

From: Daniel Orr *RO*
To: Daniel Holody; Mel Gray
Date: 5/14/04 2:34PM
Subject: Hub Visit

I made some changes to the schedule. Please see attached. I have also requested to PSEG the interviewees listed on the schedule. My thoughts on the individuals is that we have not formally sat down in interviews with the key individuals at the manager and senior manager level. I also believe that Mike Brothers has not yet had that opportunity with Hub. The last time we did this, nearly a year ago, the players were all different or in different roles. It is also important to hear what they have to say about progress towards improving the safety culture. My experience with Hub is to have an org chart available to him during the site visit pre brief and he requests lots of last minute changes. Then it is a scramble to PSEG to request the changes.

On the in-field interviews I was thinking that we could list 12 key plant functional groups that were outliers by the Synergy survey. The synopsis that Mel and I did several weeks ago, available on the g drive, could be used to identify those groups. Those twelve functional groups would be listed where I have inserted "Location."

For changes to the schedule, please continue to work off the g drive so that we all reference the correct rev.

Mel, I made the interview requests to Howard Berrick, would you please continue to work with him next week. I informed Howard that he should contact you on the interview schedule.

Thanks.

Dan O

CC: George Malone; Marc Ferdas; Scott Barber

C-57

SALEM/HOPE CREEK SITE VISIT**MONDAY (5/24/04)****Objective**

NRC Region I Senior Managers to review with Resident Inspectors current overall PSEG performance, particularly as it relates to safety culture, equipment reliability, and human performance. The site visit will also include in-field interviews with Hope Creek and Salem personnel and afternoon scheduled interviews with management and senior site leadership.

7:45 Hub/Randy/Dan Arrive

7:45 - 8:45 SCWE Update
Resident Inspector Office Performance Themes - Recent Insights

8:45 - 11:30 Field Interviews

HJM

Location
Location
Location
Location

ARB

Location
Location
Location
Location

DJH

Location
Location
Location
Location

11:30 - 12:30 Working Lunch/Caucus
Resident Inspector Office

12:30 - 4:30

HJM

(Location)

Neil Bergh

IAT Member (or Walsh) Greg Sosson

John Carlin

Mike Brothers

ARB

(Location)

Jim Hutton

Greg Sosson

Pete Tocci

Len Rajkowski

DJH

(Location)

Carl Fricker

Greg Halnon

Bill Campbell

Abdy Khanpour

5:15 - 6:15
Location

Hub & Randy debrief with Roy Anderson

6:15

Depart Site

I. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Background

PSEG percentile comparisons against 21 nuclear sites assessed within the last 2 years by Synergy.

PSEG commissioned Synergy in December 2003 to perform a Comprehensive Cultural Assessment (CCA). The CCA was to assess and monitor attitudes, culture, and performance and establish a baseline going forward.

Initial Environmental Conditions

- 3 week period to complete survey in December 2003.
- March 2003 new president and CNO arrives. Old CNO had been in place for five years.
- July - Sep 2003
 - Major restructuring from a horizontal to a more traditional vertical organization. Roles and responsibilities of each VP changed.
 - Plant managers identified.
 - All non-union employees go through selection/bidding process.
 - Approximately 100 non-union personnel laid off.
- November 2003, PSEG announces craft downsizing and expects about 100 union workers let go.
- December 2003, Synergy survey starts four days after completing a Salem Unit 2 45 day outage.
- New site performance metrics not yet available to organization prior to survey.

Purpose

Three categories.

- Nuclear Safety Culture (NSC). Includes three sub-categories.
 - Nuclear Safety Cultural Values, Attitudes, Behaviors and Practices (NSC V,B&P) that have shaped and reinforced organization's capabilities, infrastructure, and environment for nuclear safety performance.
 - SCWE
 - ECP
- General Cultural Work Environment (GCWE). Assessment of general culture, environmental and programmatic areas that affect organizational performance and may have an inter-dependent relationship with NSC.
- Leadership, Management and Supervision (LMS). Leadership behaviors and practices. Business/Resource management behaviors and practices. Personnel management behaviors and practices.

