

**From:** Castelveter, David  
**Sent:** Tue, 13 Apr 2021 15:43:16 +0000  
**To:** Harrington, Holly  
**Subject:** FW: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Please do not forward.

David A. Castelveter  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Director, Office of Public Affairs  
11555 Rockville Pike (Mail Stop O-16D3)  
Rockville, MD 20852  
301-415-8200 (O)  
240-393-9563 (C)  
david.castelveter@nrc.gov  
www.nrc.gov

Stay Connected to the NRC



---

**From:** Hawken, Roy <Roy.Hawken@nrc.gov>  
**Sent:** Monday, April 12, 2021 07:31 PM  
**To:** Castelveter, David <David.Castelveter@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Hi David,  
FYI.  
Best Wishes,  
Roy

---

**From:** Hawken, Roy  
**Sent:** Monday, April 12, 2021 2:16 PM  
**To:** Roberts, Ashley <Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** FW: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Good Afternoon Ashley,

Thank you for the opportunity to review your drafts. I have a few high-altitude observations.

As David correctly intimates in his email below, it will be a challenging (perhaps impossible) task to define a Phase 3 that will satisfy everyone. I support David's suggestion that (1) we need to assure employees that returning to the office is safe for everyone, including those who take public transportation and those who work in cubicles; (2) our policy should endeavor, in appearance and practice, to be reasonable,

impartial, even-handed, and fair -- from both an individual and institutional standpoint; (3) we should justify why in-person engagements are necessary to enhance or facilitate the fulfillment of our mission, and we should do this using objective, not anecdotal, evidence; and (4) it would be well to support our final position by reference to the policies of other agencies and organizations.

Also, although I recognize the need for well-defined rules, it is my impression that the rules, as drafted, may be viewed as unduly prescriptive and unnecessarily complicated. The instructions in the memo, in addition to being more reader-friendly, also seemed to be more flexible, taking into account the differing needs of each office and the differing responsibilities of each Staff member.

Hang in there. Thank you for your efforts to formulate a process that will return us to the new normal.

Wishing you safety and health,  
Roy  
E. Roy Hawkens  
Chief Administrative Judge  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
301-415-5147

---

**From:** Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 08, 2021 5:24 PM  
**To:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>; Moore, Scott <[Scott.Moore@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Moore@nrc.gov)>; Martin, Jody <[Jody.Martin@nrc.gov](mailto:Jody.Martin@nrc.gov)>; Dacus, Eugene <[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)>; Decker, David <[David.Decker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Decker@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Johnson, Cherish <[Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov](mailto:Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov)>; Ficks, Ben <[Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov](mailto:Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov)>; Zabler, Marian <[Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov](mailto:Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov)>; Clark, Brooke <[Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov](mailto:Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov)>; Ammon, Bernice <[Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov](mailto:Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov)>; Mamish, Nader <[Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov](mailto:Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov)>; Skeen, David <[David.Skeen@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Skeen@nrc.gov)>; Vietti-Cook, Annette <[Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov](mailto:Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov)>; Hawkens, Roy <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)>  
**Cc:** Roberts, Ashley <[Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov](mailto:Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Mary, thanks. I will provide editorial type comments to Ashley soon but a few early observations.

I recognize that this is a work in progress, and the newly proposed telework policy is in development and quite likely necessary, but the Phase 3 direction will go over like a lead brick in a deep pool.

Whether warranted or not, expectation by many employees are that they will be able to permanently telework or less than one, maybe two days per week. Many expect four days per week, if not more. Without OCHCO pre-approval, two-three days per week for many will be hard to swallow, despite prior policy and an anticipated return to pre-COVID conditions. Yes, at some point we need to define the new normal.



We should be sure to cite other organization policies, as leadership has commended staff for great and effective work in a telework posture. We need to justify why in-person engagements, not anecdotal but through studies, are more effective than the new anticipated norm. We also will need to assure employees that returning to the office is safe for all. Many corporations plan on a permanent telework environment for many of staff.

We will need to clarify if Office Directors, Deputies and SLAs will be expected to be in the office more than others to supervise the new posture.

We should discontinue use of the term Tour of Duty, as this is not the military. Some people believe we are too military in our approaches to workforce matters. This is optics more than anything and I am a military guy.

We MUST be consistent in the guidance to ALL that the approval of telework agreement do not enable validated allegations of favoritism, cronyism, or a return to old-habit beliefs. All should follow the same guidance in approving telework agreements.

This will be a difficult decision, especially if other government agencies allow a more relaxed posture.

I personally have opposed, historically, more than one-two days telework per pay period but I also have learned much during the Pandemic. We must find the right balance that is fair to all as what we are doing now, for the most part, seems to be working. Naturally, there will be circumstances where an employee is EXPECTED to be in the office for specific projects, events, meetings, etc.

A tough call.

[David A. Castelveter](#)  
[U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission](#)  
[Director, Office of Public Affairs](#)  
[11555 Rockville Pike \(Mail Stop O-16D3\)](#)  
[Rockville, MD 20852](#)  
[301-415-8200 \(O\)](#)  
[240-393-9563 \(C\)](#)  
[david.castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:david.castelveter@nrc.gov)  
[www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov)

Stay Connected to the NRC



---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 04:19 PM

**To:** Moore, Scott <[Scott.Moore@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Moore@nrc.gov)>; Martin, Jody <[Jody.Martin@nrc.gov](mailto:Jody.Martin@nrc.gov)>; Dacus, Eugene <[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)>; Decker, David <[David.Decker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Decker@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Johnson, Cherish <[Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov](mailto:Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov)>; Ficks, Ben <[Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov](mailto:Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov)>; Zobler, Marian <[Marian.Zobler@nrc.gov](mailto:Marian.Zobler@nrc.gov)>; Clark, Brooke <[Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov](mailto:Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov)>; Ammon, Bernice <[Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov](mailto:Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov)>; Mamish, Nader <[Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov](mailto:Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov)>; Skeen, David <[David.Skeen@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Skeen@nrc.gov)>; Vietti-Cook, Annette <[Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov](mailto:Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov)>; Hawkens, Roy <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)>  
**Cc:** Roberts, Ashley <[Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov](mailto:Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Please see the message below; we invite your comments as well.

