

NOTES - M. F. (DAS)

(2004)

Mode 4

Special Review - Includpt Assesst Team  
Interview Process

- \* See Attached for Summary
- \* Conf Call w/ Regis (Boyle, Dyer, Loran)  
team findings.
- Chris Echill a tea.

A10304 - 10.5  
6:30 - 10:20 10.5

B-275

## Summary

### OVERALL OBSERVATIONS

No new safety issues were revealed to us during our discussions with selected IAT members on March 23, 2004 at Salem/Hope Creek. It appears that the IAT questions being asked are adequate and appropriate time is being afforded to each individual interviewed. Preliminary findings by the IAT has identified that the Labor/Management relationship needs improvement. It also appears that some individuals that could be affected by lay-offs have taken the approach of maintaining a "Low Profile" so as not to draw attention to themselves. Additionally, previous senior management leadership styles may have contributed to the work environment at Salem/Hope Creek. Our reviews identified some potential areas for improvement in the interview process, see comments below.

### AREAS FOR IMPROVEMENT

- 1) The IAT's efforts have primarily focused on identifying operational events and it appears that they have not tried to develop engineering/technical issues that could have impacted the work environment. This could be attributed to the limited interaction by the IAT with the engineering departments (system and design).
- 2) Several work centers had limited or no contact with the IAT, specifically security, QA, and system/design engineering (as discussed above).
- 3) The interview selection process at some occasions has PSEG management act as an intermediary in developing the sample pool. Specifically, the IAT selects a sample pool by job type and PSEG selects the individual to go to the interview. We believe that in order to remove the appearance that PSEG has influenced the process the team should have selected the individuals by name for the an interview.
- 4) The IAT has not incorporated an "open door" policy as part of the interview process. However, they did follow-up on developed sources during interviews as appropriate.
- 5) The IAT or PSEG has not formalized/communicated policies/procedures for (1) the control and retention of handwritten notes by IAT members; and (2) the process for IAT to inform PSEG management of potential issues. For example it was unclear if PSEG management was aware of the following issues that the IAT became aware of: (a) a small pocket of the population did not want to participate in the interviews (Salem and Hope Creek Chemistry); and (b) one work group was reported to have stopped writing notifications in protest (issue unknown). A union steward became aware of the issue and convinced the workers to halt the protest.

### NEXT STEPS

A conference call was conducted on March 24 between R. Blough (NRC) and C. Bakker, (PSEG) to share the NRC's observations of review of the IAT interview process. PSEG stated that it will explore the observations provided to them. As of the close of business on March 24, PSEG distributed a site wide communication endorsing an "open door" policy for the IAT.