From:

John Grobe -

To:

Jack Strosnider, William Dean 1166

Date:

Fri, Oct 27, 2000 12:56 PM

Subject:

Re: 10/20/00 ISI PROGRAM CHANGES

Bill,

We would be excited at the opportunity to work with the Strosnider/Batemen team to help frame and or pilot any necessary program changes. Given the situations at PWRs in Region III, we chose to currently utilize the proposed PIs to gain insight into plant performance and would only take further action after consultation with regional and NRR higher management. This would be internal assessment ind discussion, but we should not stick our head in the sand between now and the eventual time we revise the program.

I would be willing to have John Jacobson and/or Mel Holmberg provide insight and input into the deventual development of the new assessment and inspection program revisions in this area.

Please keep us posted on how we can help.

Jack

>>> William Dean 10/25 6:43 AM >>>

Jack - if I read the document correctly, I understand that you are going to implement the attached without any forthcoming guidance from HQ. I would prefer that you wait until we have the final IP2 Lessons Learned Report in hand and allow us to make integrated commensurate changes to the inspection procedures. As you are aware, our process for procedure changes calls for developing changes to procedures, provideing them to regions for sufficient comment period time, and then implementing the change. Our current ISI procedure, while flexible in where the regions can apply its ISI resources, can probably be upgraded in terms of the direction that should be provided to our inspectors. It is not intended to look at all SG tube inspection activities, but to allow the regions to choose where to apply resources depending on what conditions exist at the site.

We have plans to work with Jack's people to craft appropriate changes to the inspection guidance and you are welcome to provide a staff member from your division to help us in that regard, representing your suggested recommendations. We do not intend to use the suggested PI as such a tool, but instead, to use it to guide the level of effort that may be warrented in conducting the ISI inspection where a region opts to look at SG tube inspection activities. I appreciate the input and we will use the recommended approach along with the lessons learned report on IP2 as an input to the feedback process and I will be assigning Sam Malur as the lead to coordinate the action in response to it.

>>> Justine Burza 10/24 1:49 PM >>>

The attached document is now in ADAMS. The Document may also be viewed by searching for Accession Number: ML003462236

Hard copy to follow.

CC:

Bill Bateman, Bruce Boger, Doug Coe, DRS DIVs, ...

5/4