Thank you,  
Mary

---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 3:07 PM  
**To:** OEDO ODs/DODs/RAs <[OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov](mailto:OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Good afternoon,

Attached please find the proposed guidance for the first six months of Phase 3 in the NRC's COVID-19 Re-occupancy Plan. The guidance has been developed based on a variety of inputs, including the recent Office/Region post assessment briefs, lessons learned, research, and NRC senior leadership.

We are providing these materials and requesting your review and comments. As you conduct your review, please bear in mind the guidance covers the first 6-month period, following our movement to Phase 3. This may not apply to each location simultaneously. As we implement, we anticipate an iterative process that will be informed by our experience as locations enter Phase 3.

Please provide your comments to Ashley Roberts, no later than Friday, April 23. OCHOC will collect and aggregate the comments for OEDO's review and consideration, and final drafting of the guidance.

PLEASE DO NOT SHARE THIS DOCUMENT AS IT IS A DRAFT WORK IN PROGRESS DOCUMENT. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE, IT WILL BE SHARED WITH THE UNION.

Thank you in advance and please do not hesitate to contact Ashley or myself if you have any questions.

Regards,  
Mary



**From:** Harrington, Holly  
**Sent:** Thu, 28 Apr 2022 19:42:53 +0000  
**To:** Lising, Jason; Lamary, Mary; Castelveter, David; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza; Abraham, Susan; Dilworth, Eric  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

Thanks, Jason.

For the record, Jason will pull together charts with the three major indices data for NRC, Government-wide and medium agencies so that I can look at the numbers and write some talking points either highlighting good or explaining the not-so-good as to how we stack up.

Holly

---

**From:** Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 3:25 PM  
**To:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza <[Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov](mailto:Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov)>; Abraham, Susan <[Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov)>; Dilworth, Eric <[Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov](mailto:Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

I'll call you Holly.

---

**From:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 3:22 PM  
**To:** Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>; Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza <[Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov](mailto:Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov)>; Abraham, Susan <[Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov)>; Dilworth, Eric <[Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov](mailto:Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

Did I miss something? I didn't see anything agency-specific in the attached report. In which report of the many they have listed online do I find the data specific to how the agency ranks against other medium-sized agencies? To be clear, I need to see how we stack up against similar agencies and if that "stack up" is better or worse than in previous years. The part I've highlighted below in red is on the right track, but I don't see how the charts you're pasted below and the paragraph summary you wrote align.

Holly

---

**From:** Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 2:36 PM  
**To:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza <[Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov](mailto:Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov)>; Abraham, Susan <[Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov)>; Dilworth, Eric <[Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov](mailto:Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

Holly,

The reports OPM generate this year are not the traditional ones they've given in the past. The attached is now available on their website [www.opm.gov/fevs](http://www.opm.gov/fevs).

There is a good news story to communicate – as in the past, **NRC remains above the government averages in all major indices reported. NRC also marks comparatively higher against the average mid-sized agencies except for in the global satisfaction index which is 1% below that average this year. NRC also scores well in the new performance confidence index.** (see OPM description below).






Gotta step away for about 30 minutes but will be back if you need anything further.

Regards,  
Jason

“Performance Confidence is defined as ‘The extent to which employees believe their organization has an outstanding competitive future, based on innovative, high quality products and services that are highly regarded by the marketplace.’ Employee perceptions of their organization’s performance, including customer service and work quality, have been linked with actual performance results.”



## Employee Engagement Index Scores by Agency Size

Index	G'wide	 Very Small (<100)	 Small (100–999)	 Medium (1,000–9,999)	 Large (10,000–74,999)	 Very Large (≥75,000)
Employee Engagement	71	81	76	77	73	70
Leaders Lead	60	73	66	67	62	59
Supervisors	80	88	84	85	82	79
Intrinsic Work Experience	73	82	78	78	75	73

## Global Satisfaction Index Score Comparisons

Index	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021
<b>Overall Satisfaction</b> (An average of the responses for the 4 items below)	64	64	65	69	64

## Global Satisfaction Index Scores by Agency Size

Index	G'wide	 Very Small (<100)	 Small (100–999)	 Medium (1,000–9,999)	 Large (10,000–74,999)	 Very Large (≥75,000)
Global Satisfaction	64	77	70	71	67	63

## OPM Major Indices since 2018

FEVS Indices	2018	2019	2020	2021
<b>Engagement: Overall</b>	77	74	78	76
• Leaders Lead	68	65	69	64
• Supervisors	84	82	85	87
• Intrinsic Work Experience	78	76	79	78
<b>Global Satisfaction</b>	74	72	75	70
<b>Performance Confidence</b>	-	-	-	91



---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 9:39 AM

**To:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza <[Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov](mailto:Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov)>; Abraham, Susan <[Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov)>; Dilworth, Eric <[Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov](mailto:Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

Our pre-brief was on gwide data, no comparatives, so really nothing to help address how NRC stood against other agencies, etc.

---

**From:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 9:37 AM

**To:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>; Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza <[Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov](mailto:Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov)>; Abraham, Susan <[Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov)>; Dilworth, Eric <[Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov](mailto:Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

It doesn't give us any time to develop responses if we get immediate questions. Based on your pre-brief, do you have a sense of what we could/should say, if asked?

