

D. Vito

From: [Redacted]
To: <DJV@nrc.gov>
Date: 11/24/03 10:18AM
Subject: PSEG

Dave,

I received the attached file this morning, unsolicited.

It gives verbatim comments from PSEG Nuclear's Third Quarter 2003 SCWE survey. I do not have the quantitative results, number of respondents or any additional information. I trust you will be able to obtain whatever else is available.

My concerns for what is happening at PSEG Nuclear have been further fueled by what employees expressed in this document. Frankly, now that [Redacted] has been at the helm for over six months, I was hoping for a more positive outcome.

As we discussed last week, I'll be at your office at 1 p.m. tomorrow.

Thank you,
Kymn

> -----Original Message-----

> From: Lake, Thomas D.
> Sent: Monday, November 03, 2003 9:45 AM
> To: MANAGERS
> Subject: 3RD QUARTER SURVEY COMMENTS

>
> Hello,

>
> Attached are the comments from the third quarter 2003-survey respondents.
> I have broken them down into the areas or combination of areas where the
> comment appears applicable. Although numerical results are an important
> aspect of the survey and the one we often focus on the most, the written
> comments are insightful and reflect fertile ground for improvement too.

>
> Tom Lake
> Employee Concerns Program Manager
> x3654

>
> <<SURVEY COMMENTS 3rdq03.doc>>

CC: <EXN1@nrc.gov>

Information in this record was deleted
in accordance with the Freedom of Information
Act, exemptions 7C
FOIA- 2005-0194

E-146

3rd Quarter 2003SURVEY COMMENTS

▲ Culture ▲ Employee Concerns Program ▲ Management ▲ Corrective Action Program

▲ ▲	IF YOU CARE, THIS PLACE WILL SQUASH YOU LIKE A BUG.
▲ ▲	I THINK WE SHOULD LOOK AT THE RECENT CHARGES BROUGHT AGAINST NASA WITH REGARD TO SCHEDULE PRESSURE AND BUDGET RESTRAINTS AFFECTING THE NASA PROGRAM. HOW DO THE SAME ITEMS EFFECT NBU WORK AND SAFETY PROGRAMS?
▲ ▲	I DO NOT FEEL THE MANAGEMENT & UPPER-CRUST ARE COMMITTED TO SAFETY - ONLY ON PAPER. FOR EXAMPLE, DAILY SAFETY MESSAGES, NO OR VERY FEW MANAGEMENT ARE THERE. NOW OUR DAILY MEETINGS HAVE TURNED INTO ONCE PER WEEK SAFETY ROLLOUTS WITH MANAGEMENT CONCURRENCE!
▲ ▲	IT IS UNCLER HOW PERSONNEL & POSITION CHANGES WILL IMPACT THE CULTURE.
▲ ▲	I TOTALLY FEEL THAT SAFETY IS OUR #1 PRIORITY.
▲ ▲	I DO NOT BELIEVE THAT CONCERNS ABOUT SAFETY ARE TREATED WITH THE SAME PRIORITY AS THOSE SPECIFICALLY ABOUT NUCLEAR SAFETY. THE CAP DOES THE BEST IT CAN, BUT WHEN SAFETY STAFF RESPOND TO CONCERNS WITH "BE CAREFUL" RATHER THAN LOOKING AT AN ISSUE, I BELIEVE THERE IS A PROBLEM.
▲ ▲ ▲	THIS FORM WAS COMPLETED DURING THE MANAGEMENT REORGANIZATION IN AUGUST 19, 2003. I BELIEVE THAT I HAVE RECEIVED UNFAIR TREATMENT AS A RESULT OF BEING VOCAL ABOUT SAFETY AND WORK ISSUES. I DON'T TRUST MANAGEMENT, OR THE UNION, OR COMPANY ENOUGH TO HAND WRITE THIS ON THE FORM. PLEASE ACCEPT MY APOLOGY FOR THAT. IF YOU TAKE A LOOK AROUND, YOU WILL SEE MANY MIRRORS ON DESKS. THIS IS AN INDICATION OF MISTRUST. I HAVE HAND AND NOW HAVE A SUPERVISOR WHO WILL SNEAK UP ON ME TO SEE WHAT I'M DOING SUCH AS FILLING OUT THIS FORM. I HAD TO CAREFULLY FILL THIS FORM OUT LOOKING OVER MY SHOULDER. THIS SUPERVISOR WILL NOT BE HERE MUCH LONGER DUE TO THE REORG. HOPEFULLY THINGS WILL CHANGE WITH THOSE WHO ARE LEFT.
▲ ▲ ▲	ASK INPO AND THE NRC. THEY HAVE CLEARLY STATED THIS AS WELL - THE PIRS PROCESS FAILED AT THE NBU. THE NEW PROCESSES AND RE-DESIGN APPEARS TO ENSURE THE CONTINUED LACK OF SUCCESS.
▲ ▲ ▲	MY CORRECTIVE ACTIONS ASSIGNED THROUGH CAP ARE NOT EFFECTIVE IN PREVENTING RE-OCCURRENCE. TOO MANY MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL ARE RESISTANT TO ELIMINATION OF LOW VALUE WORK AND DO NOT ENCOURAGE THINKING OUT OF THE BOX.
▲ ▲ ▲ ▲	THE CORRECTIVE ACTION PROGRAM IS A JOKE. NOTHING GETS FIXED THAT REQUIRES MONEY TO SPEND. THE PLANT IS DEGRADING AND MANAGEMENT REFUSES TO FIX IT. AN EXAMPLE IS THE BOILER FEED PIPING NEEDS TO BE REPLACED IN THE SALEM TGA. IT GOT THROWN OUT OF THE 45 DAY OUTAGE. WHY DOES IT MATTER WHETHER SOMEONE IS MAST OR REPRESENTED?
▲	THIS SURVEY NEEDS TO BE PERFORMED AGAIN AFTER THE RE-ORGANIZATION AND EVERYTHING IN PLACE BY SEPTEMBER 15, 2003.
▲	SINCE I DO NOT HAVE THE "BIG PICTURE" ON OVERALL PROGRAM EFFECTIVENESS, IT IS DIFFICULT TO MAKE ANY DISTINCTIVE RESPONSES.
▲	IT DOES NOT APPEAR THAT WE KNOW HOW TO IMPROVE OUR OWN PERFORMANCE. REPLACING OUR MANAGEMENT EVERY FEW YEARS WILL NOT IMPROVE BARGAINING UNIT PERFORMANCE. IT ONLY REINFORCES POOR PERFORMANCE. IMPLEMENT ACCOUNTABILITY AT ALL LEVELS.
▲	QUESTION 16-20 I HAVE ANSWERED, BUT HAVE NOT SEEN ANY ACTIONS TO SUPPORT MY ANSWERS.
▲	SOME OF THE CLASSIFICATIONS OF OSHA RECORDABLES HAVE BEEN SUSPECT, "BEE STING".
▲	UPGRADE THE SALEM I&C SHOP

