

SURVEY COMMENTS

▲ Culture ▲ Employee Concerns Program ▲ Management ▲ Corrective Action Program

▲	When Performance Partnership appraisals are down graded and raises are negatively impacted because concerns over violations of procedure are expressed, one learns to keep the concerns to one's self.
▲	This organization needs much help. There is little help here and morale is low. People are lied to and the liars are running scared. Everyone is so afraid of losing their job that they are afraid to do their jobs. This is a bad condition and we all need to help improve it. We need security to do this.
▲	Our biggest problem continues to be follow-through. We are very good at root cause analysis. We are not good at timely and appropriate implementation of corrective actions. Some of our processes are not working well, budget, work planning/scheduling, and document control. Change is good; change for the sake of change is stupid.
▲	Our biggest problem with our Safety Conscious Work Environment is looking out for each other. Everyday I find at least one person who is not wearing safety glasses in an area where they are required. Why has no one else noticed? Especially if they are working with other people. The worst part of it is seldom does that person appreciate me looking out for their safety. The newest of the Health & Safety Administrators is getting more involved. This is a good thing and in the long run will improve our safety culture. Get more managers, superintendents and directors out in the plant. Workers need to see upper management is involved and concerned with the real world.
▲ ▲	There is a growing amount of finger pointing & managing by intimidation in the MAST environment with upper management.
▲ ▲	I am not afraid to raise issue to my department management, but I am afraid of senior management's response to these issues. There is a "blame the messenger" culture developing. I am afraid for repercussions on my department manager as well as myself.
▲ ▲	Management states they are concerned about safety, but their action, or inaction, doesn't always support their statements. We have a joke that states, "safety is our number one priority as long as it doesn't cost the company any money".
▲ ▲	Sometimes management expresses their safety concerns, but I do not feel they always want you to do what they say. I feel there is a "don't ask don't tell" attitude.
▲ ▲	I believe that what management states to the group and then what is stated to the individual are two sides of the coin. As a group, safety is priority one; as an individual, if you can get the job done faster to get production back quicker, then do it (just don't get caught).
▲ ▲	I believe that upper management is more concerned with #'s and \$'s than they are with the people, and it shows in the attitudes and morale of the employees.
▲ ▲	Not only has safety went away in the past five years, a policy of reverse discrimination now has taken over.
▲ ▲	Too many levels of management. Only qualification is to be a "good ol' boy" from another plant. Concerns never make it to the top because it looks like one of the many levels of management didn't do their job. Been here 18 years and never saw it this bad.
▲ ▲	I think our numbers speak for themselves. The OSHA reportable rate and the CAP program have yet to fix, resolve, or improve safety.
▲ ▲	Management makes decisions on who you are and what your level is. They don't take family life in consideration; it's only about the plants running. Do for some & not others. Retaliation comes and don't realize it until stressed out. Work directly with one supervisor, but not the supervisor who writes appraisals. Appraisals are not handled in timely manner. Supervisor doesn't follow through procedures and policies.
▲ ▲	While I believe most of management is open to frank discussion of safety & quality concerns, I also believe that the discussion may result in reprisals from some management personnel. With the current emphasis on EPS & budgets, I can't imagine raising a concern that may result in a shutdown without significant badgering by managers & VPs. I also don't believe raising issues will result in promotional opportunities.
▲ ▲	Company states one thing, but practices another. I.E. be safe, but get it done ASAP! In our department, the superintendent threatens the first line supervisors in front of the union. These are just two of the

