

From: <stan.gamble@exeloncorp.com>
To: <NRCREP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Oct 27, 2005 10:13 AM
Subject: ROP Survey

10/21/05

70 FR 61318

8

This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain Exelon Corporation proprietary information, which is privileged, confidential, or subject to copyright belonging to the Exelon Corporation family of Companies. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this e-mail is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout. Thank You.

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

2005 OCT 27 AM 10:34

RECEIVED

SISP Review Complete
Template = ADM-013

ERIDS = ADM-03
Odds = J. Sanders (SXSS)

Mail Envelope Properties (4360E05F.5CA : 12 : 58826)

Subject: ROP Survey
Creation Date: Thu, Oct 27, 2005 10:12 AM
From: <stan.gamble@exeloncorp.com>

Created By: stan.gamble@exeloncorp.com

Recipients

nrc.gov
twf2_po.TWFN_DO
NRCREP

Post Office

twf2_po.TWFN_DO

Route

nrc.gov

Files

MESSAGE
rop2005survey.doc
Mime.822

Size

888
69632
98258

Date & Time

Thursday, October 27, 2005 10:12 AM

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Participant Name: Stanley T Gamble

Company: Exelon

Address: 300 Exelon Way, Kennett Square, PA 19348

Note: Those who wish to complete this survey anonymously will not receive a direct response from NRC.

E-mail Address: stan.gamble@exeloncorp.com

Phone Number: 610-718-3404

FRN Subject: Solicitation of Public Comments on The 2005 Implementation of the Reactor Oversight Process

QUESTIONS

In responding to these questions, please consider your experiences using the NRC oversight process. Shade in the circle that most applies to your experiences as follows:

1) very much 2) somewhat 3) neutral 4) somewhat less then needed 5) far less then needed

If there are experiences that are rated as unsatisfactory, or if you have specific thoughts or concerns, please elaborate in the "Comments" section that follows the question and offer your opinion for possible improvements. If there are experiences or opinions that you would like to express that cannot be directly captured by the questions, document that in question number 19.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Serita Sanders, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (Mail Stop: OWFN 7A15), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001. Ms. Sanders can also be reached by telephone at 301-415-2956 or by e-mail at SXS5@nrc.gov.

Please send us your response by December 1, 2005, either by postal mail or e-mail:

U.S. Postal System: Michael T. Lesar
Chief, Rules and Directives Branch
Office of Administration (Mail Stop: T6-D59)
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Electronically: NRCREP@nrc.gov

Questions related to specific Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) program areas
(As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(1) Does the Performance Indicator Program provide useful insights to help ensure plant safety?

1	2	3	4	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(2) Does appropriate overlap exist between the Performance Indicator Program and the Inspection Program?

1	2	3	4	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(3) Does NEI 99-02, "Regulatory Assessment Performance Indicator Guideline" provide clear guidance regarding Performance Indicators?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(4) Does the Inspection Program adequately cover areas important to safety and is it effective in identifying and ensuring the prompt correction of performance deficiencies?

1	2	3	4	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(5) Is the information contained in inspection reports relevant, useful, and written in plain English?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(6) Does the Significance Determination Process yield an appropriate and consistent regulatory response across all ROP cornerstones?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(7) Does the NRC take appropriate actions to address performance issues for those plants outside of the Licensee Response Column of the Action Matrix?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(8) Is the information contained in assessment reports relevant, useful, and written in plain English?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

Questions related to the efficacy of the overall ROP. (As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(9) Are the ROP oversight activities predictable (i.e., controlled by the process) and reasonably objective (i.e., based on supported facts, rather than relying on subjective judgment)?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(10) Is the ROP risk-informed, in that the NRC's actions and outcomes are appropriately graduated on the basis of increased significance?

1	2	3	4	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(11) Is the ROP understandable and are the processes, procedures and products clear and written in plain English?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(12) Does the ROP provide adequate regulatory assurance when combined with other NRC regulatory processes that plants are being operated and maintained safely?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(13) Is the ROP effective, efficient, realistic, and timely?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(14) Does the ROP ensure openness in the regulatory process?

1	2	3	4	5
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(15) Has the public been afforded adequate opportunity to participate in the ROP and to provide inputs and comments?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(16) Has the NRC been responsive to public inputs and comments on the ROP?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

(17) Has the NRC implemented the ROP as defined by program documents?

1	2	3	4	5
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Comments:

