

From: A. Randolph Blough *RT*  
To: Glenn Meyer; Scott Barber  
Date: 10/16/03 4:35PM  
Subject: Salem/ hope creek performance

Reply requested by 10/18/03

Scott/Glenn, i fell i need to send this to a wider audience but wanted scott to see it and have a chance to call glenn first.

#####

At this morning's RA staff meeting, we spent over an hour talking about Salem/Hope Creek. Generally, we have done a very good job on monitoring their performance and addressing the allegation; however, some worries were voiced: (1) OI and the allegation office are both eager to see more progress on the review or re-review of the [redacted] we have been given by the allegor, and that we would expand those to include anything coming from other interviews, that we would be able to show proof of our review, and that no tech issues would fall through the cracks. Further, that our review would include an appropriate review of the materials provided by the allegor, for example, if there are allegations about an event, then we would look through the TARP reports, CRs (etc) that the allegor has provided and review the ones pertaining to the allegor's event. (2) RA/DRA are interested in being sure we revisit the big picture periodically, ie., what recent performance and OI insights are telling us wrt SCWE and overall margin of safety; and are we comfortable with the plants operating and our current regulatory posture; and (3) DRS believes that Salem's performance confounds the ROP and, therefore, we should generate an ROP deviation memo to obtain EDO approval to do more inspection and oversight of Salem.

Accordingly, I would propose the following:

*AL*  
1) OI and the allegation office are both eager to see more progress on the review or re-review of the [redacted] we have been given by the allegor, and that we would expand those to include anything coming from other interviews, that we would be able to show proof of our review, and that no tech issues would fall through the cracks. Further, that our review would include a 'smart review' of the materials provided by the allegor, for example, if there are allegations about an event, then we would look through the TARP reports, CRs (etc) that the allegor has provided and review the ones pertaining to the allegor's event.

Br3# should generate a tracking tool for all the tech issues. The tool should list, for each issue, topic, key references, lead Inspector, status, and other info. The list should be updated weekly, along with the 2-page summary of the big picture (starting from Hub's recent summary to the EDO). Branch #3 should then brief Blough and/or Hollan, using those documents (and other material you need) and covering:

- allegation review status, particularly on tech issues;
- the big picture on Salem/ Hope Creek performance; and
- OI progress and tech staff support.

2) RA/DRA are interested in being sure we revisit the big picture periodically, ie., what recent performance and OI insights are telling us wrt SCWE and overall margin of safety; and are we comfortable with the plants operating and our current regulatory posture;

Every other week, the briefing mentioned above should include Hub and/or Jim, Ernie, and Wayne and/or Jack.

3) DRS believes that Salem's performance confounds the ROP and, therefore, we should generate an ROP deviation memo to obtain EDO approval to do more inspection and oversight of Salem.

I would like to expand the quarterly performance review called for by IMC0305. The Branch chief (Glenn) would still coordinate it, but we would do it more like a mid-cycle, involving the DRP and DRS division directors, and lead inspectors from recent key inspections. Agenda topics would include:

- recent performance and results;
- significant ongoing or unresolved issues and next steps to resolve;
- significant worries about Art.Is, that need attn, and for each, is there a way within the program to

information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions 7C  
FOIA-2005-0194

*R-92*

evaluate it, or is there some way compatible with the program to get at it (e.g., mgt meetings or visits), or should we seek a deviation from the action matrix.

Time is short; I need the branch's reaction to this by Monday.

I will also be looking at resources, and whether Fitz should be moved out of Br#3 to allow all to focus on Art Is.

thanks.

randy