From: Edmund Sullivan *NRR*
To: Wayne Schmidt *RT*
Date: Mon, Aug 21, 2000 12:59 PM
Subject: Re: INDIAN POINT 2 INSPECTION REPORT

Wayne,

I am curious to know your reaction to Ian concern at the end of his message below. I think it would be good to get this message out since I don't think it can be captured anywhere else but I don't know how readily these items can be related to the larger performance issues.

Ted

>>> "Ian Barnes" <tees@airmail.net> 08/17 5:18 PM >>>
Folks,

I have made another cut at your latest version of the IP2 inspection report. I placed little effort in improving the language. I do believe that the report needs editing to reduce the repetitive use of information, but am reluctant to embark on that path in that I am no longer fully conversant with current report expectations.

I opened the report and then went to File >Document>Review>Reviewer to show the recommended changes.

You all need to know that this report currently causes me some heartburn. The thrust of the report appears to me to minimize: (a) the significance of poor training of analysts, (b) inadequate Data Analysis Guidelines, and (c) inadequate analysis technique guidance. While this may be considered expedient with the current weak NRC enforcement posture, issue of this report as written would probably send exactly the wrong message to utilities and eddy current contractors.

Regards,

Ian Barnes