

**Ted Wingfield notes/comments on the [redacted] interview (10-22-03)** 7C

ASSESSMENT QUESTION	YES/NO	AMPLIFICATION (WHY, WHY NOT, ETC.)
Will raise concerns and has done so before?	YES	None
Raises concerns for others?	YES	Union steward (believes he has a "reputation" of persistence and follow through ... other union members are confident and comfortable with giving him their issues so that he can push them up the chain of command)
Believes others raise concerns without hesitation?	NO	He feels the environment (for raising issues) is intentionally cumbersome to discourage (or at least it has the effect of discouraging) identification and correction of problems
Knows of someone who has experienced retaliation for raising concerns?	YES	He believes that an [redacted] received a "poor" performance assessment and little or no raise due to "raising concerns"

- Page 8 - "Because I didn't feel they [management] listened to what we had to say ..." as his reason for not participating in previous surveys
- Page 8 - "... [surveys] are not done well, you can pretty much interpret them any way you want"

---

- Page 8 & 9 - On why the change to actually participating: no specific change recently ... just because he is on the 'safety council' so he would do it to prove that they (union members) could do them [participate in the surveys] ... I believe he still held the belief that there would be no action
- Page 11 & 12 - He chose the position (as 'safety coordinator') because it was an off-shift position that they (union) did not want to lose ... seemed like a 'reluctant choice' to me ... the 'lesser of two evils'
- Page 17 - In talking about the Temporary Power & Light procedure (too complicated, burdensome, ineffectual, etc.) ... basically, he doesn't like the detailed structure and requirements ... "extension cords ... outside ... with nothing on them ... supposed to be wrapped ... We overlook them to get the job done rather than to do the right thing"
- Page 18 - Had to threaten a call to OSHA to get an exposed fan fixed
- Page 19 (top) - He does not believe in 'verbatim compliance with procedures' (a view not uncommon among nuclear equipment operators with greater than 15 years of experience at any nuclear plant) ... I think he truly thinks he knows best and therefore is doing 'the right thing.' I think he would not comply (and probably has already not complied) with a procedure to 'get the job done right' then (after-the-fact) pushed to get the procedure changed to what he believes it should look like
- Page 19 through 21 - I don't understand the issue with the Reactor Coolant Pumps - NEEDS TO BE DEVELOPED MORE ... was there (is there) a problem ... What happened? Did they get someone else to get the levels? Did they decide not to get the oil level?
- Page 20 - He feels the environment (for raising issues) is intentionally cumbersome to discourage (or at least it has the effect of discouraging) identification and correction of problems
- Page 20 - He feels like he is getting (and has gotten) 'lip-service' from the Plant Manager ~~X~~
- Page 20 - He feels they [management] say 'tell us the issues' but then responds negatively when people do respond
- Page 23 - He believes that the 1<sup>st</sup> line supervisors are either in-line with upper management to push production over safety (industrial and nuclear) or they are forced into that line of thinking because their pay structure promotes that behavior.

Information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions 7C  
FOIA 2005-A10U

R-103

Ted Wingfield notes/comments on the [REDACTED] interview (10-22-03) 7C

- Page 23 - "... they don't promote you doing the right thing ..."
- Page 25 through 31 - Breaker issue ('trunk operated' switch bending during breaker rack-in and an [REDACTED] using a metal bar to pry the breaker into place) could be important IF:
  - It affects (or could affect) safety related breakers AND
  - It affected or could affect breaker operation
  - This is an industrial safety issue BUT if it has occurred on other large equipment breakers (Safety Injection Pumps, Residual Heat Removal Pumps, etc.) have they in the past and/or would they now [REDACTED] etc.) perform the unauthorized maintenance (re-bend/un-bend the switch) again to 'move forward'
  - This is also another indicator of Corrective Action Program (CAP) ineffectiveness with multiple notifications and no [effective] corrective action
- Page 33 - "I feel I pay for that [getting things done right]"
- Page 33 through 37 - He is saying that the OPS department operates 'outside the process' often when they are 'the performing organization' ... i.e. cleaning condenser waterboxes ... and therefore they will not see trends over time 'JUST FIX IT AND MOVE ON'
- Page 41 - another instance of not following procedures (labeling) "... but as written we do not follow it"
- Page 43 - Several mentions of issues where he has 'not gotten a satisfactory response' but he gave no specifics ... "the majority of cases they are not closed to my satisfaction"
- Page 44 - "I don't think they get to the root cause of a lot of them [corrective action items]"
- Page 47 - "I hear one of the supervisors say 'I didn't get a raise last year because I tried to slow down and do the right thing and I can't do that'"