Holly

---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 9:36 AM

**To:** Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza <[Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov](mailto:Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov)>; Abraham, Susan <[Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov)>; Dilworth, Eric <[Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov](mailto:Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** RE: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

Thanks, yes we got a prebrief last week, and were told the embargo was to be lifted the 25<sup>th</sup>, so I have been anxiously awaiting; there are some interesting data on TW

---

**From:** Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 28, 2022 8:29 AM

**To:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Gibbs-Nicholson, Jawanza <[Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov](mailto:Jawanza.Gibbs-Nicholson@nrc.gov)>; Abraham, Susan <[Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov](mailto:Susan.Abraham@nrc.gov)>; Dilworth, Eric <[Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov](mailto:Eric.Dilworth@nrc.gov)>; Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

FYI OPA/OCHCO leadership,

OPM will release the first set of comparative government-wide 2021 FEVS rankings this afternoon. This information was not included in the previous reports this year so this will be our first look at how NRC ranks against other agencies and should be followed by Partnership for Public Service's Best Place to Rankings in the following weeks.



Regards,

A. Jason Lising

Sr Organizational Development Specialist

Office of the Chief Human Capital Officer

US Nuclear Regulatory Commission

[jason.lising@nrc.gov](mailto:jason.lising@nrc.gov) | 301-287-0569 | TWFN/ 03 B28

---

**From:** Rosales, Edgar <[Edgar.Rosales@opm.gov](mailto:Edgar.Rosales@opm.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, April 27, 2022 3:34 PM

**To:** Pendleton, Aaron <[Aaron.Pendleton@nrlb.gov](mailto:Aaron.Pendleton@nrlb.gov)>; Alice Macklin <[amacklin@cftc.gov](mailto:amacklin@cftc.gov)>; Antoine Dotson <[adotson@imls.gov](mailto:adotson@imls.gov)>; Armando Molina <[armando.molina@ibwc.gov](mailto:armando.molina@ibwc.gov)>; Cain, Brendan <[Brendan.Cain@nrc.gov](mailto:Brendan.Cain@nrc.gov)>; Camille Parks <[camille.parks@ncpc.gov](mailto:camille.parks@ncpc.gov)>; Cassie Matos <[MatosC@fca.gov](mailto:MatosC@fca.gov)>; Cathy Shrestha <[CShrestha@mmc.gov](mailto:CShrestha@mmc.gov)>; Christinia Thomas <[Christinia\\_Thomas@nigc.gov](mailto:Christinia_Thomas@nigc.gov)>; Crystal Kearney-Hennings <[CrystalK@dnfsb.gov](mailto:CrystalK@dnfsb.gov)>; David Kotz <[DKotz@usagm.gov](mailto:DKotz@usagm.gov)>; Bisciegia, Debbie <[debbieb@DNFSB.gov](mailto:debbieb@DNFSB.gov)>; Deon Fortune - Canada <[DEON.FORTUNE-CANADA@EEOC.GOV](mailto:DEON.FORTUNE-CANADA@EEOC.GOV)>; Earlene Sesker <[sesker@access-board.gov](mailto:sesker@access-board.gov)>; Elizabeth Lyons <[elyons@imls.gov](mailto:elyons@imls.gov)>; Erica A Barker <[erica.barker@prc.gov](mailto:erica.barker@prc.gov)>; Hall, Debra <[dhall@oshrc.gov](mailto:dhall@oshrc.gov)>; Ingram, Shanyta <[singram@fmcs.gov](mailto:singram@fmcs.gov)>; Jaimie Smyser <[smyserj@abmc.gov](mailto:smyserj@abmc.gov)>; Janice Minor <[jminor@usccr.gov](mailto:jminor@usccr.gov)>; Lising, Jason <[Jason.Lising@nrc.gov](mailto:Jason.Lising@nrc.gov)>; Gilliam, Jewel <[jewel.gilliam@eeoc.gov](mailto:jewel.gilliam@eeoc.gov)>; Karen Hayden <[KHayden@cpsc.gov](mailto:KHayden@cpsc.gov)>; Leigh Ann Massey <[lmasssey@osc.gov](mailto:lmasssey@osc.gov)>; Lesley Duncan <[lduncan@iaf.gov](mailto:lduncan@iaf.gov)>; Linda Beard <[lbeard@oshrc.gov](mailto:lbeard@oshrc.gov)>; Lisa Lawn <[llawn@ustda.gov](mailto:llawn@ustda.gov)>; Michael Jerger <[jerger@nmb.gov](mailto:jerger@nmb.gov)>; Nina Cox <[NINA.COX@EEOC.GOV](mailto:NINA.COX@EEOC.GOV)>; Noél Tarquinii <[NJTarquinii@Kennedy-Center.org](mailto:NJTarquinii@Kennedy-Center.org)>; Olympia Hand <[Olympia.Hand@usitc.gov](mailto:Olympia.Hand@usitc.gov)>; Reid, Patrice <[Patrice.Reid@nrc.gov](mailto:Patrice.Reid@nrc.gov)>; Patricia Midgett <[pmidgett@flra.gov](mailto:pmidgett@flra.gov)>; Paula Chandler <[pchandler@flra.gov](mailto:pchandler@flra.gov)>; Renee Fox <[Renee\\_Fox@nigc.gov](mailto:Renee_Fox@nigc.gov)>; Samantha Jones <[Jones@nmb.gov](mailto:Jones@nmb.gov)>; Simpson, Donna <[dsimpson@cpsc.gov](mailto:dsimpson@cpsc.gov)>; Tiffany Enoch <[Tiffany\\_R\\_Enoch@ustr.eop.gov](mailto:Tiffany_R_Enoch@ustr.eop.gov)>; Toni Reddish <[ToniR@dnfsb.gov](mailto:ToniR@dnfsb.gov)>; Vy Tran <[Vy.Tran@FHFA.GOV](mailto:Vy.Tran@FHFA.GOV)>

**Subject:** [External\_Sender] 2021 OPM FEVS Governmentwide Release Update

Hello,

For your awareness, the official OPM release of the 2021 OPM Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey (OPM FEVS) Governmentwide Management Report and governmentwide results will be Thursday afternoon, April 28. The Governmentwide Management Report and governmentwide results will be available on our OPM FEVS website ([www.opm.gov/fevs](http://www.opm.gov/fevs)) under reports.

Let me know if you have any questions and I'll contact you as soon as possible if there are any changes to this schedule.

