19, 2002 at 9 o'clock in TB2, Conference Room 11. I attended as a note taker. The meeting was to discuss [REDACTED] refusal to accept a TARP assignment. [REDACTED] stated that the purpose of the meeting was to discuss [REDACTED] issues and [REDACTED] assignment to the TARP Team. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] has already discussed this with [REDACTED] and thought this was a closed issue. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] had met with [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] was in agreement with [REDACTED] position. [REDACTED] expressed concern over reporting time and the fact that [REDACTED] and that [REDACTED] said that the 90 minute reporting time created an undue hardship on [REDACTED] family. [REDACTED] said that TARP was not doing what was required by the procedure. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was 'taking a stand for safety' and as such [REDACTED] had protection under QA and Federal Law. [REDACTED] said that TARP assignment is not a condition of employment. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] skill set was not appropriate for most TARPs. Several times, [REDACTED] asked about the consequences of refusing this assignment, including getting a letter from Human Resources. [REDACTED] said the consequences have not yet been decided, but could be up to, and including, termination. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] refusal of a TARP position was discussed using the Consensus method with several group including HR. [REDACTED] expressed concern about the ability to leave site during an accident. [REDACTED] stated again that [REDACTED] had issues with procedural compliance that were 'cross-cutting issues' and that [REDACTED] was 'taking a stand for safety'. [REDACTED] asked if they could meet with [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] already had discussed this with [REDACTED] and that they were in agreement. [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] if [REDACTED] accepted this assignment. [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] discussed refusal and [REDACTED] said that refusal was insubordination. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] was confused and that there was a moving target, but [REDACTED] would not be insubordinate. [REDACTED] asked again if [REDACTED] would accept the position. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] needed to talk to a HR and a lawyer. [REDACTED] offered to arrange a meeting with several people within the company. [REDACTED] again asked for the consequence of refusal and to meet with [REDACTED] again. [REDACTED] again answered that the consequences are yet to be determined, but could be termination. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] would talk to the senior NRC rep and that this meeting had a 'chilling effect' on [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] said that PSEG had been cited several times for a chilling effect before. [REDACTED] asked [REDACTED] again if [REDACTED] would accept the assignment. [REDACTED] said to do whatever you want. [REDACTED] interpreted this as a refusal and told [REDACTED] that [REDACTED] was suspended. [REDACTED] stated that [REDACTED] accepted the assignment and [REDACTED] rescinded the suspension. [REDACTED] said that [REDACTED] and I were intimidating. [REDACTED] The meeting ended

EXHIBIT

17A

PAGE

1

OF

1

PAGE(S)