Approach to Survey

All PSEG and long-term contractors afforded opportunity to respond. CCA outputs are designed

to support future interactions between management and employees to jointly develop solutions for any identified needs for cultural or performance improvements.

Sources of Input

168 multiple choice questions.

NSC has 74 questions
45 for NSC V,B&P
19 for SCWE
10 for ECP

GCWE has 41 questions, some similar with NSC

LMS has 53 questions.

2 write in questions/responses available to all respondents.

Synergy notes that the write-in responses are useful in determining underlying reasons for lower rating provided by targeted functional organization outliers.

Multiple choice questions are generally designed as positive statements to which respondents provide rated degree of agreement or disagreement. Scale of 1 to 5 with 3 as the anchor or midpoint.

- 1 is inadequate or strongly disagree
- 2 is less than adequate or disagree
- 3 is adequate or generally agree
- 4 is very good or strongly agree
- 5 is excellent or fully agree.

Forty question sets for various sub-parts.

Synergy calculated a composite cultural indicator (CCI) for NSC, GCWE, or LMS, dimensions (such as SCWE under NSC), sub-dimensions (such as Indicators and Precursors of a Potential Chilled Work Environment under SCWE), and individual questions. The CCI was the mean of all numerical responses to a particular question or set of questions. CCI's were provided with numerous sorts by functional organization.

High percentage of negative responses provide an indication of stratification. Synergy graphically illustrated percentage of negative responses by black diamonds.

- 1 Black diamond for >10% in NSC or >20% in GCWE or LMS
- 2 Black diamonds for >15% in NSC or >30% in GCWE or LMS
- 3 Black diamonds for >20% in NSC or >40% in GCWE or LMS

Negative responses were provided with each CCI.

Survey Participation

- 2003 CCA survey response rate was 67.2% overall.
- Industry average is 77% for Synergy surveys.
- Functional organizations at <40% participation are considered low responding.
- Organizational affiliation was 97% provided, which is consistent with Synergy's experience.
- 36% survey respondents provided write-in responses, which is also consistent with Synergy's experience. The responses were generally constructive in nature, but not necessarily positive.
- See section III. for participation rates of various functional organizations.

Overall Conclusions

Mean range label designations

< 2.50	significantly less than adequate
2.50 - 2.84	less than adequate
2.85 - 2.99	nominally less than adequate
3.00 - 3.15	nominally adequate
3.16 - 3.30	adequate
3.31 - 3.50	adequate to good
3.51 - 3.70	good
3.71 - 3.90	good to very good
3.91 - 4.20	very good
4.21 - 4.50	very good to excellent
> 4.50	excellent

Synergy's Issue Identification Criteria

Numerical thresholds represent industry standards as interpreted by Synergy. Synergy used the following thresholds for identifying whether a dimension, sub-dimension, or question response was outside "the norm."

Nuclear Safety Culture (NSC): Dimension, sub-dimension, or question with a mean value rating < 3.50 or a negative response pocket > 10/15%

General Culture and Work Environment (GCWE): Dimension, sub-dimension, or question with a mean value rating < 3.50

LMS Behaviors and Practices: Dimension, sub-dimension, or question with a mean value rating < 3.15

Significant recurring themes from write-in comments.

Significant deviations from industry norms.

Industry norms versus PSEG results by dimension:

1. Nuclear Safety Culture CCI
industry norm = 4.00
PSEG = 3.73 "Good to Very Good"
11th percentile
2. NSVB&P Dimension of NSC:
industry norm = 3.88
PSEG = 3.54 "Good"
11th percentile
3. Overall SCWE Dimension of NSC:
industry norm = 4.40
PSEG = 4.31 "Very Good to Excellent"
11th percentile
4. SCWE sub-dimension - indicators and precursors:
industry norm = 4.28
PSEG = 4.17 "Very Good"
16th percentile
5. SCWE sub-dimension - demonstrated willingness to act:
industry norm = 4.5
PSEG = 4.45 "Very Good to Excellent"
16th percentile
6. ECP Dimension of NSC:
industry norm = 3.57
PSEG = 3.41 "Adequate to Good"
16th percentile
7. GCWS CCI
industry norm = 3.5
PSEG = 3.4 "Adequate to Good"
26th percentile
8. LMS CCI
industry norm = 3.35
PSEG = 3.32 "Adequate to Good"
33rd percentile
9. CAP Effectiveness: (identified as "other" dimension, not with the major three NSC, GCWS, LMS)
Industry norm = 3.68
PSEG = 3.24
11th percentile

