

From: David Vito *RT*
To: [REDACTED] *7C*
Date: 4/5/05 1:54PM
Subject: PSEG letter

Attached in Word Perfect, and text copied below.

April 5, 2005

Mr. William Levis RI-2003-A-0110
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
PSEG Nuclear LLC - N09
P. O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: NRC OFFICE OF INVESTIGATIONS CASE NOS. 1-2003-045 AND [REDACTED] *7C*

Dear Mr. Levis:

The Region I Field Office of the NRC Office of Investigations (OI) initiated an investigation on September 8, 2003 (Case No. 1-2003-045) to determine whether a former Principal Organizational Development Specialist at Salem/Hope Creek was subjected to discrimination. Specifically, the former Principal Organizational Development Specialist claimed that her position was eliminated and last day of work moved up from April 16, 2003 to March 28, 2003, by a former Chief Nuclear Officer (CNO) for having raised safety conscious work environment issues and other safety concerns to the former CNO and the Chairman of the Board. Based on the results of the OI investigation, the NRC has concluded that there was insufficient evidence to demonstrate that the former CNO eliminated this individual's position or moved up her last day of work because of engagement in NRC protected activity.

With respect to the elimination of the Principal Organizational Development Specialist's position, the evidence indicated that the individual took the assignment voluntarily with the understanding that there were no guarantees that the assignment would extend beyond 2002, and that the former CNO's decision to eliminate the position was based on budgetary reasons. With respect to moving up this individual's last day of work, the evidence indicated that the decision was made by Corporate Human Resources (HR) personnel, who instructed the Senior HR Client Consultant to deliver the message to the individual on March 18, 2003. However, due to work schedule conflicts on the part of the Senior HR Client Consultant, the individual was not informed until March 24, 2003. OI was unable to elicit any testimony or obtain any relevant documentation to show that the HR personnel involved in this decision were aware that she had raised safety concerns.

