From: "Knorr, Jim" <Jim.Knorr@nmcco.com>
To: <NRCREP@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Oct 27, 2005 8:59 AM
Subject: ROP Survey

Attached are my answers to the ROP survey. In general the program has been a good one. However, my main issue with the process is the lack of a clear exit strategy once a plant has been placed in a column other that Column 1 of the action matrix.

Jim Knorr

Two Creek, Wisconsin

10/21/05
70FR 61318

(1)

RECEIVED

2005 OCT 27 AM 10: 33

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

SISP Review Complete

Template=ADM-013

E-RIDS=ADM-03

Add = S. Sanders (SXS5)

Mail Envelope Properties   (4360CF2D.C66 : 8 : 56422)

Subject:	ROP Survey
Creation Date:	Thu, Oct 27, 2005 8:59 AM
From:	"Knorr, Jim" <Jim.Knorr@nmcco.com>

Created By: Jim.Knorr@nmcco.com

Recipients
nrc.gov
  twf2_po.TWFN_DO
    NRCREP

Post Office	**Route**
twf2_po.TWFN_DO	nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	296	Thursday, October 27, 2005 8:59 AM
TEXT.htm	2923	
rop2005survey[1].pdf	144036	
Mime.822	202264	

Options

Expiration Date:	None
Priority:	Standard
Reply Requested:	No
Return Notification:	None
Concealed Subject:	No
Security:	Standard

NOTE: If you would like to fill this survey out on-line, a Word file format of this survey is contained in the zip electronic version.

Participant Name:

Company:

Address:

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

E-mail Address:

Phone Number:

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

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
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

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

1	2	3	4	5
☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Comments:

(18)   Does the ROP result in unintended consequences?

        1   2   3   4   5

        ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐   ☐

Comments:

(19)   Please provide any additional information or comments related to the Reactor Oversight
        Process.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of October 2005.

                                    For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

                                    ___/RA/_____
                                    Stuart A. Richards
                                    Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
                                    Division of Inspection Program Management
                                    Inspection Program Branch