

425

From: Glenn Tracy <sup>NRR</sup>  
To: Al Tardiff, James Creed, John Thompson, Richard Rosano, Vonna Ordaz <sup>NRR</sup>  
Date: 1/4/01 12:09PM  
Subject: Re: Revised PP SDP for IMC 609 and Group 2 questions in IP 0610

Good. A minor blip. Thanks. I will be discussing your other status report with Vonna/ Dick today and get back to you. I concur with the tone of Bill Dean. Thanks, GT

>>> James Creed 01/04 12:06 PM >>> <sup>P.II</sup>  
Glenn:

Here's Status Report #2:

I got a little confused with our charted course. I called Dick and he helped me better understand where we are and where we want to be. I understand that as soon as the Commission has blessed the definitions of the colors for force-on-force findings, you are going to send them out with the direction that they are to be used. We probably do not need to create an "interim" PPSPD Chart for that. Let's keep this as simple as possible.

We do need to modify our current PPSPD chapter (IMC 0609, Appendix E) and the associated chart to incorporate those changes and others that we have gleaned over the first year of initial implementation. I **am currently doing that** and hope to have a draft in your hands by Jan 19. Our collective efforts ought to be focused on the modification we need to produce for the republication of IMC 0609 after the first year of implementation (the object of the Lessons Learned Focus Group).

I suggest that once we have reached consensus on the "permanent revised PPSPD," we use it no matter what the inspection or evaluation program (SPA or OSRE) looks like. After all, a finding is a finding is a finding!

As far as the application of the interim PPSPD to the Quad Cities etc. case, we should apply the Commission approved guidance and the all we need to do is coordinate the meetings, Supplemental inspections etc. as we would normally do.

Jim Creed <sup>P.II</sup>

Information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions 5  
FOIA 2001 - 0226

EX 5

6/11

>>> John Thompson 01/03 11:22 AM >>> *NRP*  
Folks,

As you all are probably aware, it is expected that the staff will have Commission guidance on how to proceed with drafting the interim PP SDP by next week. I have been informed by Bill Dean that he would like to issue the interim PP SDP soon so that we can expedite updating Appendix E of IMC 609. I would presume that once Bill Dean and Glenn are comfortable with the PP SDP draft, then the regions would be given a chance to comment before we issue the interim guidance. I don't expect that the public stakeholders need to have input on the interim PP SDP, because we are merely implementing Commission guidance. I believe that the public stakeholders will get involved again when we update the PP SDP after we had a chance to acquire a year of implementation experience.

A few questions to consider when we move forward after receiving Commission guidance on the PP SDP:

1. Who is designated lead for developing the interim PP SDP? Peter Koltay and I need to work closely with that individual(s). I think a meeting to discuss how to implement the Commission guidance should occur soon after we receive the SRM from the Commission. Jim Creed has told me he is involved in taking a shot at revamping the PP SDP for the long term, but I did not get the impression that his effort was focused on the PP SDP interim development.
2. Will we use the PP SDP during the SPA pilot, and if so, does it need to be compatible for use with the SPA program? (i.e., will the licensees use it or is it just a tool for the staff?)
3. We should benchmark the interim PP SDP before we use it. My suggestion is to run four or five completed OSREs through the draft PP SDP to ensure that it has been reasonably benchmarked for consistency. Would it then be wise to take Farley, Oconee, and the other completed OSREs that have been in a holding pattern and run them through the SDP before sending the draft to the regions?
4. We should think about scheduling the SERP panels for these OSREs in the holding pattern, such as Oconee and Farley. Also, inspection findings that are other than GREEN will be applied to the ROP third and fourth quarter updates. This could, in theory, change the assessment column that a plant is currently in, such as Quad Cities (Quad Cities currently has one Yellow and one White PI hit). Without addressing the enforcement aspect, reported licensee performance by quarter (albeit retroactive), and the corresponding NRC response actions mandated by the Action Matrix, need some thought as to how to proceed, such as conducting a supplemental inspection.

CC: John Grobe, Robert Skelton, Roy Caniano