Overall Conclusion for Nuclear Safety Culture

- **Employee concerns regarding plant equipment and material condition as manifested by longstanding or recurrent equipment problems, work- arounds, and compensatory measures resulted in lower ratings in several NS V,B&P sub-dimensions. Employee ratings of CAP were particularly low.** This is Synergy's #1 major key issue and opportunity for improvement at PSEG. This key issue shows itself in any number of concerned areas identified by the CCA.
- Several, seven, individual functional organizations provided significantly lower ratings of one or more key attributes of SCWE. The negative response rate listed is for the Indicators and Precursors of a Potential Chilled Work Environment CCI. Priority level 2 or 3 was determined based on a composite review of all the SCWE results.
 - 3 were priority level 2 (potential need for remedial action in near term).

-Facilities - yard/nuclear workers	19% Negative response rate
-Salem Rad Pro	21%
-Hope Creek Chemistry	19%
 - 4 were priority level 3 (potential need for further evaluation of underlying causes).

-Work control - on-line/cycle	24% Negative response rate
-Salem Chemistry	20%
-Hope Creek Shift Ops	18%
-Salem Mech Maint	21%
- Employee confidence in the ECP is need of improvement. Particular functional organizations with overall ECP CCI is listed.

Salem Chemistry	2.74	
HC Shift Ops	2.63	
On-line/cycle maintenance	2.83	
Salem Rad Pro	2.92	
Salem Mech Maintenance	2.81	
HC Chemistry		2.80
HC Mech Maintenance	3.00	
Salem 12 hr/WIN	3.17	
Salem Shift Ops	3.12	
HC 12 Hr/WIN	3.10	
Other Training	3.18	
HC Electrical/I&C	3.01	
Salem Other Maintenance	3.17	

Overall Conclusions for GCWE

- **Employee concerns regarding plant equipment and material condition as manifested by long-standing or recurrent equipment problems, work-arounds, and compensatory measures affected ratings in several GCWE dimensions including "High Standards" and "Conduct of Work."**

- GCWE areas with lowest ratings:

Effectiveness of Work Management (particularly in the area of Maintenance Planning and Scheduling Process)	2.53
General Communications	2.83
Change Management	2.87
Performance Recognition	2.87
Performance Appraisal	3.07

CCIs <3.15 indicate a need for improvement.

CCIs <3.00 indicate a significant need for improvement

Overall Conclusions LMS

- LMS CCI was 3.32, 33rd percentile. Consists of:

Leadership Business and Practices, 3.19, 11th percentile
Business/Resources Management Behaviors and Practices, 3.18, 11th percentile
Personnel Management Behaviors and Practices, 3.51, 44th percentile
- ***Employee concerns regarding plant equipment and material conditions as manifested by long-standing and recurrent equipment problems, work-arounds, and compensatory measures affected ratings in several LMS sub-dimensions, including "Confidence in Management,," "Management of Resources," and "Management of Systems and Processes."***
- Additional LMS areas with low ratings include:

Effectiveness of Leadership in Establishing and Implementing Strategies and Plans and in Providing Clear Direction for Organizational Issues
Effectiveness of Management Change

II. ASSESSMENT METHODOLOGY

- Generally the respondents completed the questionnaire anonymously during group meetings. However, opportunities were available at the individuals discretion.
- Trends. First CCA survey provided by Synergy. Trend limited to seven survey questions that request responses based on "today" and "a year ago."
- Percentile was calculated based on 21 Synergy site surveys performed within the last 2 years.
- Survey and questionnaire and associated write-in comments were complimentary in establishing a high degree of confidence that important issues were identified as these apply to PSEG Nuclear-wide and to specific PSEG Nuclear major organizations and sub-organizations. The information obtained has been integrated in the development of key findings, opportunities for improvement and conclusions.

