

1Q/2009 ROP Action Matrix Summary

The assessment program collects information from inspections and performance indicators (PIs) in order to enable the agency to arrive at objective conclusions about the licensee's safety performance. Based on this assessment information, the NRC determines the appropriate level of agency response, including supplemental inspection and pertinent regulatory actions ranging from management meetings up to and including orders for plant shutdown. The Action Matrix Summary listed below reflects overall plant performance and is updated regularly to reflect inputs from the most recent performance indicators and inspection findings. [Security](#) information is not publicly available and the associated performance indicators and inspection findings are not integrated into the Action Matrix Summary.

Notes have been added to plants that are not in the licensee response column of the Action Matrix.

The substantive cross-cutting issues are available on the [ROP Substantive Cross Cutting Issues Summary](#) page for each of the plants.

Licensee Response Column	Regulatory Response Column	Degraded Cornerstone Column	Multiple/Repetitive Degraded Cornerstone Column	Unacceptable Performance Column
Arkansas Nuclear 2	Arkansas Nuclear 1¹	Palo Verde 1²	Palo Verde 3³	
Beaver Valley 1	Byron 1⁴	Palo Verde 2⁵		
Beaver Valley 2	Byron 2⁶			
Braidwood 1	Calvert Cliffs 1⁷			
Braidwood 2	Calvert Cliffs 2⁸			
Browns Ferry 1	Cooper⁹			
Browns Ferry 2	Farley 1¹⁰			
Browns Ferry 3	Kewaunee¹¹			
Brunswick 1	McGuire 1¹²			
Brunswick 2	McGuire 2¹³			
Callaway	Nine Mile Point 2¹⁴			
Catawba 1	Oconee 1¹⁵			
Catawba 2	Palisades¹⁶			
Clinton	Prairie Island 1¹⁷			
Columbia Generating Station	Prairie Island 2¹⁸			
Comanche Peak 1	San Onofre 2¹⁹			
Comanche Peak 2				
Crystal River 3				
D.C. Cook 1				
D.C. Cook 2				
Davis-Besse				
Diablo Canyon 1				
Diablo Canyon 2				
Dresden 2				
Dresden 3				
Duane Arnold				
Farley 2				

[Fermi 2](#)
[FitzPatrick](#)
[Fort Calhoun](#)
[Ginna](#)
[Grand Gulf 1²⁰](#)
[Harris 1](#)
[Hatch 1](#)
[Hatch 2](#)
[Hope Creek 1](#)
[Indian Point 2²¹](#)
[Indian Point 3²²](#)
[La Salle 1](#)
[La Salle 2](#)
[Limerick 1](#)
[Limerick 2](#)
[Millstone 2](#)
[Millstone 3](#)
[Monticello](#)
[Nine Mile Point 1](#)
[North Anna 1](#)
[North Anna 2](#)
[Oconee 2](#)
[Oconee 3](#)
[Oyster Creek](#)
[Peach Bottom 2](#)
[Peach Bottom 3](#)
[Perry 1](#)
[Pilgrim 1](#)
[Point Beach 1](#)
[Point Beach 2](#)
[Quad Cities 1](#)
[Quad Cities 2](#)
[River Bend 1](#)
[Robinson 2](#)
[Saint Lucie 1](#)
[Saint Lucie 2](#)
[Salem 1](#)
[Salem 2](#)
[San Onofre 3](#)
[Seabrook 1](#)
[Sequoyah 1](#)
[Sequoyah 2](#)
[South Texas 1](#)
[South Texas 2](#)
[Summer](#)

[Surry 1](#)
[Surry 2](#)
[Susquehanna 1](#)
[Susquehanna 2](#)
[Three Mile Island 1](#)
[Turkey Point 3](#)
[Turkey Point 4](#)
[Vermont Yankee](#)
[Vogtle 1](#)
[Vogtle 2](#)
[Waterford 3](#)
[Watts Bar 1](#)
[Wolf Creek 1](#)