3rd Quarter 2003

▲ ▲	SAFETY IS A CONCERN WHEN IT IS CONVENIENT. MOST SAFETY ISSUES ARE NEVER ADDRESSED IN AN EXPEDIENT TIME FRAME. (IE., LIGHTING ISSUES, TP&L, AND SCAFFOLD) MOST TIMES WE ARE REACTIVE AND NOT PROACTIVE. SAFETY ISSUES SHOULD BE ADDRESSED IN THE WORK MANAGEMENT PROCESS AHEAD OF TIME, NOT THE DAY OF THE JOB.
▲ ▲	IDENTIFYING PROBLEMS IS VERY EASY AND IS NOT THE PROBLEM. ANSWERS TO THESE IDENTIFIED PROBLEMS ARE USUALLY NOT DONE IN A TIMELY MANNER AND ARE VERY HARD TO DETERMINE WHAT THE FINAL OUTCOME IS.
▲	SEEMS LIKE MORE OFTEN THAN NOT, ISSUES ARE DELAYED IN RESOLUTION IN THE CAP. MANY ARE EXTENDED WITH NO GOOD REASON.
▲	THERE IS NO PRIORITIZATION OF CAP ITEMS. ALL ARE TRENDED THE SAME WHETHER THEY ARE SAFETY RELATED OR QC/PROGRAMMATIC.
▲	THE NOTIFICATION PROCESS IN SAP IS ONE OF THE MOST DIFFICULT EVOLUTIONS I ENCOUNTER AT MY WORKPLACE. THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE SAP PROCESS WAS POOR AT BEST AND I AM NOT YET TO BE OFFERED OR HAD THE TIME TO RECEIVE ANY HELPFUL TRAINING IN SAP.
▲	I FEEL THE CAP IS A GREAT PROGRAM, BUT I FEEL MANY PEOPLE REGARD IT AS A BURDEN AND OFTEN DISREGARD COMPLYING WITH PROCEDURES WMAP-2 AND NC-CA.TM-0006(Z). SOME LEVEL 1 PRESENTATIONS ARE UNTIMELY.

- 1 As a nuclear worker, I am responsible for identifying problems and adverse conditions
- 2 I believe a culture exists at PSEG Nuclear that is conducive to raising nuclear safety and quality concerns
- 3 I believe that if my management had made a non-conservative decision, I could challenge that decision.
- 4 I feel free to approach management regarding any nuclear safety or quality concern.
- 5 I believe that I can raise any nuclear safety or quality concern without fear of retaliation
- 6 I am familiar with the Employee Concerns Program.
- 7 I am confident that issues reported through the Employee Concerns Program are thoroughly investigated and appropriately resolved.
- 8 I believe that upper management supports the Employee Concerns Program.
- 9 I can use the Employee Concerns Program without fear of reprisal.
- 10 I believe that the Employee Concerns Program will maintain confidentiality of my concern at my request.
- 11 Management's expectations regarding safety and quality are clearly communicated.
- 12 Management's expectations are consistent with performance reviews, rewards, and discipline
- 13 I believe that management wants employees to report concerns
- 14 My management takes corrective actions on employee concerns brought to them.
- 15 I believe my work environment is generally professional and open (i.e. free of any harassment, intimidation, discrimination or retaliation)
- 16 Resolution of potential nuclear safety/nuclear quality issues including root cause and broader implications through the CAP is effective in our organization
- 17 Identification of potential nuclear safety/nuclear quality issues through the Corrective Action Program (CAP) is effective in our organization
- 18 I feel free to raise nuclear safety/nuclear quality concerns through the CAP without fear of reprisal.
- 19 I am confident that issues reported through the CAP are prioritized appropriately, thoroughly investigated and resolved in a timely manner.
- 20 The CAP is utilized effectively by PSEG Nuclear to resolve conditions adverse to quality in a timely manner.
- 21 I know how to write a Notification and get it into the system.