



*Dep. of Labor
OSHA
my copy*

**REQUEST FOR REVIEW
OF
NUCLEAR ACCESS AUTHORIZATION DENIAL
BASED ON BACKGROUND INFORMATION
INSTRUCTIONS FOR REQUEST FOR REVIEW APPLICATION**

(Read this page before completing application.)

1. The reason for your access authorization denial is given in Section I of this form. If you want to request a review of this decision, you must complete this form.
2. Your review will be conducted by an NMC entity independent of NMC Security.
3. You should be notified in writing of the disposition of your review within 30 days following receipt by NMC of all information supporting your review request. Pending the disposition of your review request, your access authorization will remain denied
4. This form must be completed in ink or typed. Please print or write legibly. You must complete Sections II and III. Section IV is for NMC use only. If you need additional space, please put your name on each extra page used and indicate the section number to which you are responding.
5. If you have questions while completing this form, please contact the NMC AA/FFD Program Manager for help at (920) 755-7756. Incomplete forms cannot be processed and will be returned for corrections. Improperly completed forms only delay your request for review of access authorization denial.
6. Pursuant to the Fair Credit Reporting Act, a copy of the consumer investigative report (CIR) which was obtained by Nuclear Management Company in support of your request for a Nuclear Security Clearance is enclosed. If this box is checked, NMC did not request a CIR.
7. After completing the request for review, please make sure that you sign the certification provided below and that your signature has been witnessed. Once completed, the request for review is considered to be CONFIDENTIAL.

CERTIFICATION


I certify that the information I have provided in completing this application for review of access authorization denial is true, complete and accurate to the best of my knowledge and beliefs, and is made in good faith. I authorize NMC and its agents to review the information I have provided in this application in reviewing my access authorization denial.

SIGNATURE  _____ DATE _____

*7C
D-3*

WITNESS _____
Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions K
FOIA- 2006-13

SECTION I: CASE FACTS SUPPORTING DENIAL



On Tuesday, March 22, 2005, while completing scaffolding work you failed to secure a tool with a lanyard which resulted in the tool falling from the 26' elevation to the 8' elevation creating a potential significant safety event. The requirement to secure tools to a lanyard was discussed in a pre-job brief. You failed to adhere to this requirement because you stated you didn't want to slow the job up and a lanyard was not readily available.

7c

was a review done of where I was working (exact body position) and where the wrench ended up? As to significant plant or personal damage. Bottom area was taped off.

significant safety event. Was that to plant or personal not an issue at K.N.P.P.

SECTION II: APPLICANT RESPONSE

IN THE SPACE BELOW, PLEASE PROVIDE THE REASON(S) WHY YOU BELIEVE THE DENIAL OF YOUR NUCLEAR ACCESS AUTHORIZATION (AS STATED IN SECTION I) IS NOT WARRANTED:

After in processing and once inside the plant tool bags were issued to personal. Some tool bags were equipped with lanyards and some were not. It was known that all personal would not have these lanyards. My tool bag was one without lanyards. I worked almost 2 weeks without lanyards. During this time supervision or peer checking did not mention the use of lanyards that I can recall. I am not the type of person that would defy an issue, if it was policy to use them.

After the brief in the morning of Mar. 22, 2005 my partner and a laborer were assigned a task to do and we worked a couple of hours at it. Shortly before 12:30 break the wrench fell and at break I notified my Supt. [REDACTED]. The tool was not in my hand at the time of the drop but was knocked off the water box on which we were working.

In hindsight I should have refused to do the task without proper equipment. I should not have been placed in this situation. I feel the plant (PBNP) should accept some responsibility because of the equipment that was not available at the time and not hold me totally responsible.

In the case facts it says I stated that I didn't want to slow the job up. These are the words of Bob Cruise while he was going through the C.A.P. questions. There never was a question that the task had to be done by a certain time. The statement sounds like we

Section II Applicant response



Because of the equipment that was not available and that lanyards were required but not briefed on are the reasons for my appeal.

7C



7C

April 20, 2005

SECTION III: APPLICANT DOCUMENTATION

IF YOU ARE SUBMITTING ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN SUPPORT OF YOUR REQUEST FOR REVIEW, PLEASE LIST AND IDENTIFY EACH DOCUMENT BELOW:

7C

Document Title

Author

Date

Up to this time I haven't received
a copy of the C.A.P. that I asked for.

Paul Williams was asked,

Don Popp was asked,

Gerald Young was asked,

Paul Retzlaff was asked for the pre-job brief.

So far just a bunch of stone walling, but

that's O.K. I realize how busy they all must be.

SECTION IV: NUCLEAR ACCESS AUTHORIZATION REVIEW DISPOSITION



NMC Site VP Referral: Yes No

7.6

NMC Site VP:

RECOMMENDATION (X CHOICE):

- Uphold action.
- Reverse action (e.g., denial, suspension). Basis for reversal is given below.
- Continue review process pending receipt of additional information.

REVERSAL BASIS:

Name

Signature

Date
