

INTERVIEW REPORT
OF

[REDACTED] was interviewed by telephone by the reporting agent as part of Investigation No. 1-2003-045. [REDACTED] was specifically interviewed to obtain his knowledge of whether Kymn HARVIN's job was eliminated and/or her last day of work was moved up because she engaged in NRC protected activity. [REDACTED] was initially called on his cellular phone [REDACTED] but due to storms in the area, the call was discontinued until [REDACTED] was able to reach his residence [REDACTED] whereupon the interview began in earnest.

[REDACTED] began his employment at Salem and Hope Creek Generating Stations in [REDACTED]. When he left his employment there he was the [REDACTED] of the Salem and Hope Creek units. His supervisor was [REDACTED]. Since March 2004, he has been the [REDACTED]. His work telephone number is [REDACTED]. [REDACTED] provided the following information:

He does not have any first hand knowledge to support or prove that HARVIN's job was eliminated or that her last day of work was moved up because she engaged in NRC protected activity, although it is [REDACTED] belief that the adverse acts were taken against HARVIN because she did engage in protected activity. Specifically, [REDACTED] says that although there were job reductions in the Information Technology (IT) and Business Services Departments at the plants because there was a duplication of effort in those functions at PSEG headquarters, there was no such duplication in HARVIN's work by anyone else. That makes him believe that the decision to eliminate her job was not based on business reasons/cost reduction. He added that until HARVIN began raising safety concerns he observed good interactions between HARVIN, [REDACTED], and [REDACTED]. He believes that after HARVIN began raising safety concerns her relationship with [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] turned "sour," but he has no first hand knowledge or proof to support that the relationships soured after HARVIN began raising safety concerns. Also, [REDACTED] was not able to offer any specific examples to show that the relationships soured.


[REDACTED] believes that HARVIN did her job well; employees confided in her; and she was honest with employees; and with her assessments of the work at the plants. He indicated that her work helped the plants receive an INPO recognized strength, and that [REDACTED] touted her job and function to INPO as a plant strength. He indicated that in his [REDACTED] working in the nuclear power industry, he had not seen a person/job function who had been viewed as a strength by INPO one day, and the next day there position was eliminated. He also believed that, due in part to HARVIN's work, the plants had a strong year [in 2002].

[REDACTED] summarized his beliefs by stating that it did not make any business sense to eliminate her job, it did not make any sense from an INPO standpoint to eliminate her job [you are supposed to keep your strengths], coupled with his belief that [REDACTED] and [REDACTED] lack

100
70
L-15

integrity, leads him to believe that HARVIN's job was eliminated and her last day moved up because she engaged in NRC protected activity.

Reported by:



Jeffrey A. Teator, Special Agent
Office of Investigations
Field Office, Region I