[redacted] 82-88

[redacted] 92

BWR [redacted]

[redacted]

~~1990~~ 1997-98 6 mos. - HOPE CREEK - procedure reviews

licensed [redacted] 1/99 - 11/02 [redacted] 4/03

JAN 04 - [redacted]

99 ↓

[redacted]

4-5 mos. [redacted]

Complex mos. [redacted]

3 yrs. [redacted]

7C

5-6 mos. Outage support

7C

[redacted]

AOM

equipment perf. issues - as best as can ⇒

human perf. -

sequence of steps -

"hand coffed" - real business needs

Enough people - to do on spot reviews / operability calls

procedural compliance

emphasis on production -

on line - recurring system operating issues -

Information ... record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions 2C

FOIA- 2005-194

N-34

Meadows — outages — descope
business decision — control rod drives

Ops — shut down — [redacted] — PSEG
addressed crew — COG —

[redacted] to apologize for failure to scram
— poor planning — re IPTE

— normal for them to review perf. failure station
— overall org. let ind. down let them,

unduly held people to scrutiny because not reported perf. event

[redacted]

[redacted] political
COG + Sr. mgt.

time frame — not known

Summary impression — event not reported

Aware of any other instances where Ops Mgt. faced pressure from senior mgt. or PSEG Power ~~in~~ regarding operational decisions? (akin to bypass valve issue)

Only mention of PSEG Power off weighing in on operational decision — are there others?

Why won't you raise

Example — Ops Mgt. March 03