Thank you,

**From:** Harrington, Holly  
**Sent:** Wed, 9 Feb 2022 15:20:16 +0000  
**To:** Burnell, Scott  
**Subject:** RE: Announcement from the Office of the Inspector General

When will it be over?

Holly

---

**From:** Burnell, Scott <Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 09, 2022 10:20 AM  
**To:** Harrington, Holly <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Announcement from the Office of the Inspector General

Trying to keep track of the EPW hearing, how soon do we need to talk?

---

**From:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 09, 2022 10:16 AM  
**To:** Burnell, Scott <[Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Burnell@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Announcement from the Office of the Inspector General

Close hold. This is what we need to talk about

Holly

---

**From:** Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, February 09, 2022 9:42 AM  
**To:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** Announcement from the Office of the Inspector General

FYI

*David A. Castelveter  
Director, Office of Public Affairs  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Mail Stop O-16A20  
11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852  
[www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov)  
301-415-8200 Office  
301-415-8201 Desk  
240-393-9563 Cell*

Stay Connected to the NRC





Good morning, all,

I hope you are well.

The attached report conveys the result of our special inquiry (OIG Case No. C20-022) into counterfeit, fraudulent, and suspect items in operating nuclear power plants. We respectfully request a response from your office on this matter by April 11, 2022.

The issuance of this report will coincide with that of an audit report of similar subject matter sent to you under separate cover (OIG-22-A-06, Audit of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Oversight of Counterfeit, Fraudulent, and Suspect Items at Nuclear Power Reactors).

**Both reports will be made public through [nrc.gov](http://nrc.gov) and a press release on Thursday, February 10.**

Please feel free to reach out if you have any questions.

Best regards,

(b)(6)

(b)(6)

Office of the Inspector General  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission and  
Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board  
11555 Rockville Pike  
Rockville, Maryland 20852  
Office Direct: (b)(6)  
Email: (b)(6)





**From:** Castelveter, David  
**Sent:** Fri, 9 Apr 2021 13:48:37 +0000  
**To:** Harrington, Holly  
**Subject:** Re: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

I read it several time. It is poorly composed

---

On: 09 April 2021 09:38,  
"Harrington, Holly" <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)> wrote:

The guidance, as is typical for OCHCO, is quite dense. Among other issues, it switches back and forth between "per week" and "per pay period" verbiage, but these were my takeaways:

The office director has the authority to independently approve three days **a week** of telework. (I'm a little confused about how this applies to those on compressed schedules, though, as there was also verbiage about number of days per pay period in the office)

The office director AND OCHCO have to approve four telework days a week or full-time telework.

We're all going to have to take "hybrid work environment" training.

It appears that "supervisors" have to be in the office 30 percent of the time? I don't quite understand what "aim for optimal presence" means.

The guidance needlessly reiterates things like: **employees shall maximize the use of technology to provide for a virtual work environment.**

Most of the rest of this, as I read it, just applies to those without "portable" work. It does do away with some of the extra flexibilities that we've not been needing in our office, such as weekend hours and excused absence for childcare, etc.

It is not clear to me how this would affect Chris.

Since you've weighed in as office director and will be providing editorial comments, I'm going to refrain. By the way, this was not pre-reviewed by the task force. My guess is this is OCHCO's first crack at a new telework policy and there will be significant discussion and rewriting to come.

Holly

---

**From:** Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 08, 2021 5:24 PM  
**To:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>; Moore, Scott <[Scott.Moore@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Moore@nrc.gov)>; Martin, Jody <[Jody.Martin@nrc.gov](mailto:Jody.Martin@nrc.gov)>; Dacus, Eugene <[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)>; Decker, David <[David.Decker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Decker@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Johnson, Cherish <[Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov](mailto:Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov)>; Ficks, Ben <[Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov](mailto:Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov)>; Zabler, Marian <[Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov](mailto:Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov)>; Clark, Brooke <[Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov](mailto:Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov)>; Ammon, Bernice <[Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov](mailto:Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov)>; Mamish, Nader <[Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov](mailto:Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov)>; Skeen, David <[David.Skeen@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Skeen@nrc.gov)>; Vietti-Cook, Annette <[Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov](mailto:Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov)>; Hawkens, Roy <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)>

**Cc:** Roberts, Ashley <Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Mary, thanks. I will provide editorial type comments to Ashley soon but a few early observations.

I recognize that this is a work in progress, and the newly proposed telework policy is in development and quite likely necessary, but the Phase 3 direction will go over like a lead brick in a deep pool.

Whether warranted or not, expectation by many employees are that they will be able to permanently telework or less than one, maybe two days per week. Many expect four days per week, if not more. Without OCHCO pre-approval, two-three days per week for many will be hard to swallow, despite prior policy and an anticipated return to pre-COVID conditions. Yes, at some point we need to define the new normal.

We should be sure to cite other organization policies, as leadership has commended staff for great and effective work in a telework posture. We need to justify why in-person engagements, not anecdotal but through studies, are more effective than the new anticipated norm. We also will need to assure employees that returning to the office is safe for all. Many corporations plan on a permanent telework environment for many of staff.

We will need to clarify if Office Directors, Deputies and SLAs will be expected to be in the office more than others to supervise the new posture.

We should discontinue use of the term Tour of Duty, as this is not the military. Some people believe we are too military in our approaches to workforce matters. This is optics more than anything and I am a military guy.

We MUST be consistent in the guidance to ALL that the approval of telework agreement do not enable validated allegations of favoritism, cronyism, or a return to old-habit beliefs. All should follow the same guidance in approving telework agreements.

This will be a difficult decision, especially if other government agencies allow a more relaxed posture.

I personally have opposed, historically, more than one-two days telework per pay period but I also have learned much during the Pandemic. We must find the right balance that is fair to all as what we are doing now, for the most part, seems to be working. Naturally, there will be circumstances where an employee is EXPECTED to be in the office for specific projects, events, meetings, etc.