III. SURVEY PARTICIPATION

Site Ops	60%	877/1464
Engineering and Tech Support	81%	309/381
Nuclear Assessment	96%	63/66
Business Support Organization	59%	89/151
CNO Staff and Support	80%	12/15
Composite	67.2%(Industry norm 77%)	1395/2077

PSEG Employees	72.3%
PSEG Contractors	26.0%
PSEG Union	55.6%

Organizational affiliation provided by 97% (Consistent with Industry norm)
 Write-in comments provided by 36% (Consistent with Industry norm)

Low responding organizations (Defined as less than 40% participation)

Other Facilities	18%
Other Station Support	21%
HC Electrical/I&C	26%
Salem Mechanical Maintenance	26%
Salem 12Hr/WIN	29%
Salem Electrical/I&C	32%
Salem Other Operations	36%
HC Other Operations	37%
Security	37%
Supply Chain Organizations	38%

Reason for lower participation is not clearly identified.

IV. KEY NSC RESULTS

NS V,B&P

- Six sub-dimensions

Nuclear Safety Is Our Top Priority	3.59
Operational Nuclear Safety	3.63
Identification of Potential Nuclear Safety Issues	3.62
Timely Resolution of Identified NS Issues	3.35
Effective Resolution of Identified NS Issues	3.27
Continuous Improvement of NS Performance	3.71

CCIs <3.50 indicate a need for improvement.

CCIs <3.30 indicate a significant need for improvement

- Employee concerns regarding plant equipment and material condition as manifested by longstanding or recurrent equipment problems, work-arounds, and compensatory measures resulted in lower ratings in several NS V,B&P sub-dimensions. Employee ratings of CAP were particularly low.

DETAILED ANALYSIS OF THE SCWE

SCWE, Two Sub-Dimensions:

Indicators and Precursors of a Potentially Chilled Work Environment

Demonstrated Willingness to Take Appropriate Action

-Willingness to Inform/Document Rating

-Willingness to Escalate Rating

Criteria for SCWE

	Light Green	Yellow	Red
Overall SCWE	<4.00	>3.80 >10% negative	<3.60 >15% negative
SCWE I&P	N/A	<3.70 >15% negative	<3.50 >20% negative
Willingness to Inform/Document	N/A	<4.25 >5% negative	<4.00 >10% negative
Willingness to Escalate	N/A	<3.90 >10% negative	<3.70 >15% negative

Highlights

- 20% Negative responses were provided for having known someone that had a negative reactions from management for having raised a concern.
-Industry median - 14%
- 15% Negative responses were provided for having a concern about receiving a negative reaction from management.
-Industry median - 12%
- 14% of survey respondents indicate that concerns about being viewed as uncooperative, as a complainer or as a source who is resistant to change were having an adverse impact on their willingness to identify/pursue resolution of potential nuclear safety issue.
- Industry median - 12%
- 1 organization up to 39%, 5 organizations > 25%
- 8% in past year, received negative reaction for nuclear safety issue.
- Industry median - 5.6%
- 1 organization at 27%
- 9 organizations >25%

Supervisors and management in my functional organization value workers who identify and pursue resolution of potential nuclear safety issues.

- 3.79 CCI mean response
- industry median = 4.02
- organization lowest was 3.17
- 12 organizations <3.60

