

G. Meyer
From: A. Randolph Blough, *RT*
To: Gwm
Date: 3/22/04 6:02PM
Subject: Fwd: Re: followup with lochbaum for 3/18 meeting

FYI

C-140

From: Hubert J. Miller *ET*
To: A. Randolph Blough
Date: 3/22/04 5:51PM
Subject: Re: followup with lochbaum for 3/18 meeting

got it, thanks

anderson said he might meet with dave I. after bakken does

i hope they put this much energy into meeting with their own staff.... addressing the many, many practical questions/issues plant staff has

>>> A. Randolph Blough 03/22/04 04:21PM >>>

I told Dave that we do not necessarily see SCWE sliding at the moment as he had contended during the meeting.

At 4 pm today, I spoke briefly with Dave Lochbaum. He had said, in his remarks to us at the end of the 3/18 meeting, that things are continually getting worse at Salem/Hope Creek. I told him that we had been watching for that, that we asked the residents this question frequently, and that, further, we were looking for signs of that during our site visit last thursday as we talked to site staff. I said, bottom-line, that our current assessment is that SCWE is either stable or getting very slightly better, but not obviously getting steadily worse as he maintained. He acknowledged my statement, and then clarified that he had not meant to say that **SCWE** is getting worse, but instead his point is that, **with a faulty CAP, mishandled items must be piling up**. Also, he remarked that Roy Anderson's letter of feb 13, Discipline and Punishment has likely done some damage, scaring a lot workers who feel that they may be victimized when work doesn't happen on time, even though the delays may be beyond their control (e.g., work control or parts problems).

He also mentioned that PSEG's Bakken has asked to meet with him and he agreed. (i had also heard that from Bakken).

randy

>>> Hubert J. Miller 03/22/04 08:12AM >>>

Dave,

I called Frank Cassidy Friday and took a call from Roy Anderson yesterday.

Both know we intend to have a few people on-site to talk to key people doing interviews for PSEG....following up to understand exactly how the interviews are being done, how they select who they interview, confidentiality, the things we talked about in our post meeting caucus, etc. etc. We need to do this right away so they don't go down a long path and find out they missed it by a mile.

Their schedule for completing the review makes this an urgent matter.

Also, Glenn, Randy, et al will be leading us in examining what next steps should be in overview of the program. This will undoubtedly need to key off what we find in our scouting mission over the next several days. As I said at the public meeting, we need to decide what our formal oversight will be.....there is a broad range of options as I said in the meeting. (We know some would have us do this under or with an order.)

This also should be settled soon given that the licensee study is proceeding at full tilt.

Gina, pls schedule a briefing later this week.

>>> David Vito 03/19/04 11:23AM >>>

I stayed for while after the group departed last night to talk with Lisa Jarriel about her impressions of the meeting. She had several good comments that I wanted to share with everyone.

SCWE Result Matrix - Lisa indicated that other facilities (Mike Brothers has been involved in at least one) undergoing this type of review have developed a matrix that compares the Best Practices for a Safety Conscious Work Environment to the results of the various tools that are being used. Such a matrix allows a comparison of the tools to see if they are measuring the same things and/or the right things. Since Mike Brothers is now at PSEG, we may want to suggest to him that PSEG also consider generating such a matrix.

IAT - Independence, randomness of selection of interviewees, ID protection, open door aspects - I don't want to speak for everyone, but Lisa and I had a little apprehension, after listening to their description of the IAT, as to whether the IAT had established a process which would account for these attributes and assure that they get what they need (and not necessarily what they might like). It might be a good idea to look over their shoulders with regard to: how they are selecting those who are interviewed; what kind of confidentiality policy is associated with the process; and whether there is an "open door " policy for providing information to the IAT, and if there is one, how that message was imparted to the site staff. One could wonder if the IAT will provide results that will be as candid as the results that are generated by the Synergy and USA reviews.

Management Training - PSEG made several statements about training that is being or will be provided to managers regarding SCWE, but they did not describe the training in any detail. Lisa indicated that she would like to review whatever training programs, policies, or procedures, that are being or have been developed regarding SCWE at Salem/Hope Creek.

Event Review Board - Lisa and I discussed Mike Brothers knowledge of the ERB, which is a process change that was made at Millstone with regard to getting a rapid handle on any personnel action or event/incident that has any hint of involving retaliation or chilling effect. It involves gathering all facts about a given action (preferably before the personnel action is taken) or incident and any other similar actions to assure that the current action doesn't involve aspects that could be perceived as retaliatory, e.g., disparate treatment. This concept has worked well at Millstone, and is probably a significant contributor the turnaround in SCWE there. We may want to ask PSEG (Mike B.) if they are considering adopting a similar process.