A tough call.



David A. Castelveter  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Director, Office of Public Affairs  
11555 Rockville Pike (Mail Stop O-16D3)  
Rockville, MD 20852  
301-415-8200 (O)  
240-393-9563 (C)  
david.castelveter@nrc.gov  
www.nrc.gov

Stay Connected to the NRC



---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 04:19 PM  
**To:** Moore, Scott <[Scott.Moore@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Moore@nrc.gov)>; Martin, Jody <[Jody.Martin@nrc.gov](mailto:Jody.Martin@nrc.gov)>; Dacus, Eugene <[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)>; Decker, David <[David.Decker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Decker@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Johnson, Cherish <[Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov](mailto:Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov)>; Ficks, Ben <[Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov](mailto:Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov)>; Zobler, Marian <[Marian.Zobler@nrc.gov](mailto:Marian.Zobler@nrc.gov)>; Clark, Brooke <[Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov](mailto:Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov)>; Ammon, Bernice <[Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov](mailto:Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov)>; Mamish, Nader <[Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov](mailto:Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov)>; Skeen, David <[David.Skeen@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Skeen@nrc.gov)>; Vietti-Cook, Annette <[Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov](mailto:Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov)>; Hawkens, Roy <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)>  
**Cc:** Roberts, Ashley <[Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov](mailto:Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Please see the message below; we invite your comments as well.

Thank you,  
Mary

---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 3:07 PM  
**To:** OEDO ODs/DODs/RAs <[OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov](mailto:OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Good afternoon,

Attached please find the proposed guidance for the first six months of Phase 3 in the NRC's COVID-19 Re-occupancy Plan. The guidance has been developed based on a variety of inputs, including the recent Office/Region post assessment briefs, lessons learned, research, and NRC senior leadership.

We are providing these materials and requesting your review and comments. As you conduct your review, please bear in mind the guidance covers the first 6-month period, following our movement to

Phase 3. This may not apply to each location simultaneously. As we implement, we anticipate an iterative process that will be informed by our experience as locations enter Phase 3.

Please provide your comments to Ashley Roberts, no later than Friday, April 23. OCHOC will collect and aggregate the comments for OEDO's review and consideration, and final drafting of the guidance.

PLEASE DO NOT SHARE THIS DOCUMENT AS IT IS A DRAFT WORK IN PROGRESS DOCUMENT. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE, IT WILL BE SHARED WITH THE UNION.

Thank you in advance and please do not hesitate to contact Ashley or myself if you have any questions.

Regards,  
Mary

**From:** Castelveter, David  
**Sent:** Tue, 13 Apr 2021 00:17:15 +0000  
**To:** Hawkens, Roy  
**Subject:** Re: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Thank you sir

---

On: 12 April 2021 19:30,  
"Hawkens, Roy" <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)> wrote:

Hi David,  
FYI.  
Best Wishes,  
Roy

---

**From:** Hawkens, Roy  
**Sent:** Monday, April 12, 2021 2:16 PM  
**To:** Roberts, Ashley <[Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov](mailto:Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Good Afternoon Ashley,

Thank you for the opportunity to review your drafts. I have a few high-altitude observations.

As David correctly intimates in his email below, it will be a challenging (perhaps impossible) task to define a Phase 3 that will satisfy everyone. I support David's suggestion that (1) we need to assure employees that returning to the office is safe for everyone, including those who take public transportation and those who work in cubicles; (2) our policy should endeavor, in appearance and practice, to be reasonable, impartial, even-handed, and fair -- from both an individual and institutional standpoint; (3) we should justify why in-person engagements are necessary to enhance or facilitate the fulfillment of our mission, and we should do this using objective, not anecdotal, evidence; and (4) it would be well to support our final position by reference to the policies of other agencies and organizations.

Also, although I recognize the need for well-defined rules, it is my impression that the rules, as drafted, may be viewed as unduly prescriptive and unnecessarily complicated. The instructions in the memo, in addition to being more reader-friendly, also seemed to be more flexible, taking into account the differing needs of each office and the differing responsibilities of each Staff member.

Hang in there. Thank you for your efforts to formulate a process that will return us to the new normal.



Wishing you safety and health,  
Roy  
E. Roy Hawkens  
Chief Administrative Judge  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel  
301-415-5147

---

**From:** Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 08, 2021 5:24 PM  
**To:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>; Moore, Scott <[Scott.Moore@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Moore@nrc.gov)>; Martin, Jody <[Jody.Martin@nrc.gov](mailto:Jody.Martin@nrc.gov)>; Dacus, Eugene <[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)>; Decker, David <[David.Decker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Decker@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Johnson, Cherish <[Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov](mailto:Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov)>; Ficks, Ben <[Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov](mailto:Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov)>; Zabler, Marian <[Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov](mailto:Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov)>; Clark, Brooke <[Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov](mailto:Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov)>; Ammon, Bernice <[Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov](mailto:Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov)>; Mamish, Nader <[Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov](mailto:Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov)>; Skeen, David <[David.Skeen@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Skeen@nrc.gov)>; Vietti-Cook, Annette <[Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov](mailto:Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov)>; Hawkens, Roy <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)>  
**Cc:** Roberts, Ashley <[Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov](mailto:Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Mary, thanks. I will provide editorial type comments to Ashley soon but a few early observations.

I recognize that this is a work in progress, and the newly proposed telework policy is in development and quite likely necessary, but the Phase 3 direction will go over like a lead brick in a deep pool.

Whether warranted or not, expectation by many employees are that they will be able to permanently telework or less than one, maybe two days per week. Many expect four days per week, if not more. Without OCHCO pre-approval, two-three days per week for many will be hard to swallow, despite prior policy and an anticipated return to pre-COVID conditions. Yes, at some point we need to define the new normal.

We should be sure to cite other organization policies, as leadership has commended staff for great and effective work in a telework posture. We need to justify why in-person engagements, not anecdotal but through studies, are more effective than the new anticipated norm. We also will need to assure employees that returning to the office is safe for all. Many corporations plan on a permanent telework environment for many of staff.

