

## SALEM/HC SCWE

### HIGH LEVEL SUMMARY

#### Unsafe Operations

To date, there has been no contemporary information that has been conveyed through interviews or through inspection that would rise to the level of unsafe acts on the part of licensee management or operations that would warrant prompt and immediate action by the NRC. This aspect is evaluated in an ongoing and continuous manner.

There have been issues where production over safety pressures have been evident. In one case, an [REDACTED] was alleged to have taken an action to [REDACTED] on the steam supply to a main feedwater without approval of the operating shift. This was done to avoid taking the unit off line to effect repairs. A December 31, 2003 interview with the responsible Salem Shift Manager confirmed that the [REDACTED] did not have permission to operate the valve. Thus, this is an apparent violation of the PSEG Conduct of Operations procedure. DRP recommends that [REDACTED]

In a recent HC interview, a HC reactor operator related a situation where he wanted to take a conservative action because he had lost reactor power indication (from a computerized calorimetric calculation) and wanted to lower power to a known state (approximately a 1% power reduction) and was prohibited from doing so by the operating supervisor (OS). More interviews are needed to review this matter.

#### The PSEG Work Environment

To date there has been no information conveyed through interviews or through inspection that indicates that personnel would not raise safety issues to management. Thus, PSEG meets minimum standards for implementing a **Safety Conscious Work Environment** at Salem/HC.

Although the Salem interviewees to date have all indicated that interviewees would not hesitate to raise safety issues to management, they have indicated that senior management's response is often one to directly challenge the issue as being a safety issue or to recharacterize it as minor or to take action to minimize the importance of the concern. In a HC case, there appeared to be a desire to maximize generation in the face of uncertain reactor power conditions. Some Salem Shift Managers (SMs) indicated that there had been a paradigm shift under the [REDACTED] era in which they were being asked why they couldn't take an action to improve production rather than being asked if it was a proposed action was safe or not. These SMs provided examples of situation in which they were asked to either delay a shutdown or to proceed with startup or power ascension even when they were reluctant to do so. According to the SMs, none of these examples constituted a violation of the license or technical specifications, but management's approach was diametrically opposed to past practice in these instances. Cost pressures appeared to have been a contributor to the paradigm shift.

### PSEG Industrial Safety Issues

Many Nuclear Equipment Operators (NEOs) interviewed raised a number of industrial safety issues that have not been adequately addressed. They indicated that they had wrote notifications but that they either were never addressed or addressed in an inadequate manner. In some instances, they indicated that management did not want to hear about there problems and considered it "whining" on their part.

### PSEG Labor-Management Issues

One interviewee [REDACTED] During the interview, he stated that he had been on days off and had traveled to the site on his own time to resolve other labor management issues. He was requested to take a [REDACTED] even though he was off which he discussed with operations management at that time. The [REDACTED] told him to go home and to not worry about it which he did. He subsequently got a call from an [REDACTED] was told to come in for the test which he subsequently did. Later, he was told he was [REDACTED] When asked why this occurred during the interview, he indicated that [REDACTED] had told another manager that "We're going to make an example out of [REDACTED] and we're going to show the union that management is running the station and not the union."

There were other examples where union members indicated that management was generally unresponsive to industrial safety issues rased by the union. One union member [REDACTED] indicated that he and others had to protect the plant from management's "good ideas." By anecdote, he also commented that "PSEG has the right management team in place for the sixth time".

### PSEG's Corrective Action Process(CAP)

Some interviewees indicated that the CAP provides a shield or a convenient excuse for why action has not been taken to address equipment problems or personnel safety issues. On occasion, NEOs have been told to reenter thier concerns in the system. When they have done so nothing changes.

### NRC Considerations

During interviews, we listen very carefully to issues that may be safety significant and try to develop questions that sufficently probe the issue so that it's significance is fully understood. WE use this approach as part of our ongoing litmus test to determine if any unsafe acts have been idnetified.

Recent interviews have applauded the [REDACTED] regime as being effective at addressing emerging concerns (both safety and otherwise) from all levels of the organization. The retirement of [REDACTED] and the removal of [REDACTED] from positions of power has been viewed as bringing relief to the previously unhealthy work environment. However, one potential contributor [REDACTED] to this environment still wields significant management influence power on-site. We plan to continue to understand both his positive and negative contribution to the SCWE at Salem/HC.