B-219¹

1st Quarter 2003 & 4th Quarter 2002

	many problems in our dept.
▲ ▲	Not all issues are appreciated, sometimes holding management to the standards they have written, makes their lives more difficult and then the worker is a trouble maker.
▲ ▲	Production, production, production
▲ ▲	My major concern with CAP is that corrective actions identified to resolve issues & prevent recurrence are not carried out to completion. I feel this is due to lack of proper prioritization and lack of commitment of resources (e.g. people & time) to complete the required actions. Also, assignments of evaluations (e.g., for identified issues) still tends to be done as a punitive measure vs. assignment to the person/organization that can best evaluate & correct the issue, thus, ineffective corrective actions result.
▲ ▲	I think that we ask folks to use the corrective action system so much that they use it to their benefit as a faceless person (i.e., don't need to look someone to throw a rock) to get a political agenda item done. The volume becomes so high that we do not do the research to effectively prioritize and resolve issues.
▲ ▲	We have focused on age and quantity vs. effectiveness of corrective actions over the past several years.
▲ ▲	I feel free to report concerns; however, the enormous workload prevents performing an effective and thorough resolution of quality issues. Many times, a deadline on completing a project takes precedence over quality. The constant emergent problems where a lot of people are thrown into round the clock coverage adds to the backlog.
▲ ▲ ▲	I've been subjected to harassment by my peers, lost financial incentives, and been overlooked for promotion. All for identifying a problem, which we corrected the week after I raised the concern. After several years, I'm still subjected to this. #1-I'm still paying for something from years ago, for raising a concern which I was correct about and we stopped doing it! #4- Depends who? #5-I've been singled out for bringing up concerns more than once! #11-What's communicated and wanted are opposite. #13-Only if it's not too inconveniencing. #14-Either to correct or make an example out of someone. #15-I've been continually harassed for years.
▲ ▲ ▲	#7 EC thoroughly investigates, but they do not resolve issues, they leave it to the management to fix and they (management) don't. #15 Among my peers, there is a definite feeling of intimidation from upper management about bringing concerns.
▲ ▲ ▲	I feel that management's tolerance of employees' concerns is directly proportional to cost.
▲ ▲ ▲	There is no safety enforcement. There is not a safety culture. There is no confidentiality in reporting anything, and retaliation is thorough and well directed from the top down in the nuclear organization. The only way to correct this would be to remove many managers and implement a complete re-education program. A daunting and expensive venture in any organization, but especially so here. I simply mentioned that I had concerns to the employee concerns rep and shortly thereafter there were too many pointed questions and accusations thereafter.
▲ ▲ ▲	I do not believe we do a very good job of effectively resolving root causes. In addition, we don't implement the corrective actions in a timely manner. We've got to do better.
▲ ▲ ▲	Look at notification 20117049.
▲ ▲ ▲	I feel that it is all right to raise a concern as long as it does not jeopardize production, PIs, the Manager/Supt's assessments, or departmental standing. Typically when the outage mode safety is not the primary concern. As a matter of fact, just look at the backlog and see how many "safety" items are unresolved. People have been fired for making mistakes. Why would you bring something up if you thought you would be fired? Supervisors, 1st line, are simple.
▲ ▲ ▲	The effectiveness of corrective actions and the ability to find and fix the true root cause is marginal.
▲ ▲ ▲	Issues take to long to fix after identification. SAP is still not used widely and sometimes not efficient. Safety concerns are taken into account on most issues.
▲ ▲ ▲ ▲	I feel that my management puts productivity in front of safety and uses "safety first" as a PR Campaign.
▲ ▲ ▲ ▲	We are getting better, I do believe!
▲ ▲ ▲ ▲	This organization has developed a culture that discourages the reporting of issues. Instead of just writing a notification to identify a problem, the identifier must contact people who may be involved first. This often results in overt or tacit intimidation to not report the issue. This appears to have become an unwritten management expectation since many of us are uncertain of our employment in the current business environment, the practice results in under reporting of issues.
▲ ▲ ▲ ▲	I feel that the process that are in place have come a long way and really seem to be working. As we move forward, I believe these processes will help us to reach the 2nd quartile.

1st Quarter 2003 & 4th Quarter 2002

▲▲▲▲	When a person raises a concern, he himself becomes responsible for solving it. This causes more work for him and his regular work gets delayed. This phenomenon discourages problem identification.
▲▲▲▲	We have a very safety conscious work environment. It is overdone... Relatively minor issues are inappropriately made a big deal with regulatory pressure this may be appropriate.
▲▲▲▲	This place sucks! Employee Concerns sucks!
▲▲▲▲	PS is not effective in totally resolving issues.
▲▲▲▲	Many of these questions I don't know the answer to.
▲▲▲▲	Being that I have just finished my training and reported to shift this week, it is difficult to give fair answers as I have little experience with many of these issues.
▲	The ECP is not effective & is only a tool to protect management, not the employee.
▲	I cannot honestly answer these questions since I have not had experience with Employee Concerns. I would only be answering questions based on hearsay from others and not personal experience.
▲	I do not believe employee Concerns is effective in the management of "personnel" issues. I have seen at least 3 incidents where it failed completely & also believe it is pro-management & this has been a proven fact. Would I go to EC with personnel issues - NO!
▲	ECP is window dressing only!
▲	I don't know much about the ECP.
▲▲	Does senior management really back the ECP if the staff has been eliminated from 3 to 1?
▲▲▲	Issues are usually thoroughly investigated, but resolutions are influenced by cost, DCPs, etc. Safety wise, things are better, but improvement is needed with management's involvement. Need a maintenance team assigned to safety issues. Chemistry area needs to be looked at. Many "work arounds" and equipment in need of repair. Need another maintenance team assigned.
▲	These questions are truly not geared to address upper managements' problems.
▲	If this company doesn't start up-grading equipment, store housing some parts, and listening to the workers & techs about problems here, we're all going to be out of a job. Take off the band-aids – WAKE UP!
▲	My opinion has changed over the last year. PSEG Nuclear staff generally lack experience at almost every critical position. Management does not meet ANSI minimum requirements. Senior Leadership takes actions that give mediocre near-term results and have no long term plan for improvement.
▲	#14 I have no info for/against. I've high confidence if one were brought it would be addressed promptly.
▲	#14 as long as it doesn't cost any money to fix the problem. Most of the 3's used would probably go to 2.5s if there was a column for "who knows".
▲	Management words on safety are fine, but not consistent with management actions and pressure to meet schedule. It is difficult, if not impossible, to meet the schedule and also meet all of the standards of performance.
▲	The fact that maintenance department is schedule driven and although they preach safety, they really don't care as long as the job gets done. I am unsure of management's expectations, they seem to change so much that every new manager has their own ideas on how things are done.
▲	#12 was marked as such due to the inappropriate treatment of a maintenance supervisor. How can a guy (supervisor) home in bed be held responsible for night shifts actions? If this is the case, why does the axe stop in his back? Why is the superintendent spared? Why not right up the ladder? They are as responsible as he is.
▲	The problems never change; the concerns I bring up to management never get fixed. Getting the job done on time is more important than safety. Any concerns that are brought up are never addressed. Same old thing.
▲▲	#15, I feel there is a lack of professionalism, not to the point that we are unsafe, but a climate of inapproachability among peers and resistance to questioning attitudes. People are ashamed to admit when they don't understand, others will harass when they ask. #16-20, I have never heard of "CAP".
▲▲	Supervisor actively discourages us from using CAP because it generates too much work. CAP is effective at PSEG, but I have zero confidence in its up to the level of my supervisor. My conclusions are that ability to report concerns depends on who you are and your rank, not what you know.
▲▲	Corrective Action Program is not being fully embraced by Maintenance & SWIM leadership. Repeated events indicate corrective actions are not effective as implemented.