We will need to clarify if Office Directors, Deputies and SLAs will be expected to be in the office more than others to supervise the new posture.

We should discontinue use of the term Tour of Duty, as this is not the military. Some people believe we are too military in our approaches to workforce matters. This is optics more than anything and I am a military guy.

We MUST be consistent in the guidance to ALL that the approval of telework agreement do not enable validated allegations of favoritism, cronyism, or a return to old-habit beliefs. All should follow the same guidance in approving telework agreements.

This will be a difficult decision, especially if other government agencies allow a more relaxed posture.

I personally have opposed, historically, more than one-two days telework per pay period but I also have learned much during the Pandemic. We must find the right balance that is fair to all as what we are doing now, for the most part, seems to be working. Naturally, there will be circumstances where an employee is EXPECTED to be in the office for specific projects, events, meetings, etc.

A tough call.

[David A. Castelveter](#)  
[U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission](#)  
[Director, Office of Public Affairs](#)  
[11555 Rockville Pike \(Mail Stop O-16D3\)](#)  
[Rockville, MD 20852](#)  
[301-415-8200 \(O\)](#)  
[240-393-9563 \(C\)](#)  
[david.castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:david.castelveter@nrc.gov)  
[www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov)

Stay Connected to the NRC



---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>

**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 04:19 PM

**To:** Moore, Scott <[Scott.Moore@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Moore@nrc.gov)>; Martin, Jody <[Jody.Martin@nrc.gov](mailto:Jody.Martin@nrc.gov)>; Dacus, Eugene <[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)>; Decker, David <[David.Decker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Decker@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Johnson, Cherish <[Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov](mailto:Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov)>; Ficks, Ben <[Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov](mailto:Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov)>; Zabler, Marian <[Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov](mailto:Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov)>; Clark, Brooke <[Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov](mailto:Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov)>; Ammon, Bernice <[Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov](mailto:Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov)>; Mamish, Nader <[Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov](mailto:Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov)>; Skeen, David <[David.Skeen@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Skeen@nrc.gov)>; Vietti-Cook, Annette <[Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov](mailto:Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov)>; Hawkens, Roy <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)>

**Cc:** Roberts, Ashley <[Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov](mailto:Ashley.Roberts@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Please see the message below; we invite your comments as well.

Thank you,  
Mary

---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Thursday, April 8, 2021 3:07 PM  
**To:** OEDO ODs/DODs/RAs <[OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov](mailto:OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** CLOSE HOLD - Draft Phase 3 Guidance

Good afternoon,

Attached please find the proposed guidance for the first six months of Phase 3 in the NRC's COVID-19 Re-occupancy Plan. The guidance has been developed based on a variety of inputs, including the recent Office/Region post assessment briefs, lessons learned, research, and NRC senior leadership.

We are providing these materials and requesting your review and comments. As you conduct your review, please bear in mind the guidance covers the first 6-month period, following our movement to Phase 3. This may not apply to each location simultaneously. As we implement, we anticipate an iterative process that will be informed by our experience as locations enter Phase 3.

Please provide your comments to Ashley Roberts, no later than Friday, April 23. OCHOC will collect and aggregate the comments for OEDO's review and consideration, and final drafting of the guidance.

PLEASE DO NOT SHARE THIS DOCUMENT AS IT IS A DRAFT WORK IN PROGRESS DOCUMENT. PRIOR TO ISSUANCE, IT WILL BE SHARED WITH THE UNION.

Thank you in advance and please do not hesitate to contact Ashley or myself if you have any questions.

Regards,  
Mary



**From:** Harrington, Holly  
**Sent:** Wed, 25 May 2022 13:28:37 +0000  
**To:** Wellock, Thomas  
**Subject:** RE: Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson

I'd say answer whatever questions you can. Let me know how it goes and I'll write up a TNT.

Holly

---

**From:** Wellock, Thomas <Thomas.Wellock@nrc.gov>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2022 9:15 AM  
**To:** Harrington, Holly <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson

I'd be happy to talk to her, but I don't think I can comment on Jackson as a scholar. The question should be directed to physicists with an expertise in her field. I only know her importance as a regulator.

Tom

---

**From:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2022 9:12 AM  
**To:** Wellock, Thomas <[Thomas.Wellock@nrc.gov](mailto:Thomas.Wellock@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson

Good morning! Is this something you'd feel comfortable responding to?

Holly

ContactUsID: 3135

Public Affairs Location: [opa.resource@nrc.gov](mailto:opa.resource@nrc.gov)

Subject: Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson

ContactUsCategory:

ContactUsDocumentTitle:

ContactUsNumberTitle:

Question or Comment: I am a writer with (b)(6)

(b)(6) I am working on an article about Dr. Shirley Ann Jackson, retiring president of Rensselaer Polytechnic Institute, who served as chairperson of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission from 1995 to 1999. Is there

anyone at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission able to speak about Dr. Jackson as a scholar and researcher as well as her impact on women of color in physics and STEM? Thank you for your time and attention. (b)(6) Tel (b)(6)

Would you like to remain anonymous?: False

Name: (b)(6)

E-mail: (b)(6)

Organization: (b)(6)

Address: (b)(6)

City: (b)(6)

State: (b)(6)

ZIP/Postal Code: (b)(6)

Country: United States of America

Phone: (b)(6)

**From:** Castelveter, David  
**Sent:** Fri, 23 Jul 2021 21:01:08 +0000  
**To:** Harrington, Holly  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Memos - CLOSE HOLD

Well, that is the intent, but, the change requires compliance with the Collective Bargaining Agreement.

