

1-2003-051F

Interview of [REDACTED]

Date: October 23, 2003

Position/Location: [REDACTED]

Number of years: w/PSEG since [REDACTED]

Special Duties held: [REDACTED]

DRAM

He has raised issues himself and helped others to. He cannot think of any issues regarding reactor safety or nuclear safety that were not addressed. Overall, the issues raised are addressed and the company's response to issues is sometimes good and sometimes not. It's based upon management's priorities and how the issue is viewed by the supervisor. It may not be seen as significant as the employee sees it. With other issues, the general feeling is that management takes too long.

He offered as the most prominent issue the problems they have with tagging issues. Tagging problems are seen by workers as immediate concerns, but management prioritizes them. He has seen a change over the past three to four years in which a tagging problem used to cause a stand-down from work. Now, the issue will be addressed at the beginning of the shift by a supervisor or manager, but work keeps going. He explained that the company differentiates between administrative tagging errors and physical tagging errors. The company doesn't ignore the problem, they fix it and then move on. The union believes that all tagging incidents are serious because they can lead to problems and would take a more drastic approach and stop work. [REDACTED] described the union's fear that something might happen due to the lack of knowledge with the people hanging tags and the complicated SAP system and believed this to be a primary concern at this time.

He never saw or heard that people were retaliated against for raising concerns. Some people are afraid to raise concerns because of a "notion" that something might happen to them. In terms of talking with the NRC, he did not see any fear as an issue but believed there may be some people with a fear to "open their mouth." He does not see this an issue that management caused, it's more a personality issue. [REDACTED] claimed he has seen more ineffectiveness in handling concerns than retaliation. He believes people complain about ECP not having helped them. He offered a recent example of a concern he was involved with regarding an employee allegedly resetting alarms. He thinks the biggest complaint regarding ECP is that it has no "teeth" and there are no results. Therefore, people use it less and less. Also, sometimes there are results where management cannot provide specific information. He gave an example of shift supervisor who behaved inappropriately and was later moved to training. He has never seen ECP try to hide any information and believes they are accurate in their presentation of the facts to management.

[REDACTED] indicated that he is comfortable with handling situations and knows what buttons to push, to include the VP level, based upon his length of employment there. Never saw retaliation and the union would not allow it to happen. Believes supervisors are not the concern, but when the issue goes higher to management or a superintendent and that person feels it is a priority or not, that's where the conflict come in. He is not aware of any retaliation against a supervisor for addressing an employee's concern. He believes management is aware that they could get in trouble if they try to stifle people. Also believes they promote the idea to come forward with concerns, but it's the action taken that may not meet the needs of the person who comes

All 7C-15
N-15

forward. He offered an example of an [REDACTED] with a concern about indicating lights on equipment throughout the station. [REDACTED] a notification and was told it was being addressed. This was not good enough for the [REDACTED] and he kept pushing to the point where [REDACTED] intervened and asked if there was some significant issue that required that type of priority attention. He advised him to let management manage. [REDACTED] claimed that with the employees empowered with the notification system, they believe in their issues and they want them taken care of. Overall, he believes management is trying to address these concerns by taking care of what is important first.

He is not aware of anyone being suppressed by management/supervision in not writing a notification. The complaints are primarily that the issue did not get taken care of or it's "blown off". The other complaint is that the level is reduced at management's discretion. He offered an example of the tagging issue being believed to be a Level 1 or II. Management made it an "X" or a 3. This upset the members of the tagging committee.

[REDACTED] indicated there is pressure regarding getting work done, but he never heard of anyone told to skip a step. He considered blatant instructions like that "suicide." He does not see "production over safety" as their culture, but he sees it starting to happen. Since deregulation, there is more emphasis on money and they move faster-as exhibited with some of the tagging issues he discussed. He believes this has an adverse affect on safety. His overall assessment of the safety culture at Salem/HC is that it is definitely better than it was two to three years ago. Offered the use of PPE(hardhats, glasses, harnesses) as much better. In terms of equipment performance, he knows they are "running longer", but does not have knowledge to compare or say anything is worse. He claimed they always hear about not having parts and there is a general joke about their spare parts being sold. He mentioned service water at Hope Creek and screens as a safety concern due to a methane gas problem.

[REDACTED] discussed management's interest in questions raised during INPO reviews.

He believes that [REDACTED] is the person to speak with regarding safety on the island. He would have complaints and problems and what is effective or ineffective from his years there.

ALL 7C