

Allegation No.: RI-2001-A-0132
Site/Facility: Hope Creek
ARB Date: November 28, 2001

Branch Chief (AOC): W. Cook
Acknowledged: No
Confidentiality Granted: No

Issue discussed:

Based upon a telephone call with the alleged, the resident inspector understood the individual to have the following three concerns:

1. Bartlett was providing individuals qualified as deconners to work as Senior HP technicians during the Hope Creek refueling outage in October 2001.

2. Allegor believes that he was abused and has been blacklisted by PSEG because he is a [REDACTED] He was denied access to the Hope Creek site for the recent refueling outage although he was contracted to work the outage for Bartlett. He does not want to work at Hope Creek now, but wants to be taken off of the industry "blacklist" because in his words: he is an American citizen, he loves this country [REDACTED] E4
7C

3. An American living in Norway was contracted by Bartlett and granted access to the Hope Creek outage (worked the Turbine Hall at night) without ever having worked in a nuclear plant before. He had no access problems. The American was granted access within seven days, but alleged still has not been processed.

Allegor contacted prior to referral to licensee (if applicable)? _____

ALLEGATION REVIEW BOARD DECISIONS

Attendees: Chair - Blough Branch Chief(AOC) - Cook SAC - Vito
OI Rep. - Monroe RI Counsel - _____ Others - GSmith, Crlenjak

DISPOSITION ACTIONS: (List actions for processing and closure. Note responsible person(s), form of action closure document(s), and estimated completion dates.)

- 1) Acknowledgment letter to individual - inform alleged that Concerns 2 and 3 are not within NRC purview.

Responsible Person: SAC
Closure Documentation: _____

ECD: 12/21/2001
Completed: _____

- 2) Refer the first concern to the licensee. DRP to provide words for Enclosure 1 to referral letter.

Responsible Person: Meyer
Closure Documentation: _____

ECD: 12/21/01
Completed: _____

- 3) Review licensee response within 30 days of receipt and provide response to alleged. R-10

Responsible Person: Meyer
Closure Documentation: _____

ECD: 2/15/02
Completed: _____

information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions 7C
FOIA- 2004-314

ARB MINUTES ARE REVIEWED AND APPROVED AT THE ARB

SAFETY SIGNIFICANCE ASSESSMENT: Safety significance is minimal, based upon concern being historic in nature. Any radiological problems, with respect to inadequate RP technician coverage, would have likely surfaced earlier during the outage and have been addressed via the licensee's CAP.

PRIORITY OF OI INVESTIGATION:

If potential discrimination or wrongdoing and OI is not opening a case, provide rationale here (e.g., no prima facie, lack of specific indication of wrongdoing):

Rationale used to defer OI discrimination case (DOL case in progress):

ENFORCEMENT STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS CONSIDERATION (only applies to wrongdoing matters (including discrimination issues) that are under investigation by OI, DOL, or DOJ):

What is the potential violation and regulatory requirement? _____

When did the potential violation occur? _____

(Assign action to determine date, if unknown)

Once date of potential violation is established, SAC will assign AMS action to have another ARB at four (4) years from that date, to discuss enforcement statute of limitations issues.

NOTES: (Include other pertinent comments. Also include considerations related to licensee referral, if appropriate. Identify any potential generic issues) _____

Distribution: Panel Attendees, Regional Counsel, OI, Responsible Individuals (original to SAC)