Table 13.1 - Functional Organizations With Low SCWE Ratings

Organization	Overall SCWE Rating	Overall I&P Rating	Willingness to Inform/ Document Rating	Willingness to Escalate Rating
Facilities - Yard/ Nuclear Worker	(Yellow) 3.79 13% negative	(Yellow) 3.67 19% negative	(Red) 3.96 6% negative	(Yellow) 3.77 11% negative
Salem Rad Pro	(Red) 3.83 16% negative	(Red) 3.66 21% negative	(Yellow) 4.12 8% negative	(Red) 3.65 22% negative
Work Control - Online/Cycle Maintenance	(Light Green) 3.98	3.99	(Yellow) 4.04	(Yellow) 3.82 12% negative
HC Shift Operations	4.01 10% negative	(Yellow) 3.69 18% negative	-----	(Yellow) 3.82 8% negative
Salem Mechanical Maintenance	(Yellow) 4.01 11% negative	(Red) 3.72 21% negative	-----	-----
HC Chemistry	(Yellow) 4.03	(Yellow) 3.82 19% negative	(Yellow) 4.33 8% negative	(Red) 3.94 21% negative
ETS - Fuels/ Reactor Eng.	-----	-----	-----	(Yellow) 3.88 11% negative
Facilities - House/Custodial	-----	-----	-----	(Yellow) 3.88 4% negative
HC Other Ops.	-----	-----	-----	(Yellow) 4.00 14% negative
Salem Other Maintenance	-----	-----	-----	(Yellow) 4.11 11% negative
ETS - Programs	-----	-----	-----	(Yellow) 4.06 14% negative

- It should be noted that there are several, seven individual functional organizations that provided significantly lower ratings of one or more key attributes of SCWE.
 - 3 were priority level 2 (potential need for remedial action in near term).
 - Facilities - yard/nuclear workers
 - Salem Rad Pro
 - Hope Creek Chemistry
 - 4 were priority level 3 (potential need for further evaluation of underlying causes).
 - Work control - on-line/cycle
 - Hope Creek Shift Ops
 - Salem Mech Maint

ECP

Three sub-dimensions:

Acceptable Alternative Path	CCI 3.51
Overall Confidence Rating	CCI 3.27
Bases for Confidence	CCI 3.43

- It should be noted that employee confidence in the ECP needs improvement. Particularly the case for:

Salem Chemistry	2.74	
HC Shift Ops	2.63	
On-line/cycle maintenance	2.83	
Salem Rad Pro	2.92	
Salem Mech Maintenance	2.81	
HC Chemistry		2.80
HC Mech Maintenance	2.81	
Salem 12 hr/WIN	2.80	
Salem Shift Ops	3.12	
HC 12 Hr/WIN	3.10	
Other Training	3.18	
HC Electrical/I&C	3.01	
Salem Other Maintenance	3.17	

NSC Areas of Relative Strength

- For NS V,B&P, Nuclear safety is the first and overriding priority at our site. CCI 4.09/Negative RR 4%
Four other similar questions were considered relative strengths and included:
At our site, we conduct operations, maintenance and modifications in accordance with the design bases. 3.91/ Negative response rate 2%
Lack of prior responsiveness by my supervisor is not having an adverse impact on my willingness to identify and pursue resolution of potential nuclear safety issues or concerns. 3.86/Negative response rate 8%. NRC comment: interesting to note that as a relative strength, this question also identified weak outliers.

- For **SCWE**, *If I identified a potential nuclear safety issue or concern (including a degraded condition that could adversely affect nuclear safety) I would inform my supervision and or document the issue or concern.* 4.55/Negative response rate 0.8%
NRC comment: interesting to note that this may have been the question with the least negative response rate. This was validated on some level but not total certainty.
- Two other similar questions were considered relative strengths.

NSC Areas of Relative Weakness

- For **NS V,B&P**, I am confident that the CAP will ensure that potential nuclear safety problems are addressed in a timely manner. CCI 2.95/Negative RR 31%
- Nine other similar questions responded at less than 3.30 CCI, significant need for improvement.
- Eleven other similar questions responded at less than 3.50 CCI, need for improvement.
- For **ECP**, I am confident that issues or concerns reported through the ECP will be appropriately resolved. CCI 3.26, Negative RR 22%.
- Two other similar questions responded at less than 3.30 CCI, significant need for improvement.
- Four other similar questions responded at less than 3.50 CCI, need for improvement.
- For **SCWE** related survey questions at <3.80 (note the higher threshold) and/or negative response rates at >10%:

SEE DETAILED ANALYSIS OF SCWE UNDER SECTION IV ON PAGE 4.

V. KEY GCWE RESULTS

13 Sub-dimensions,

1 below 3.15 CCI, indicating a need for improvement

Performance Appraisal

3 below 3.00 CCI, indicating a need for significant improvement.

