

ENCLOSURE

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION IV

Inspection Report: 50-397/95-17

License: NPF-21

Licensee: Washington Public Power Supply System  
3000 George Washington Way  
P.O. Box 968, MD 1023  
Richland, Washington

Facility Name: Washington Nuclear Project-2

Inspection At: Washington Nuclear Project-2

Inspection Conducted: April 11 - 14, 1995

Inspector: F. R. Huey, Technical Assistant

Approved:

*A. Bill Beach*  
\_\_\_\_\_  
D. Chamberlain, Chief, Reactor Project  
Branch E

5/12/95  
Date

Inspection Summary

Areas Inspected: Special, announced followup inspection of the licensee's employee concerns program. Inspection Procedure 92720 was used as guidance during this inspection.

Results:

- The inspection identified that the licensee had addressed the NRC concerns previously documented in NRC Inspection Report 50-397/93-51, dated January 12, 1994.
- Employees appear to be comfortable raising straight-forward technical concerns with their supervisors. However, several employees indicated that they would be reluctant to raise programmatic or personnel performance concerns. This would appear to indicate a need for continued licensee management enforcement of its commitment to a discrimination-free work environment in which employees feel comfortable raising any safety concern with their supervisors.
- The employee concerns program training provided to contractor personnel did not appear to have been effective, in that none of the contractor



personnel interviewed were familiar with the Nuclear Safety Issues Program or how it worked.

Summary of Inspection Findings:

Attachment:

- Attachment - Persons Contacted and Exit Meeting

## DETAILS

### 1. EMPLOYEE CONCERNS PROGRAM (92720)

The inspector performed a review of the licensee's employee concerns program (ECP), as followup to a previous review documented in NRC Inspection Report 50-397/93-51, dated January 12, 1994.

#### 1.1 ECP Review

The licensee appears to have done a credible job of addressing the issues noted in Inspection Report 50-397/93-51 regarding dealing with employee concerns. In particular, the licensee has implemented a dedicated Nuclear Safety Issues Program (NSIP) which independently evaluates employee concerns, and appears to have corrected the weaknesses noted during the December 1993, NRC inspection. Some specific procedural enhancements which have been incorporated into licensee Procedure NSIP-1 included:

- a. An initial letter is issued to identified employees which confirms receipt and licensee understanding of the scope of the employee's concerns, and provides the licensee's action plan and time schedule for evaluating and responding to the concerns.
- b. An update letter is issued to the employee in the event that the time schedule for resolution of his concerns is extended.
- c. A final closure letter is issued to the employee documenting the conclusions of the licensee's evaluation and any associated corrective actions.

The licensee completed an evaluation of two employee concerns program files, which had been noted by Inspection Report 50-397/93-51 as involving poor licensee evaluation of potential discrimination concerns. The licensee confirmed that these cases had not been properly evaluated, and subsequently performed appropriate evaluations and corrective actions.

The inspector reviewed several recently closed ECP files and concluded that the files appeared to be in good order and clearly documented a thorough evaluation of the employee's concerns.

The inspector interviewed 26 licensee supervisors and employees, and concluded that the ECP training sessions provided by the NSIP manager appeared to have been effective. All personnel who recalled having the training were familiar with the new program and how it is intended to work. However, seven employees did not recall any training on NSIP and were not aware of its existence, indicating the need for continued licensee emphasis and promotion of the new program. The inspector also noted that several of the licensee supervisors, although aware of the NSIP program, did not appear to have a strong appreciation for their personal responsibility and culpability for 10 CFR 50.7 discrimination problems.

The inspector noted that interviewed employees consistently shared the view that they were comfortable raising straight-forward problems with their supervisors. However, several employees indicated that, in the current environment of cutbacks and downsizing, they would be very reluctant to raise any type of programmatic or personnel performance problems. This would appear to emphasize the need for continued licensee management enforcement of its commitment to a discrimination-free work environment in which employees can feel comfortable raising any safety concern with their supervisors.

The inspector interviewed five contractor supervisors and employees and concluded that the ECP training provided to contractor personnel did not appear to have been effective. None of the contractor personnel interviewed were familiar with Nuclear Safety Issues Program or how it worked.

### 1.2 Conclusions

The licensee has appropriately addressed the procedural concerns identified in NRC Inspection Report 50-397/93-51. Employees appear to be comfortable raising straight-forward technical concerns with their supervisors. However, several employees indicated that they would be reluctant to raise programmatic or personnel performance concerns. The ECP training provided to contractor personnel did not appear to have been effective in that none of the contractor personnel interviewed were familiar with the Nuclear Safety Issues Program or how it worked.

## ATTACHMENT

### 1 PERSONS CONTACTED

#### 1.1 Licensee Personnel

- \*J. Parrish, Vice President, Nuclear Operations
- J. Streeter, Assistant to Managing Director
- \*G. Smith, Manager, Quality Assurance
- J. Harmon, Manager, Nuclear Safety Issues Program
- M. Hatcher, Staff Attorney

#### 1.2 NRC Personnel

\*Denotes personnel that attended the exit meeting. In addition to the personnel listed, the inspector contacted other personnel during this inspection period.

### 2 EXIT MEETING

An exit meeting was conducted on April 14, 1995. During this meeting, the inspector reviewed the scope and findings of the report. The licensee did not express a position on the inspection findings documented in this report. The licensee did not identify as proprietary, any information provided to, or reviewed by the inspector.

5. 11. 1954