1st Quarter 2003 & 4th Quarter 2002

▲	CAP is not effective or timely. Long-standing issues are not resolved in CAP.
▲	I don't believe adequate funds are allocated for CAP concerns to be corrected in a timely manner. We still have issues open since 1996-1997.
▲	S21: One 20-minute session on how to write a notification is not enough.
▲	The CAP program determines the action. Maintenance department and/or DEP funding prevents the action from being implemented! See 2CP99, high priority; parts on hand, failed due to lack of action.
▲	Ineffectiveness of CAP may only be a perception. There is zero feedback from CAP. There needs to be a feedback mechanism to ensure the initiator of a CR receives feedback regarding the evaluation. This should be prior to the evaluation being confirmed.
▲	I still do not have a lot of confidence in the SAP computer system. It has improved and I have gotten better at using it, but I still think there must be a better system/way available.
▲	In my opinion there is not enough time and energy spent teaching employees how to follow the CAP through SAP. The SAP portion of the CAP is not user friendly, therefore more educating is required. The old MMIS screens with three levels (names) of ownership at the conclusion to a response seemed more effective.
▲	The CAP itself is broken and ineffective.
▲	A notification written for a light fixture that had become detached from the ceiling took more than 1 year to resolve, even with follow-up calls. Another notification written for repairing a door latch to a security area took almost a year to resolve. Also I think the notification process is used for matters that could be resolved with a phone call in many cases.
▲	CAP is so complicated that feeding the system has become the goal vs. using the program to solve problems. The use of the apparent root causes for level 2's has proven not to be effective in resolving problems. The "apparents" should be labeled and either made Level 3 or get a full root cause.

1. As a nuclear worker, I am responsible for identifying problems and adverse conditions.
2. I believe a culture exists at PSEG Nuclear that is conducive to raising nuclear safety and quality concerns.
3. I believe that if my management had made a non-conservative decision, I could challenge that decision.
4. I feel free to approach management regarding any nuclear safety or quality concern.
5. I believe that I can raise any nuclear safety or quality concern without fear of retaliation.

6. I am familiar with the Employee Concerns Program.
7. I am confident that issues reported through the Employee Concerns Program are thoroughly investigated and appropriately resolved.
8. I believe that upper management supports the Employee Concerns Program.
9. I can use the Employee Concerns Program without fear of reprisal.
10. I believe that the Employee Concerns Program will maintain confidentiality of my concern at my request.

11. Management's expectations regarding safety and quality are clearly communicated.
12. Management's expectations are consistent with performance reviews, rewards, and discipline.
13. I believe that management wants employees to report concerns.
14. My management takes corrective actions on employee concerns brought to them.
15. I believe my work environment is generally professional and open (i.e. free of any harassment, intimidation, discrimination or retaliation).

16. Resolution of potential nuclear safety/nuclear quality issues including root cause and broader implications through the CAP is effective in our organization.
17. Identification of potential nuclear safety/nuclear quality issues through the Corrective Action Program (CAP) is effective in our organization.
18. I feel free to raise nuclear safety/nuclear quality concerns through the CAP without fear of reprisal.
19. I am confident that issues reported through the CAP are prioritized appropriately, thoroughly investigated and resolved in a timely manner.
20. The CAP is utilized effectively by PSEG Nuclear to resolve conditions adverse to quality in a timely manner.
21. I know how to write a Notification and get it into the system.