General Communications

Change Management

Performance Recognition

GCWE Areas of Relative Weakness

- *Within my functional area, we have an effective work management process.* CCI 2.53/Negative RR 51%. **Interesting to note that this was the area or question that received the highest negative response rate for the entire survey.**
- Seven other questions responded at less than 3.00 CCI.
- Five other questions responded at less than 3.15 CCI.

VI. KEY LMS B&P RESULTS

LMS CCI 3.32/33rd percentile.

3 Sub-dimensions, includes 14 areas

LB&P CCI 3.19/11th percentile

Business/Resources Management B&P CCI 3.18/11th percentile

Personnel Management Behaviors and Practices CCI 3.51/44th percentile

2 Areas needing improvement, CCI<3.15

Manage Resources (CCI 3.09)

Manage Systems and Processes (CCI 3.02)

1 Area needing significant improvement, CCI<3.00

Manage Change (CCI 2.95)

LMS Areas of Relative Weakness

- *Our site management team is sufficiently visible and accessible to employees.* CCI 2.72/Negative RR 41%.
- Eight other questions and focused on senior site management responded at less than 3.00 CCI.
- Eight other questions and focused on supervision and management responded at less than 3.15 CCI.

VII. FUNCTIONAL ORGANIZATION ANALYSIS

Functional Organizations with Relatively High Ratings for NSC, NSVB&P, SCWE, and/or ECP (High ratings = >3.92 NSC overall, >3.72 NSVB&P, >4.53 SCWE, and >3.59 ECP)

Engineering Services/Document Control
 Human Resources
 CNO Staff and Support
 IT
 Other Nuclear Assessment
 Financial
 Field Engineering
 Salem Other Operations
 Security (Overall NSC, and ECP only)
 Learning Services
 ET&S Projects
 Nuclear Licensing
 Technical Training
 HC System Engineering
 EP
 Station Support
 QA (Only for SCWE)
 Refuel Outage (Only for ECP)
 Fire Protection (Only for ECP)
 Maintenance Planning (Only for ECP)

Functional Organizations with Relatively Low Ratings for NSC, NSVB&P, SCWE, and/or ECP (Low Ratings =<3.54 overall NSC, <3.36 NSVB&P, <4.10 SCWE, and <3.18 ECP)

	Overall NSC CCI
Salem Chemistry	3.20
HC Shift Operations	3.27
On-Line/Cycle Maintenance	3.28
Salem Rad Pro	3.28
Salem Mechanical Maintenance	3.29
HC Chemistry	3.34
HC Mechanical Maintenance	3.42
Salem 12Hr/WIN	3.45
Yard/Nuclear Worker	3.52
Salem Shift Operations	3.53
HC 12 Hr/WIN	3.54
HC Rad Pro (Only for NSVB&P)	
Other Training Organization (Only for NSVB&P and ECP)	
Warehouse (Only for SCWE)	
HC Electrical/I&C Maintenance (Only for SCWE and ECP)	
SMART/Custodial/HVAC (Only for SCWE)	
Salem Other Maintenance (Only for ECP)	

Functional Organizations with Relatively Low Ratings for GCWE and LMS

Interesting enough, both high and low rating organizations for GCWE and LMS almost identically lineup with the orders for NSC high or low as appropriate, NRC observation.

VIII. PSEG NUCLEAR "TARGETED" ORGANIZATIONS BASED ON 2003 CCA RESULTS.

Synergy provides a 2-step methodology.

- 1) Recommended investigative or remedial actions to address a targeted organization's failure to meet industry norm of acceptability.
- 2) Suggested actions to seek continued improvement in a targeted organization that meets industry norm but is a relative outlier with respect to PSEG Nuclear's general performance norms.

Relative priorities are also identified.

Synergy used:

- 1) low absolute or relative NSC, SCWE, GCWE or LMS ratings.
- 2) High absolute or relative negative response rates.

Results

All but one targeted organization (supply chain) are part of the site operations organization. Also almost all of Salem Plant Manager and Hope Creek Plant Manager are targeted.

