

From: Daniel Holody, RI
To: Jeffrey Teator
Date: 6/22/04 7:47AM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Remarks of June 16

Jeff - Please begin forwarding anything on Branch 3 to Gene Cobey - he is taking over as permanent Branch Chief around July 1 - Also, since I am on leave most of this week (today is the last day I will be here this week), he is also acting for me this week

thx'

dan

>>> Jeffrey Teator 06/22/04 07:26AM >>>

Dan, fyi - I interviewed [REDACTED] as part of the H&I investigation. jeff

>>> Daniel Holody 06/18/04 04:03PM >>>

Dave

Keith Heator, DRP, is completing paperwork now to provide to the docket room to have the remarks scanned into ADAMS

dan

>>> David Vito 06/18/04 01:54PM >>>

Randy B., Dan H., Anne P. Jeff T., et. al.,

Please see the attached "revised" remarks from the alleged's speech on Wednesday night. This version is slightly different than the handout she provided on 6/16/04, because she told me that she has added as many of her ad-libbed remarks as she could remember. She has no problems with the NRC placing this into ADAMS.

I also spoke with her about her comment on Wednesday night re: the alleged "untruths" that have been told, and are still being told, by PSEG about the corporate input to "production vs. safety pressure" with regard to site activities. I asked her if there were any statements, or specific incidents, other than those she has already referred to us, that we should know about. She didn't really have any other specific comments/incidents to tell me about, but instead provided a list of names of people we should interview, noting that "if they tell the truth," it will shed much light on the corporate pressure toward "production over safety" and "non-conservative decision making". The names she provided were [REDACTED] (after interviewing [REDACTED] next Thursday, we will have interviewed 6 of the 11 individuals named). Having heard her opinions about many of the individuals she named in prior discussions, I asked her if she really thought these people would admit that they were pressured by corporate to make a non-conservative decision, or that others had been. She indicated that we are the government and need to be very strong in our questioning of them. I told her that I believe we do make our best effort at getting the people we interview to be candid, but that if someone doesn't want to admit something, there is not much we can do. All we can do is look at the information gathered, and render a conclusion based on that information.

She also has some additional suggestions for enabling us to get to the "corporate pressure" issue:

She indicated that every two weeks while she was there, there was a video conference between [REDACTED] [REDACTED]. She didn't know if these meetings were audio or video recorded, but that if they [REDACTED] information in this record was deleted

in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions 7C
FOIA- 2005-194

7C
T-182

were, they would provide us with invaluable information in this area. She also noted that it might be possible that we could derive information for the Board of Directors meeting minutes. She wasn't sure if we could get our hands on this documentation, but indicated that she may be able to obtain it as part of the discovery process for her lawsuit.

She also suggested that, if possible, we should try to get a hold of the first draft version of [REDACTED] IAT report. She indicated that, from her experience, first versions of such reports are often more candid and revealing than the final versions, which are always polished to take out "purple words" - as she referred to them.

At the end of the call, she informed me that she was going to be calling [REDACTED] this evening to ask him "if he agreed to be the scapegoat" (for the rest of PSEG management on this issue).

As you can see from her commentary, she is still very interested in the corporate pressure issue, and proving she was correct.

CC: David Vito; Ernest Wilson; Eugene Cobey

7C