

INTERVIEW REPORT

OF

DRAFT

On November 4, 2003, [REDACTED] was telephonically contacted by the Reporting Agent (RA) as a result of his interview with the RA at the Salem/Hope Creek facility on October 26, 2003, for which he was accompanied by a union representative. [REDACTED] was asked if he had been able to answer the questions without restraint due to the fact that he was accompanied by other union personnel. [REDACTED] indicated that his responses were not restricted in any manner due to the union's presence.

[REDACTED] said he thought further about the RA's questions regarding his knowledge of individuals retaliated against for having raised concerns. During the October 26 interview, he did not consider anyone outside of management when he reported that apart from one individual, a former [REDACTED] he was not aware of instances of alleged discrimination for having raised concerns. He provided the following information, in substance, in regard to seven non-management individuals that have claimed they were retaliated against:

1) [REDACTED] a Hope Creek [REDACTED] resigned on [REDACTED] and claimed to [REDACTED] that he felt harassed by both union and management because [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] thought this occurred around December 2002-January 2003 and believed that supervision, at the CRS level, got involved and wrote a notification. The person who hung the switch was disciplined, but the company escalated the discipline and it was the subject of a grievance. [REDACTED] did not provide [REDACTED] with any specific examples of the harassment he felt even though [REDACTED] asked him for that. [REDACTED] did not see anything himself. [REDACTED] issued an email and talked to the group on [REDACTED]'s shift about harassment of individuals. [REDACTED] later told him he appreciated his actions, but he was going to leave the company. [REDACTED] recalled that [REDACTED] first switched shifts, then resigned to work at [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] described [REDACTED] as someone "always on the verge of quitting" and noted that he did not remain on a job more than two years.

2) [REDACTED] a Hope Creek [REDACTED] believes he was harassed by management by being placed in "harsh remediation" for his failure on [REDACTED]. The situation is currently in the grievance process. [REDACTED] was involved in the off-gas situation earlier this year and was very vocal during the shift meeting in pointing out the appropriate procedures and plan. [REDACTED] connects his outspokenness with this event to the remediation he was assigned primarily because [REDACTED] was involved with both issues. [REDACTED] also tried to talk with [REDACTED] regarding his position on the off-gas issue. [REDACTED] believes this reinforces the notion that he was being harassed, but there were no other incidents reported to [REDACTED] by [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] offered his personal opinion as the incidents are not connected, though he believes the grievance to be valid. He believes management simply "messed up" the remediation.

3) [REDACTED] a Hope Creek [REDACTED] [REDACTED] regarding conservative decision making in the Control Room. It was prompted by a new core

All 7CN-12

monitoring system that allowed the plant to come up in power a little due to the flow of water. [redacted] felt that without the system functioning due to a computer crash, they should decrease power to remain under 100% power to ensure the technical specification limits were not exceeded. [redacted] told [redacted] that he was harassed after writing the notification, but [redacted] could not recall that he was told who was involved or what form the harassment took. He recalled that he did not see the connection and there was no justification to file a grievance in this matter.

4) [redacted] a Hope Creek [redacted] described this as unusual, but possible. At one point, [redacted] accepted a position to a supervisor and was in the license class when he changed his mind and returned to his [redacted]. He dropped out of the license training in December 2001 or January 2002. [redacted] connected his dropping the class with the unusual amount of testing, but had no additional incidents to report to [redacted]. No grievance was filed and [redacted] said he had difficulty linking the issues due to the time lapse.

5) [redacted] a Hope Creek [redacted] believes he was harassed for being procedure and compliance minded over an issue in February or March 2002. [redacted] and [redacted] gave [redacted] a direct order twice to go on plant historian to trend power. [redacted] questioned the order each time and was escorted off-site when he questioned it the second time. [redacted] explained the system records thousands of temperatures, pressures and status and has the ability to pull up a particular point in time. However, in December or January just prior to this incident, [redacted] made the statement that he wanted the NCOs to physically monitor the boards.

The night before [redacted] was escorted off-site, [redacted] told [redacted] he was having trouble with getting [redacted] to go on historian. [redacted] argued that it was not what [redacted] meant and [redacted] would talk with [redacted]. [redacted] said they would have to follow what [redacted] said until they received different instructions. He then told [redacted] about this discussion. The next night is when [redacted] and [redacted] directed [redacted] to go into historian again. Prior to this time, they would try to get [redacted] to go on the computer, but he would have someone else get the data.

[redacted] remained off-duty for one week and the union had him returned to work as a [redacted]. A couple of months later he returned to his original position. [redacted] considers this harassment of himself in that it was unreasonable action taken by management. He does not associate it with any specific issue, but he, and [redacted] attribute it to [redacted] being compliance minded. [redacted] still sees [redacted] as someone who raises concerns, but prefers for OI to question [redacted] regarding any other adverse actions or ongoing issues.

6) [redacted] believes he was harassed because he is vocal and regularly raises union issues. In late 2002, [redacted] was fired over a FFD issue and later returned to his job. Just prior to this incident, [redacted] hurt his arm and his doctor allowed him to return to light duty. At the time the company wanted employees placed back to work in some capacity, if possible. There was a pending outage and the availability of light duty work

was easy. Management did not place [redacted] back on duty and [redacted] got involved as the [redacted] from Hope Creek. During a meeting with [redacted] and [redacted] [redacted] asked why [redacted] could not come back to work. [redacted] responded, "We can't control [redacted] [redacted] responded to that by stating that [redacted] was a worker and that he raises issues when he feels it is appropriate. [redacted] did not address this directly, but said [redacted] could not come back. [redacted] believes [redacted] regretted his previous remark. [redacted] did not come back to work on light duty, but one month after he returned to work, he was fired over the FFD issue.

AGENT'S NOTE: [redacted] was interviewed by OI on October 23, 2003. He provided additional information regarding how management views and treats him based on his activity as a lead union steward.

7) [redacted] believes he was harassed, but is not aware of why. [redacted] felt harassed by being sent into containment to check oil levels on reactor feed pumps. This was within his job function, but not his assigned duty and the duties had to be switched around by supervision (unknown) for this to occur. This situation does not usually happen and [redacted] is not aware of any reason for the switch. He is not certain what particular incident caused this and [redacted] claimed that [redacted] definitely raises safety issues. He believed that [redacted] should be asked more specific questions. A grievance was filed regarding this issue, but [redacted] does not recall the outcome. [redacted] still raises safety issues in spite of the alleged retaliation.

AGENT'S NOTE: [redacted] was interviewed at his own request regarding these assertions and other issues on November 6, 2003.

[redacted] wanted to make it clear that these situations came to his attention and any "intimidation" felt would have to be expressed directly by the individuals involved. He added that he does not personally feel intimidated or harassed and will voice concerns and bring up issues as he sees them; especially with the safety of running the plant.

Reported by:

Eileen Neff, Special Agent
Office of Investigations
Field Office, Region I

ALL
7C