

**CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP
MEETING MINUTES**

6 people 2 hours

DATE:	11/14/02	Attendees				
START/END TIMES:	2:00 p.m. – 4:00 p.m.	D. Garchow	J. Carlin	T. O'Connor	D. Jackson	D. Burgin
LOCATION:	Salem Lobby Conf. Room	N. Bergh	M. Moncourtois	T. Straub	E. Wobensmith	P. Quick
QUORUM REACHED:	Yes	M. Shaffer	S. Harvey	J. O'Connor	G. Cranfield	K. Harvin
MEETING MINUTES APPROVED BY:		C. Knaub	K. O'Hare	B. Henriksen	R. Gogola	B. Sebastian
		G. Nagy	A. Lloyd			

DISCUSSION	REQUIRED ACTIONS	RESP.	DUE DATE
NOTE: As of 11/14/02 meeting, a notification number will appear in the minutes for every action item, per Dave Garchow.			
<p>Change Management: 08/15/02: Jim Reid suggested going to the TRGs with information on how to implement the process, and put it into TQ-900. Other areas discussed for implementation were the Power Leadership Excellence Course and the Leadership Academy. Don Callahan said the new hire list might be another area to consider, so that all classes are affected. Brian Sebastian summarized that superintendents and above should have the full training, and the supervisors and below should just have the overview.</p>	<p>Roll out in TRGs the Change Management Process and get it incorporated</p>	<p>TRG Chairs</p>	<p>Next TRG Meeting</p>
<p>Industrial Safety Training Program: John Byrne provided the group a handout on the program, stating that the procedure has all the links required, and was patterned after Entergy's model for their Industrial Safety and human simulator. Tim O'Connor asked if training is defined as standard exams, etc., much like an elaborate training program. John said it was not, because it would be made up of classroom presentation and hands-on activities; OSHA runs it this way. Tim then asked if it is part of accredited training. Jim Reid responded that in Operations Training, it is identified in procedures. However, John clarified that the Industrial Safety program is geared to OSHA standards, not INPO standards. Dave Garchow added that at other sites, it is linked to access in annual requalification training.</p>	<p>Training to take lead on logistics as to how to roll out and make effective use of instructors</p> <p>Industrial Safety Training Program to start, for a duration of three months</p>	<p>Training Management</p> <p>John Byrne</p>	<p>Next CPIG Meeting</p> <p>1/06/03</p>

B-196

CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP MEETING MINUTES

<p>QA Report Out</p> <p>Business Acumen Discussion Item: Neil Bergh referenced knowledge of business and accounting principles at the first-line and supervisor level—these employees may not have a good sense of the money it costs to do business here in Nuclear. Fundamental concepts of reduction in earnings, for example, need to be rolled out and effectively communicated by the first-line supervisors to the workers so they can have a better understanding.</p> <p>Carl Fricker stated he thought it was a good idea, and suggested a workplace brainstorming session would be good. Dave Garchow suggested it could be called Financial Appreciation Day, and the worker could get involved with the presentation itself. Neil said he would take the lead on it, with the help of Carl and John Byrne. Tim O'Connor asked what the takeaway would be and Jim Reid suggested that at the Leadership Alignment Meeting, the presentation could be rolled out to the managers, and they in turn could roll it out to the workers.</p> <p>QA Issues:</p> <p><u>11/14/02</u> Neil Bergh distributed a handout concerning CAs. In reference to the top three issues listed in his handout, he said he hears from supervisors that they don't have the time to be in the field. Why? They are out there because they are directed to do it. He said some supervisors have the fundamental ability to address the performance issue, which is good; others do not have this ability. Tim O'Connor asked why it is limited to just supervisors. Neil replied that management behaviors are within procedures and process adherence. We all have a tolerance to bump or push something in the T-12 process in hopes of correcting the problem later.</p> <p>Dave Garchow said there is a leadership problem. Tim O'Connor said it's an avoidance problem, and asked, "What's the solution? Why bring it here? Can someone here help?" Neil replied that in the area of coaching and mentoring, management could help. They need to understand why a particular supervisor can't fix the problem. Don Jackson said that in the Leadership Academy, there's a difference with a talking head telling you how to improve—but in the field, it would be better to have a systematic way to indicate coaching opportunities.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">CPIG to take over ownership of the financial presentation in the Performance Process</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Neil Bergh, Carl Fricker, and John Byrne</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Next CPIG Meeting</p>
---	--	--	---

**CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP
MEETING MINUTES**

<p>QA Issues (Continued):</p> <p>11/14/02</p> <p>Neil said there are mockups in the Processing Center—they are trying to develop ways to help others be successful. Mark Moncourtois said that in the outage, cleanliness and FME were issues. QA would tell supervisors, and the supervisors would say tell the workers. The right spirit is to talk to folks to explain, rather than issue a directive—it's more effective. Tim O'Connor said QA always follows up. Neil mentioned Generic Letter 91-18, referencing resolution of degraded and nonconforming conditions. John O'Connor said he would go to the next Engineering TRG and analyze if this is a training issue or not. The Operations TRG will do the same thing.</p> <p>Bob Henriksen referenced the last page, second to last bullet, of Neil Bergh's handout—"More focus on short-term fixes than long-term fixes"—and said that the focus should be on looking at individual events—the last time we had the event, and the time after that.</p>	<p align="center">Engineering and Operations TRGs to analyze Generic Letter 91-18 for possible training issues</p>	<p align="center">Engineering and Operations TRG Chairs</p>	<p align="center">Ongoing / Next CPIG Meeting</p>
---	---	--	--

**CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP
MEETING MINUTES**

<p>Human Performance Report Out:</p> <p>Kevin O'Hare provided a handout on human performance improvement. On the board, he wrote: "In the end, there's an easy way, and there's a hard way." Kevin had the attendees repeat these words throughout his presentation, whenever he was making the point that there are two ways to go in solving problems: the easy way or the hard way. For instance, Kevin pointed out the GEMS Distribution page of his handout, and said we are doing a better job of coding.</p> <p>Tim O'Connor supplied a "Defense-in-Depth" slide, which showed the protective barriers against events. Mark Shaffer said having multiple barriers surrounding you in doing your job helps prevent errors. Tim asked if the errors have gone down in Operations in the last two years, and Mark replied that they had. Tim then said that is what human performance is all about—checks and balances in the system, so if somebody has a bad day, it doesn't lead to an event.</p> <p>Tim O'Connor then described four recent events (Maintenance issues) in the last two weeks and said we don't understand human performance at the point of contact—if we did, there would be no events. Tim then said that NAP-I does not say there should be a procedure at the job site (i.e., PORV that could have been another TMI event). Standards should have been a CAT-I, as it is in Operations. In reference to Training, Tim said there was an issue of a qualified worker and an unqualified worker on the job—the unqualified worker signed off on the job. In the area of job standards, the standards are just not there (i.e., we did not put a washer in the valve—the washer was a very large one and should not have been overlooked). There were no pre-job briefs; there were communications breakdowns in the areas of logs, turnover, package documents, notifications, schedules; and supervisory oversight was not there at all. Worker experience involving STAR, peer checks, self-checking, and independent checks were not there. Tim then said it was important to work on this chart and make it the focus of human performance. He said that Training is the #2 barrier in the defense box structure of the slide. He asked if OJT/OJE were driven this way, and the answer was no.</p> <p>John Carlin said to ask yourself what is it you are really looking at. What are all the things that are the soft skills? We need to get the right people involved in this effort.</p>	<p>Using the Defense-in-depth slide, make it the focus of human performance</p>	<p>Tmg. Manager, Ops. Director, Maint. Director</p>	<p>Ongoing</p>
--	---	---	----------------

**CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP
MEETING MINUTES**

<p>Report Out</p> <p><u>Maintenance and Technical CSE Review:</u> Earl Wobensmith provided an overview of how the Technical CSE was evaluated against the new ACAD objectives. Three strengths were identified: 1) cross-training between Operations, Engineering, and Maintenance on troubleshooting scenario; 2) use of stamping training materials, "Must be Observed by Management;" and 3) Knowledge and SME benefit using adjunct instructors.</p> <p>Dave Garchow asked why we did not stamp training materials before, and Earl responded that we did not have it in our program descriptions. It was determined that the ITRG will evaluate the possibility of putting this into the program descriptions. Don Jackson reiterated that the ASER is based on the time frame up to its presentation to the Board, and this CSE will be a part of the next Accreditation Board Meeting; we'll be judged on how we fixed it.</p> <p>Earl then went on to discuss the four findings associated with the CSE: Obj. 1: Human Performance of station personnel and ability to identify problems with equipment, etc. Obj. 2: Management lacks accountability. Obj. 5: Weaknesses in OJE process. Obj. 6: Lack of management observations.</p> <p>Tim O'Connor stated the finding says management does not get it. Earl said it says management does not think it is important and blows it off. Don Jackson stated he has not held people accountable. Tim then said the CPIG is responsible for it. Dave Garchow said he has data on who is not doing it. He then stated that it is hard to accept the reason someone does not do something is because there is not a good process in place to catch someone.</p> <p>Kymn Harvin said it sounds like Earl is saying everyone else is at fault except Earl—he should have noticed this and asked the managers why it was occurring. Tim O'Connor stated that Earl was a little kind in his presentation—Tim would have taken a much harder approach. If someone had come in today, we would be shot. John Carlin said the people in this room are not doing their job—it has placed us in a position that a large part of our business is at risk. Bob Henriksen said that ineffective CAs (Obj. 6) is a killer. He cautioned that we do not force it by mandating numbers—we need to find out why we do not think training is available.</p>	<p>Evaluate incorporating stamping of materials into training program descriptions</p>	<p>ITRG Chair</p>	<p>Next CPIG Meeting</p>
---	--	-------------------	--------------------------

**CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP
MEETING MINUTES**

<p>CPIG Charter Review (Continued): <u>11/14/02:</u> John Carlin asked what the real purpose of the CPIG is. He said we are to produce results: 1) provide information; 2) revise information; and 3) make decisions. He said there will not be any tourists at this meeting anymore.</p>	<p>Discuss how to perform at the CPIG</p>	<p>Kevin O'Hare, Neil Bergh, Kymn Harvin</p>	<p>Next CPIG Meeting</p>
<p>ERO Qualifications/Training to be Scheduled During Annual GET</p> <p>It was determined that it would be appropriate to do the ERO quals on an annual basis in tandem with Annual GET. Ted Straub mentioned that to tie the ERO quals back to Badging has cost involved, but it can be worked out. D. Callahan mentioned that TQ-900 just got signed, and will be issued after the July 4 holiday. There were two main changes: Limited SRO and Maintenance Chiefs. NAP-14 Forms call for a six-month window to review personnel and then put forms back into the system.</p>	<p>Roll out to the TRGs that ERO Quals should be incorporated into the Continuing Training Program</p>	<p>TRG Chairs</p>	<p>Next TRG Meeting</p>

**CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP
MEETING MINUTES**

QA Report on Common Site Issues (8/15/02)

John Halstead reported on focused observations of the Work Management and walkdown process. He gave the example of the RCIC Window, which occurred the week of 8/5/02 that resulted in a failure to follow the WMAP-1 procedure. John stated that this procedure does not get the same reverence as the others, and gave the example of the RCIC, where Form 5 needed to be completed in order to take the job out, and was not. The job went past T-5 to T-4, even though the work was on hold. John stated that there were four occasions of failure of procedure compliance in accordance with WMAP-1.

Dave Garchow indicated that this same issue was discussed at the morning meeting in regard to Kenda Knight's TARP. Dave challenged the management team on this, stating that we do not have the authority to violate WMAP.

Terry Cellmer brought up the conflict the worker may be experiencing – which has the higher priority—follow the process or get the work done? This seems to be the workers' thought process. Don Jackson stated that the TRGs are functioning on the premise that whenever performance issues arise, there is zero tolerance for not following procedures.

Mike Dammann stated that this has nothing to do with training. Kevin O'Hare said there might be some value in having TRGs review WMAP compliance. John Halstead said that Kevin made a good point. At present, it is difficult for someone to know if deletions or changes have been made to the procedure, since it is huge to begin with. It would be helpful to have a users' review of WMAP. Dave Garchow said there are presently teams of people reviewing T5's, T4's, etc. Mike Dammann made the observation that it appears there is a lack of working together interdepartmentally.

Jim Webster stated it seems we are hung up on accountability. In the environment where we are trained, we follow procedures; i.e., operators. He asked where the accountability lies at T5 to say we aren't ready? Who has ownership of the process at that point? The people who manage the process need to be trained on the process.

CONTINUOUS PERFORMANCE IMPROVEMENT GROUP MEETING MINUTES

Partnership portfolio training in progress
Developed schedule for 2001 initial and requal MARC training
2-year plan for Salem & Operations TRG charter created
Feedback to Don Jackson on TRG findings template, template developed and distributed to TRG chairs
Sent CSE out to VPs
New hire package and CD sent to VPs and CNO
Updated 1.0 b of agenda to read "The CPIG is chaired by the Vice President – Operations and any Vice President"
Updated 3.0 e of agenda to read "Identify how we are improving our performance through training"
Discussed at Management TRG on how to guide training
Reviewed notification of Root Cause Evaluation to see where training is needed
Reviewed and approved EP TRG
Reviewed training and procedures on valve testing; task analysis complete
New Performance Indicator forms provided to each Discipline
Human Performance actions (D. Jackson, P. Jones, all TRGs) deleted; given new actions 2/28/02
Incorporate management expectations and standards evolved into Defense In Depth training
Performance Indicator grading sheets and forms have been replaced with new PIs
Met and discussed how to incorporate Station Event-Free Clock Human Performance Guidelines