Industry Norms Criteria by NSC Priority 1 or GCWE Priority 1

Salem Chemistry
 HC Shift Operations
 Online/Cycle Maintenance
 Salem Rad Pro
 Salem Mechanical Maintenance
 Hope Creek Chemistry
 Salem 12 hr/Win

Industry Norms Criteria by LMS Priority 1

HC Operations
 HC Mechanical Maintenance
 Salem Plant Manager Ops (Ops, chem, and RP)
 Salem Maintenance
 Salem Shift Ops
 HC 12Hr/WIN
 HC Maintenance

PSEG Norms Criteria

HC Plant Manager Organizations (Ops, chem, and RP)
 Yard/Nuclear Workers
 Salem Shift Operations
 HC Maintenance

IX. OPPORTUNITIES FOR IMPROVEMENT

- The major key issue and opportunity for improvement is:

Plant equipment and the material condition of the plants are perceived to be in a degraded condition as manifested by long-standing or recurring equipment problems, work-arounds, and compensatory measures. This situation is perceived to be worsening.

Six sub-issues:

- Management commitment to resources
 - Improving CAP effectiveness
 - Improving effectiveness of maintenance planning and scheduling processes
 - Improving effectiveness of engineering work management and control
 - Improving effectiveness of the maintenance organizations
 - Establishing increased individual ownership
- Other priority level 1 opportunities for improvement include:
 - Increased emphasis on senior management expectations with respect to receptivity and sensitivity to nuclear safety concerns.
 - Improve management communications on bases of key operational decisions
 - Establish and communicate an enduring vision for PSEG Nuclear
 - Establish a more effective and productive relationship between management and union
 - Effectively implement defined strategies and plans to attain organizational vision over time
 - Establish an organizational philosophy that emphasizes and support doing things right for the right reasons and right the first time
 - Ensure management responsiveness to the results and obtain employee feedback obtained from this survey/assessment
 - Priority level 2 opportunities:

12 including: Take actions to improve employee confidence in the ECP, particularly in those organizations that provided low ratings.
 - 6 Priority level 3 opportunities.
 - Priority level 4 opportunity:

Improve the effectiveness of line organization self-assessment activities. Ensure that value is place on substance rather than form.
 - Major key issue is believed to also be driving lower survey numbers in a number of topical areas.

Low ratings of trust and confidence in senior management. Many employees believe that senior management is not sufficiently committed to effectively resolving long-standing equipment problems or to investing in the long-term future of the plants.

CAP. Many employees believe that the CAP is ineffective or broken based on the results that it is (or is not) producing, particularly equipment problems. Also a concern that the current low level of confidence in CAP may be having some degree of adverse impact on individual willingness to continue to use the system.

Maintenance work planning and schedule process. Not producing results, especially equipment problems and to a lesser extent implementation of the PM program.

Adverse impacts of workload. Ineffective prioritization and management by "due date" or "schedule adherence" is adversely affecting ability to carry out their work effectively. Some indicate a "vicious cycle" syndrome exists. Failure to fix first time results in emergent/recurrent problems that then affects ability to effectively resolve the problems currently on their platter.

Low ratings of business management skill, behaviors, and practices. Many feel focus is on processes versus whether or not process being implemented in a manner to achieve results.

Effectiveness of Maintenance Organization. In summary, maintenance personnel are genuinely concerned about the effectiveness of their organizations performance and have offered suggestions for improvement.

Ownership of identified problems with plant equipment. Many feel that increase individual ownership and accountability is a key ingredient to ensuring success.

Related Nuclear Safety Values, B&P. Many employees correlate the current situation (i.e. with respect to timely and effective resolution of equipment problems and maintenance of plant material condition) with a reduction in the organization's respect for Nuclear Safety as its Top Priority.

X. OTHER

- Worst area by negative response rate (51.07%) was: Within my functional organization we have an effective work management process.
- Best area by negative response rate (0.8%) was: If I identified a potential nuclear safety issue or concern (including a degraded condition that could adversely affect nuclear safety) I would inform my supervisor, and /or document the issue or concern. This is a NRC observation that was not explicitly described as the area with the least negative response rate by Synergy.
- PSEG respondent write-in comments only included a single reference by one individual to a plant event for a SCWE issue. This is a Synergy outlier for plants that have similar large negative pockets for SCWE concerns.