David A. Castelveter  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Director, Office of Public Affairs  
11555 Rockville Pike (Mail Stop O-16D3)  
Rockville, MD 20852  
301-415-8200 (O)  
240-393-9563 (C)  
david.castelveter@nrc.gov  
www.nrc.gov

Stay Connected to the NRC



---

**From:** Harrington, Holly <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 23, 2021 04:56 PM  
**To:** Castelveter, David <David.Castelveter@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Memos - CLOSE HOLD

The challenging part, as I read it, is the apparent insistence on four days in the office per pay period no matter what. So if someone takes a week of vacation, then the following week, they must be in the office four days. If their in-office day is a Monday and Monday is a holiday or they take Monday as annual leave, then they have to select another day in that pay period to come in? Why can't we just say – come into the office one or two days a week or as necessary and be grown-ups about it?

Holly

---

**From:** Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 23, 2021 4:49 PM  
**To:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** RE: Draft Memos - CLOSE HOLD

We have been digesting every day, multi time per day, these issues. What you have brought up, in some fashion, have been asked by other Directors and Deputies. We meet again Monday. Margie and the Chairman need to meet to discuss possibly his issues. There are so many complexities. It will not be an easy decision or uncomplicated formula.



[David A. Castelveter](#)  
[U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission](#)  
[Director, Office of Public Affairs](#)  
[11555 Rockville Pike \(Mail Stop O-16D3\)](#)  
[Rockville, MD 20852](#)  
[301-415-8200 \(O\)](#)  
[240-393-9563 \(C\)](#)  
[david.castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:david.castelveter@nrc.gov)  
[www.nrc.gov](http://www.nrc.gov)

Stay Connected to the NRC



---

**From:** Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 23, 2021 04:30 PM  
**To:** Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** FW: Draft Memos - CLOSE HOLD

As usual, I'm left scratching my head and saying huh?

1. Telework Schedules\* may be approved as follows:

- a. 2-3 telework days AND 2 in-person days **per week** may be approved by supervisor (**may include one regularly scheduled day off, i.e., 9-day work schedule**) **What?**
- b. 4-5 telework days **per week** must be approved by supervisor and Office Director/Regional Administrator, **so long as the requirement for 4 in-person days per pay period is satisfied** (may include two regularly scheduled days off, i.e., four 10-hour days per week) **What?**
- c. Full-time telework schedules of any kind, and exceptions to the requirement for 4 in-person days per pay period (includes work schedules consisting of 8, 9, or 10 work days) must be approved by the Office Director/Regional AND **Chief Human Capital Officer – based on what criteria?**

Holly

---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Friday, July 23, 2021 4:21 PM  
**To:** Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Moore, Scott <[Scott.Moore@nrc.gov](mailto:Scott.Moore@nrc.gov)>; Martin, Jody <[Jody.Martin@nrc.gov](mailto:Jody.Martin@nrc.gov)>; Dacus, Eugene <[Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov](mailto:Eugene.Dacus@nrc.gov)>; Decker, David <[David.Decker@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Decker@nrc.gov)>; Harrington, Holly <[Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov](mailto:Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov)>; Johnson, Cherish <[Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov](mailto:Cherish.Johnson@nrc.gov)>; Ficks, Ben <[Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov](mailto:Ben.Ficks@nrc.gov)>; Zabler, Marian <[Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov](mailto:Marian.Zabler@nrc.gov)>; Clark, Brooke <[Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov](mailto:Brooke.Clark@nrc.gov)>; Ammon, Bernice <[Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov](mailto:Bernice.Ammon@nrc.gov)>; Mamish, Nader <[Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov](mailto:Nader.Mamish@nrc.gov)>; Skeen, David

<[David.Skeen@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Skeen@nrc.gov)>; Vietti-Cook, Annette <[Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov](mailto:Annette.Vietti-Cook@nrc.gov)>; Hawkens, Roy <[Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov](mailto:Roy.Hawkens@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: Draft Memos - CLOSE HOLD

Good afternoon,

Please see attached for review and comment. Sorry for quick turnaround.

My apologies for the oversight, didn't realize these offices were not included in the master Office Director distribution.

Mary

---

**From:** Lamary, Mary

**Sent:** Thursday, July 22, 2021 8:24 AM

**To:** Feitel, Robert <[Robert.Feitel@nrc.gov](mailto:Robert.Feitel@nrc.gov)>

**Cc:** O'Connell, Edward <[Edward.O'Connell@nrc.gov](mailto:Edward.O'Connell@nrc.gov)>; Bartley, Malion <[Malion.Bartley@nrc.gov](mailto:Malion.Bartley@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** FW: Draft Memos - CLOSE HOLD

Good Morning,

I apologize for not including you on the distribution yesterday; I didn't realize OIG was not included in the distribution.

Please see the attached materials, and feel free to reach out directly to me if you have questions on the materials. We currently do not have an approved plan from OMB so we have redacted the proposed re-entry date, pending their approval.

Regards,  
Mary

---

**From:** Lamary, Mary <[Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Lamary@nrc.gov)>

**Sent:** Wednesday, July 21, 2021 5:41 PM

**To:** OEDO ODs/DODs/RAs <[OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov](mailto:OEDOODsDODsRAs@nrc.gov)>

**Cc:** Miotla, Sherri <[Sherri.Miotla@nrc.gov](mailto:Sherri.Miotla@nrc.gov)>; Roberts, Darrell <[Darrell.Roberts@nrc.gov](mailto:Darrell.Roberts@nrc.gov)>; Corbett, James <[James.Corbett@nrc.gov](mailto:James.Corbett@nrc.gov)>; Giessner, Jack <[John.Giessner@nrc.gov](mailto:John.Giessner@nrc.gov)>; Castelveter, David <[David.Castelveter@nrc.gov](mailto:David.Castelveter@nrc.gov)>; Woods, Mary <[Mary.Woods@nrc.gov](mailto:Mary.Woods@nrc.gov)>; Lombard, Mark <[Mark.Lombard@nrc.gov](mailto:Mark.Lombard@nrc.gov)>; Scott, Cathy <[Catherine.Scott@nrc.gov](mailto:Catherine.Scott@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** Draft Memos - CLOSE HOLD

Good afternoon

As noted in today's call, attached please find two draft memos. We ask that you review the documents for "show stoppers" only. Understand these are meant to provide the guidance and parameters around the re-entry implementation. We are aware there are many variables and case-by-case situations that

will need input from subject matter experts; however, it is not possible to describe each one in these documents.

