

~~THIS DOCUMENT IDENTIFIES
AN ALLEGER~~

Date Received: August 23, 2002
 Received via: ☒ In-person

Allegation No.: RI-2002-A-0113

Employee Receiving Allegation or suspecting wrongdoing (first two initials and last name): J G Schoppy

Source of information (please check one box): ☒ licensee employee ☒

Alleger Name: []
 Home Phone: []

Home Address: []
 City/State/Zip: []

Alleger's Employer: ☒ PSEG Nuclear

Alleger's Position/Title: []

Facility: Salem/Hope Creek

Docket No. or License No.: 50/272, 50/311, 50/354

Was alleger informed of NRC identity protection policy?

Yes ☒ No ☐

If H&I was alleged, was alleger informed of DOL rights?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

If a licensee employee or contractor,

did they raise the issue to their management and/or ECP?

Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A ☐

Does the alleger object to referral of issues to the licensee?

Yes ☒ No ☐

Provide alleger's direct response to this question verbatim on the line below:

"I'd prefer waiting until I have a chance to talk to the QA Director and ECP before I determine if I would like the NRC to follow-up on site."

Was confidentiality requested?

Yes ☐ No ☒

Was confidentiality initially granted?

Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A ☒

Individual Granting Confidentiality: N/A

Criteria for determining whether the issue is an allegation:

Is it a declaration, statement, or assertion of impropriety or inadequacy?

Yes

Is the impropriety or inadequacy associated with NRC regulated activities?

Yes

Is the validity of the issue unknown?

Yes

If No to any of the above questions, the issue is not an allegation and should be handled by other appropriate methods (e.g. as a request for information, public responsiveness matter, or an OSHA referral).

Allegation Summary:

- [1] Potential violation of 50.7, Employee Protection, in that the alleger was discriminated against for raising safety concerns through the corrective action process.

Functional Area: ☒ Power Reactor

Discipline for each concern: [1] Discrimination

Information in this record was deleted
 in accordance with the Freedom of Information
 Act, exemptions b7c
 FOIA- 2004-0191

~~THIS DOCUMENT IDENTIFIES
AN ALLEGER~~

Porton's Ex 7c

F/20

The alleged stated that the week of July 1, 2002, [redacted] was informed via email that [redacted] was placed on the Transient Assessment Response Plan (TARP) callout list for D TARP weeks. The alleged reviewed the TARP procedure (SH.OP-AP.ZZ-0101), determined that in [redacted] opinion [redacted] was not qualified to be a TARP team member, and informed [redacted] supervisor [redacted] of such. When [redacted] did not receive satisfaction from his supervisor, the alleged took [redacted] concern to the next level of management - the Engineering Programs Manager [redacted]. The alleged outlined for [redacted] the many aspects of the TARP procedure that they were apparently not meeting. According to the alleged, [redacted] agreed that they do not follow the guidance as written, requested that the alleged document this issue in their corrective action process, and removed the alleged from the TARP callout list on July 21. The alleged initiated corrective action notification on [redacted]

On August 5, [REDACTED] completed the evaluation of notification ([REDACTED]) (evaluation [REDACTED]) and determined that all procedure sections were being followed. On August 9, the alleged's supervisor threw the completed evaluation on the alleged's desk and asked the alleged what [REDACTED] decision was. The alleged stated that [REDACTED] didn't understand what [REDACTED] supervisor was referring to and asked [REDACTED] supervisor for time to review the evaluation. According to the alleged, a low volume verbal confrontation ensued for approximately two minutes. The supervisor suddenly blurted out "that's it, you're out of here" and proceeded to escort the alleged off site. [The alleged stated that [REDACTED] had later informed [REDACTED] that [REDACTED]]

the alleged could not access the protected area and discovered that [redacted] had been administratively removed from site (access denied through security). Subsequently on [redacted], the alleged met with [redacted] supervisor and Bob Settle, Engineering Supervisor - Spare Parts Engineering, to discuss the alleged's performance. The alleged stated that [redacted] supervisor told [redacted] that failure to join the TARP team could result in actions up to and including termination. The alleged stated that [redacted] told [redacted] supervisor that [redacted] felt discriminated against for raising the TARP team issue and that [redacted] felt that the experience had a chilling effect on [redacted] but that [redacted] would do whatever they wanted. At this point, the supervisor told [redacted] was suspended but quickly recanted it. The supervisor went on to say "you can come back, you'll be on the D TARP team, but no more railing about safety indicators [redacted] no slamming management, just smile and be happy." The alleged agreed but was upset by this encounter and definitely felt "chilled." The alleged does not feel comfortable discussing the issue with [redacted] management for fear of losing [redacted] job [a good performer for [redacted] according to the alleged].

During the discussion with the resident, the alleged stated that [REDACTED] planned to discuss the issue with the QA Director and the ECP. The alleged stated that [REDACTED] prefer if we (NBC) did not follow up on site until [REDACTED] gave QA and the ECP a chance to help [REDACTED] resolve the issue. [REDACTED] issue is not so much with [REDACTED] being made to participate as a TARP team member, but how [REDACTED] was treated for bringing up the procedure compliance issue.

Portions 7C