

12/31/03

9 AM-ish

PREPARED BY COUNSEL AS TO HOW TO ANSWER QUESTIONS/GUIDANCE FROM COUNSEL/DID YOU INFORM YOUR MGMT OF THIS INTERVIEW/ WERE YOU ASKED TO BRIEF THEM ABOUT WHAT WAS DISCUSSED?

Eric, Iy
HALWON - now

Asm - 50 KLS
ROSS SUMMER

~~_____~~ - cash
you

QUESTION AREAS

describe union management relationship?

Interview Date: , W/O Counsel SRO LICENSED?? **YES**
YES

Subject will raise concerns and has done so -

Subject would raise concerns if necessary -

Subject raises concerns for others, why? (union steward?) -

Subject won't raise concerns-why?

Others do raise concerns -

Others don't or hesitate to raise concerns -

Experienced retaliation for raising concerns (if yes, give brief summary of circumstances. Identify for self or others) -

A
Safety first

approach the danger

Voluntary

never with my relative by way of union
retaliation
- management was very in appropriate
in how they handled or responded to
safety issues

If subject discussed incidents/events, briefly describe the incident and identify what they offered the incident as an example of, for example:

POTENTIAL SALEM SCWE ISSUE

SPECIFIC ISSUES

yes, was on shift - generator pulled trip

* Coming out of Salem 1 Spring 2001 outage - at full power for very short time - had generator trip, turbine trip, reactor tripped. GARCHOW told CS that they needed to start

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions 7C, 7D
FOIA: 2005-194

ALL 9
7C K-1111

the reactor by a particular date or their NRC performance indicator was going to go to White if they don't. ~~CS~~ told GARCHOW they were going to start reactor when ~~CS~~ thought within a day of actually bringing steam into the turbine bldg. - because not going to start reactor with main steam stopped shut per the safety analysis. That was not a good place to be. (9-14) 1st feeling that ~~CS~~ was not going to fit in at Salem. When GARCHOW said this to ~~CS~~ they didn't know exactly what caused the generator trip. 1 on 1 conversation. If ~~CS~~ had done what was requested it would not have been a violation of 10 CFR, station procedures or license requirements. GARCHOW then asked ~~CS~~ every day when was the reactor going to be started. "I am not trying to put pressure on you, but I want to know when you are going to start the reactor up." ~~CS~~ felt that GARCHOW was putting pressure on ~~CS~~ to start reactor.

PORC reviewed and came to same conclusion as ~~CS~~ and when informed GARCHOW - GARCHOW said he wanted another PORC meeting. Took another week before ~~CS~~ allowed reactor to start up. GARCHOW accepted PORC recommendation - but he was not happy with ~~CS~~ not starting up the reactor. After hearing this - ~~CS~~ felt mgmt style was not going to be what was advertised which was 1. Safety 2. Reliability, 3. ~~Cost~~. 1st indicator that safety wasn't their #1 priority. (Pages 9-29) Pretty much from this incident forward ~~CS~~ started getting excluded by GARCHOW and O'CONNOR from more and more, to include VP level meetings because ~~CS~~ was going to go along with everything they said (p. 37-39)

②
APPROX 2 YEARS AGO - ISSUE WITH SJ CHECK VALVES 4/5 AND 12/13 LEAKING. SOME Sms AND AOM WANTED LEAK TESTING DONE TO DETERMINE IF IT WAS A PROBLEM - DECISION MADE BY WALDINGER (AND PROBABLY O'CONNOR) TO NOT TEST - BUT TO "ENGINEER IT AWAY"

①
*** SALEM GRASSING ISSUE - EARLY MARCH 2003

SOME Sms WANTED MORE CIRCULATORS (4 INSTEAD OF 3) - O'CONNOR FELT THOSE INDIVIDUALS WERE "HOLDING THE PLANT HOSTAGE"???

WAS IN ON SOME PHONE CALLS AND MEETINGS BUT SINCE SALEM - NOT AS MUCH - MORE EXP WITH HC

KEEPING REACTOR POWER AT PROPER LEVEL WITH SITUATION
DETERIORATING

SUPV BY COMMITTEE

LESS EMOTION THAN TURBINE VALVE ISSUE - RIGHT THING WAS DONE -
WAS IT TIMELY DECISION - "YES" FELT GOOD ABOUT WHERE AND HOW
THEY GOT THERE

BUT FROM A NLO PERSPECTIVE - WAS PROBABLY A SCWE ISSUE - HE
BROUGHT UP FOR THAT REASON

N/A A START-UP CHECKLIST??

**** OCCASIONS WHERE THEY HAD TO DEBATE A POTENTIAL SAFETY
ISSUE/EQUIPMENT OPERABILITY OR INOPERABILITY ISSUE FOR 4-6 HOURS
BEFORE COMING TO A DECISION - COULD BE PERCEIVED THAT THEY WERE
NOT BEING FIRM IN DECISION ON HOW THEY WERE OPERATING THE PLANT**

**** THE ECONOMICS TAKING PRECEDENCE OVER DECISION MAKING REGARDING
PLANT OPERATIONS AND OPERATIONS DECISIONS. DID NOT MEAN ECONOMIC
PRESSURE TO KEEP PLANT UP. NEVER BEEN IN MEETING THERE WHERE THAT
WAS VERBALIZED.**

**** Says even after receiving INPO 3 in 2002, union leadership still positive , but plant mgmt was
disappointed - said that after meeting plant focus was not changed to where production over rode
safety.**

If the subject offered information regarding other problems with SCWE, briefly identify (such as
the CAP, the processing of notifications, handling of routine maintenance)

WALDINGER READ PEOPLE THE "RIOT ACT" FOR WAY THEY WROTE NOTIFICATIONS?? - DAVE SHAVER NCO

CAN HE RAISE/PUSH ISSUE W/O FEARING REPERCUSSION?

FEAR OF BEING H&I FOR RAISING AN ISSUE?

EVER FELT HE COULDN'T RAISE AN ISSUE/CONCERN?

** DO NLOs - TELL YOU THEY FEEL FRUSTRATED THAT IN ID SAFETY ISSUES - THEY CAN'T GET IT FIXED TO THEIR SATISFACTION IN A TIMELY MANNER. SEES THINGS THAT SHOULD BE ID BY NLOs BUT ARE NOT - MAYBE THAT THEY HAVE GIVEN UP RAISING ISSUES.

EVER SAW/HEARD/FELT PRODUCTION OVER SAFETY DIRECTIVE?

EVER SAW/HEARD NEWARK MGMT DIRECT OR SUPERVISE A DECISION AT PLANT REGARDING SAFETY/START UP/SHUT DOWN?

BELIEVES UNION LEADERSHIP WOULD SAY NOT A BIG CHANGE FOR WORSE IN WORK ENVIRONMENT SINCE 7/02 - CONTRARY TO ALLEGER ASSERTION

** NO PLANT MGR FOR LAST 3 YEARS - LED TO "WHOSE IN CHARGE" MENTALITY - MANAGEMENT/DECISION BY COMMITTEE LED TO MUCH INPUT BY INDIVIDUALS WHO HAD NO DECISION AUTHORITY OVER ISSUE

10

70