We are finalizing the chart that will be a sort of decision tree for “I want this schedule, who/what is approval process”, which I am confident will be a useful tool but is not needed for your review of the messaging in the memo. Also, as a reminder, we will be conducting the training/listening sessions to provide assistance to you.

Please remember your review and feedback is due by COB tomorrow.

Regards,  
Mary



**From:** Harrington, Holly  
**Sent:** Tue, 14 Sep 2021 13:56:05 +0000  
**To:** Jarriel, Lisamarie;Checkle, Melanie;Mendez, Sandra  
**Cc:** Edwards, Denise  
**Subject:** RE: Questions from CI \*SENSITIVE INFO\*

We do not have a blog.

We do not allow users to put up a post on the agency Facebook page. However, if we did a post on our allegation process, they could comment. (We did this recently, so they could, if they choose, comment on that post.) Otherwise, comments on Facebook, per our policy, must relate to the topic of the post, so they could not randomly post their experience on an unrelated post. Note: There are guidelines that do not allow for personal attacks, etc., in our comments. So as long as the review was about process and outcome, however negative, it would stand. Personal attacks on employees would not.

One option for you to consider is to invite "a review" via email that you would post on your web page. Submitters could not post it directly to the page, but you post their "review" and it would be public. Once you create such a page and email box, we could do a Facebook post and Tweet about the new review option.

Holly Harrington  
Senior Advisor  
Office of Public Affairs  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
301-415-8203

---

**From:** Jarriel, Lisamarie <Lisamarie.Jarriel@nrc.gov>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 14, 2021 9:37 AM  
**To:** Checkle, Melanie <Melanie.Checkle@nrc.gov>; Mendez, Sandra <Sandra.Mendez-Gonzalez@nrc.gov>  
**Cc:** Edwards, Denise <Denise.Edwards@nrc.gov>; Harrington, Holly <Holly.Harrington@nrc.gov>  
**Subject:** RE: Questions from CI \*SENSITIVE INFO\*

FB page? Do we still have the Blog? The NAECP? The Allegation Program itself, does not have such a spot.

---

**From:** Checkle, Melanie <[Melanie.Checkle@nrc.gov](mailto:Melanie.Checkle@nrc.gov)>  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 14, 2021 9:22 AM  
**To:** Jarriel, Lisamarie <[Lisamarie.Jarriel@nrc.gov](mailto:Lisamarie.Jarriel@nrc.gov)>; Mendez, Sandra <[Sandra.Mendez-Gonzalez@nrc.gov](mailto:Sandra.Mendez-Gonzalez@nrc.gov)>  
**Cc:** Edwards, Denise <[Denise.Edwards@nrc.gov](mailto:Denise.Edwards@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** Questions from CI \*SENSITIVE INFO\*

Good morning ladies. I have a CI requesting that we add "a process or platform for an individual to anonymously share their allegation experience (OE) with others in the industry." Other than passing on the request to you guys, is there any other suggestions on how to respond to him? Is

there a formal process for a member of the public to provide feedback on the allegation process?

As for question #2 below, I intend to inform the individual that our requirement is that licensee's post NRC Form 3 which advises of DOL filing requirements, etc. Do you know of any GET CFR requirements regarding filing discrimination complaints with the NRC?

Thanks in advance,

Melanie

---

**From:** (b)(6)  
**Sent:** Monday, September 13, 2021 6:18 PM  
**To:** Checkle, Melanie <[Melanie.Checkle@nrc.gov](mailto:Melanie.Checkle@nrc.gov)>  
**Subject:** [External\_Sender] RE: [External\_Sender]

1. How can we get that added? I've learned an awful lot going through the allegation process. Real actual OE from people who have gone through the process goes a long way. In the nuclear power field we share industry OE so others learn from their mistakes and don't make the same mistake all over again.
2. How can we get the Licensee's to update their Generic Employee Training (GET)? Employers give employees a false sense of security by telling them that they can always go to the NRC with their concerns. Conveniently leaving out the fact that the NRC can not provide you a personal remedy if your Employer retaliates against you. Employees need to ask themselves, Is it worth the risk of bringing up the concern if you could possibly lose your livelihood? The NRC does not work for the License and therefore has an added barrier against retaliation.

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows

---

**From:** [Checkle, Melanie](#)  
**Sent:** Monday, September 13, 2021 8:55 AM  
**To:** (b)(6)  
**Subject:** RE: [External\_Sender]

(b)(6) the NRC does not have a process or platform for individuals to anonymously share their allegation experience (OE) with others in the industry. Thanks.

*Melanie M. Checkle*

Senior Allegation Coordinator

Enforcement and Investigation Coordination Staff

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

📞W: 404.997.4426 | 📠F: 404.997.4903 | ✉E: [melanie.checkle@nrc.gov](mailto:melanie.checkle@nrc.gov)

\*Please be advised that the NRC cannot protect the information during transmission on the Internet and there is a possibility that someone could read your response while it is in transit.\*

---

**From:** (b)(6)  
**Sent:** Thursday, September 09, 2021 9:07 AM

**To:** Checkle, Melanie <[Melanie.Checkle@nrc.gov](mailto:Melanie.Checkle@nrc.gov)>

**Subject:** [External\_Sender]

Does the NRC have a process or platform for an individual to anonymously share their allegation experience (OE) with others in the industry? Licensee employee's with allegations or safety concerns do not need to lose sight of who they work for and who pays their salaries. The nuclear power industry is a business. They are in the business to make a profit. NRC representatives do not work for the licensee and therefore are some what shielded from direct retaliation. Individuals need to know that even though the NRC enforces the licensee to promote a Safety Conscious Work Environment (SCWE), they can not protect them from retaliation by their employer.