- ▲ Note 1: Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 1 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to exceeding the GREEN/WHITE threshold for the Unplanned Scrams per 7000 Critical Hours Performance Indicator. This was based upon 2 unplanned manual scrams in December 2008, and 2 unplanned manual scrams in February 2009. A 95001 supplemental inspection is planned for late May or early June.
- ▲ Note 2: Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1&2, were in the Degraded Cornerstone Column for 1Q2009 because of one Yellow finding in the Mitigating Systems Cornerstone originating in 4Q2004. Based on the results of a supplemental inspection (documented in an NRC inspection report issued March 20, 2009), the licensee had resolved performance issues that originally placed these units in the degraded cornerstone column of the action matrix. On March 24, 2009, Region IV issued a follow-up assessment letter to close a February 15, 2008, Confirmatory Action Letter (CAL) based on the results of the supplemental inspection. As such, the NRC's regulatory oversight is currently consistent with the licensee response column of the action matrix.
- ▲ Note 3: Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 3, was in the Repetitive Degraded Cornerstone for 1Q2009 because of one Yellow finding originating in 4Q2004 and one White finding in the Mitigating Systems Cornerstone originating in 4Q2006. On June 21, 2007, a Confirmatory Action Letter (CAL) was issued to the licensee because Unit 3 transitioned to the Repetitive Degraded Cornerstone Column of the action matrix. This CAL was superseded on February 15, 2008. Based on the results of a supplemental inspection (documented in an NRC inspection report issued March 20, 2009), the licensee had resolved performance issues that originally placed these units in the degraded cornerstone column of the action matrix. On March 24, 2009, Region IV issued a follow-up assessment letter to close the CAL and document that the actions required for Unit 3 to transition out of the Repetitive Degraded Cornerstone had been met. As such, the NRC's regulatory oversight is currently consistent with the licensee response column of the action matrix.
- ▲ Note 4: Byron Unit 1 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Initiating Events Cornerstone originating in 1Q2008. Supplemental inspection was successfully completed in 1Q09.
- ▲ Note 5: Palo Verde Nuclear Generating Station, Units 1&2, were in the Degraded Cornerstone Column for 1Q2009 because of one Yellow finding in the Mitigating Systems Cornerstone originating in 4Q2004. Based on the results of a supplemental inspection (documented in an NRC inspection report issued March 20, 2009), the licensee had resolved performance issues that originally placed these units in the degraded cornerstone column of the action matrix. On March 24, 2009, Region IV issued a follow-up assessment letter to close a February 15, 2008, Confirmatory Action Letter (CAL) based on the results of the supplemental inspection. As such, the NRC's regulatory oversight is currently consistent with the licensee response column of the action matrix.
- ▲ Note 6: Byron Unit 2 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Initiating Events Cornerstone originating in 1Q2008. Supplemental inspection was successfully completed in 1Q09.
- ▲ Note 7: Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2 transitioned to the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Emergency Preparedness cornerstone originating in 1Q2009. The White finding was

related to an inaccurate threshold in the emergency action level table. A supplemental inspection for the White finding will be performed.

- ▲ Note 8: Calvert Cliffs Units 1 and 2 transitioned to the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Emergency Preparedness cornerstone originating in 1Q2009. The White finding was related to an inaccurate threshold in the emergency action level table. A supplemental inspection for the White finding will be performed.
- ▲ Note 9: Cooper Nuclear Station is in the Regulatory Response Column for a White Performance Indicator in MSPI-EAC in 4Q08.
- ▲ Note 10: Farley Unit 1 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to a White PI for Emergency AC Power System and an associated White inspection Finding. Note that the White Finding is not double counted in the Action Matrix. A 95001 inspection was conducted in 3Q/2008.
- ▲ Note 11: Kewaunee is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Emergency Preparedness Cornerstone originating in 3Q2008. Finding was originally documented as an Apparent Violation in an inspection report issued on September 23, 2008. Final Determination Letter was issued on October 29, 2008.
- ▲ Note 12: McGuire Unit 1 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Mitigating Systems Cornerstone originating in 3Q2008.
- ▲ Note 13: McGuire Unit 2 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Mitigating Systems Cornerstone originating in 3Q2008.
- ▲ Note 14: Nine Mile Point (NMP) Unit 2 transitioned to the Regulatory Response Column due to one White performance indicator (PI) in the Mitigating System cornerstone originating in 4Q2008. The White PI was related to exceeding the limit for Cooling Water System unavailability and reliability. A supplemental inspection for the White PI will be performed.
- ▲ Note 15: Oconee Unit 1 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Initiating Events Cornerstone originating in 4Q2008.
- ▲ Note 16: Palisades is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Occupational Radiation Safety Cornerstone originating in 4Q2008. Final Determination Letter was issued January 30, 2009.
- ▲ Note 17: Prairie Island Unit 1 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Mitigating Systems Cornerstone originating in 4Q2008 [Final Determination Letter was issued January 27, 2009.], and one White finding in the Public Radiation Safety Cornerstone originating in 1Q2009 [Final Determination Letter was issued May 6, 2009.].
- ▲ Note 18: Prairie Island Unit 2 is in the Regulatory Response Column due to one White finding in the Public radiation Safety Cornerstone originating in 1Q2009. Final Determination Letter was issued on May 6, 2009.
- ▲ Note 19: San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station, Unit 2 is in the Regulatory Response Column based on a White finding associated with the Mitigating Systems Cornerstone. The finding was issued on December 19, 2008 and involved the failure to establish appropriate instructions for replacement of a safety-related battery output breaker.
- ▲ Note 20: The supplemental inspection for the white performance indicator was satisfactory completed during 1q2009. The white performance indicator was for Unplanned Scrams per 7000 Critical Hours which occurred during 4q2008.
- ▲ Note 21: On December 16, 2008, the EDO approved the deviation memo to continue to provide heightened oversight for Indian Point Units 2 and 3 through calendar year 2009 because some exit criteria in the prior deviation related to ground water monitoring have not been met and the unique factors warranting a deviation from the ROP continue in 2009. This deviation is reduced in scope from prior years because the exit criteria related to the replacement alert and notification system have been met and the ROP is appropriate and sufficient to monitor performance in this regard.
- ▲ Note 22: On December 16, 2008, the EDO approved the deviation memo to continue to provide heightened oversight for Indian Point Units 2 and 3 through calendar year 2009 because some exit criteria in the prior deviation related to ground water monitoring have not been met and the unique factors warranting a deviation from the ROP continue in 2009. This deviation is reduced in scope from prior years because the exit criteria related to the replacement alert and notification system have been met

and the ROP is appropriate and sufficient to monitor performance in this regard.

Last modification: May 29, 2009