From:

David Vito (

To:

Frank Congel; Lisamarie Jarriel

Date:

1/26/04 2:04PM

Subject:

Latest draft of "work environment" letter to PSEG re: Salem/HC

Lisa and Frank,

As you are likely aware, we are a good way into our work environment review at Salem/HC, and based on what we have learned thus far, even in advance of completing all our interviews and developing a final assessment, we feel that it is time to engage the licensee on this matter. We have been contemplating this move for a while now (about a month) and have gone through several iterations of the attached draft letter (this is Rev. 7 of the draft letter). We had a long meeting this morning to incorporate some final changes/comments, so the attached is essentially concurred in up to Hub's level. We would like you to review the draft letter for concurrence.

Note: While we would normally approach this a bit more deliberately, we find ourselves in a significant time constraint (we would like to get it out in the next day or two). The alleger initially worked well with us in understanding the amount of review that was needed and that the review may be protracted as further facts developed. However, more recently, the alleger has engaged UCS (DL), who is taking more of a lead role in trying to prompt the NRC to faster action. Most recently (last Wednesday - 1/21/04), the alleger informed me during a phone call I initiated, that the had been working with DL in the drafting of a 2.206 petition, which according to her, was essentially completed: She told me that DL had spoken with Commissioner Merrifield that morning, and that while he complimented Region I's efforts to date, he essentially issued an ultimatim to the Commissioner that: unless Region I acts, or gives indication that they are going to take some sort of action against PSEG shortly, the 2.206 petition will be submitted.

I did not inform the alleger that we had been working on a letter to PSEG, as it was still in draft at the time. However, we believe that in order to be most effective in following up on this matter, it is important for us to get this correspondence on the docket before the alleger (and DL) "go public." We feel that the letter as drafted provides enough information for PSEG to develop an action plan, without divulging all of the specific details we have derived thus far from our review. We understand that the letter will prompt questions from PSEG to provide more specifics, and we intend to pursue those questions as they come forward. The letter not only asks PSEG to develop an action plan within 30 days, but also indicates that we would like to meet with them shortly after we have had an opprtunity to reveiw their action plan, in order to discuss the matter in more detail. Thanks in advance for your **PROMPT** support!!

CC: A. Randolph Blough; Brian Holian; Daniel Holody; Eileen Neff; Ernest Wilson; Glenn Meyer; Hubert J. Miller; Leanne Harrison; Scott Barber; Sharon Johnson

P V dd