

1-2003-051F

Interview of: [REDACTED]

Date: November 7, 2003 and November 13, 2003

Position/Location: [REDACTED]

Number of years: started [REDACTED]

Special Duties held: [REDACTED]

*DRAFT*  
*JAS*  
*ENC*

Interview on 11/07/03 regarding 1-2003-045:

[REDACTED] recalled the ([REDACTED]) (involved [REDACTED]) that a lot of people thought was not handled correctly. This is not the first unsafe action [REDACTED] was aware of and he claimed a lot of things happened that are not the safe way to go. The ([REDACTED]) handling was thought to be "typical" behavior of PSEG MAST in the way they handle things while at the same time lecturing the union on how safe they should be. It raised a "big stir" that "got ugly" and came down to a lot of animosity over "do what we say and not what we do." This particular action was so unsafe and this became a big event. He described himself as not quiet when it comes to having a concern. He also thinks the concerns were raised about this on all of the shifts to the point where the superintendents were upset and through their chain of command it got to [REDACTED]. He believes Kymn HARVIN had a meeting with all five shifts. HARVIN said there would be some type of synopsis or gathering of information with plans to get back to the people involved. ([REDACTED]) did not recall getting any verbal or documented feedback regarding this meeting. He added that he did not expect any action and thought they were just being placated. He may even have said at the meeting that HARVIN's job was to pacify and "wait out the storm." He asked her what she did to improve things with Maintenance and I&C to make things safer. She had no examples of anything made safer or better, but he believes she was trying.

He recalled email to HARVIN. The concerns noted in the email dated September 24, 2002, are not specifically recalled, but the ([REDACTED]) is part of that. He believes they probably involved nuclear safety issues and thought the ([REDACTED]) itself "bordered" on some of that. He recalled a lot of concerns were aired, and thought the issues had to do with procedures, tech specs, equipment, conduct of operations and maybe, industrial safety. He could not give specific procedural issue problems and indicated they are getting better at resolving them more timely. He will look for other emails and documentation that he may have.

[REDACTED] explained his statements about asking for information where actions taken by Operations adverse to the safe operation of a nuclear generating station and with the needed level of conservatism needed for the industry. He said that focused mostly on the ([REDACTED]). He meant by his statement about "actions that might have a

negative impact on the station should any outside influence get word of it" that it was his belief that things could get glossed and filtered and cleaned up before put into a final report. He referred to the grassing that almost shut them down and the recent BF19 incident. He is talking about them doing anything and everything to keep the unit running and gave as an example the ~~boiling water~~ that existed for hours, was 20 feet and "deafening" and was the worst he has ever seen. The plant should have been shut down (Sept. 02).

63  
EX-111  
2 2 2