

RULES AND DIRECTIVES
BRANCH
USNRC

Michael T. Lesar
Chief, Rulemaking, Directives and Editing Branch
Office of Administration (Mail Stop: T6D59)
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 205550001

21 October 2006

2006 NOV -1 PM 3: 21

10/10/06
71FR 59539

2

RECEIVED

Dear Mr. Lesar,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the reactor oversight process as described in solicitation letter # 7590-01-P. As a local resident in the lower Ocean County Township of NJ, I do have an interest in the NRC's re-license process of Oyster Creek NGS.

Enclosed sheets are marked as best as I could in interpreting the questions related to the program associated with your oversight process. Basically, as my understanding, it's the overview of inspection results obtained at previous inspections of commercial operating nuclear generating stations. Color-coded icons that relate to the severity of the findings then classify these results.

In a general comment to that process I must inject that I am retired and was involved with the nuclear energy activities for over forty years. There is today as it was back in 1955, the public perception that nuclear power and nuclear weapons are one in the same. Unfortunately the first use of this energy was a weapon. This perception is fostered by a lack of knowledge. Until this countries education system promotes early year learning about radiation health effects and the generic use of nuclear generation, this lack of knowledge will continue.

As you are well aware, the Europeans are far more advanced in utilizing this form of energy. That is interesting in reference that they had the worst nuclear accident, Chernobyl, (Unsafe design) in comparison to our Three Mile Island operator error incident. In addition, our political structure is part of the problem.

I also must admit that your interfacing with the uneducated public is challenging with reference of discussion in technical maters. Having attended several of these meeting I would advise that your speakers be aware of this and use basic generic terms in there responses.

In closing, again thanks for the opportunity to input my thoughts and comments.

Raymond Tierney

Raymond Tierney.
34 Kansas Rd.
Little Egg Harbor, NJ.
08087.
raytierney@comcast.net
609-296-1561

SUNSI Renew Complete

F-RIDS = ADM-03
Case = B. FO (ZBF)

Template = ADM-013

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) Strongly Agree 2) Agree 3) Neutral 4) Disagree 5) Strongly Disagree

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 the last question of the survey.

Questions related to specific Reactor Oversight (ROP) program areas

(As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(1) The Performance Indicator Program provides useful insights to help ensure plant safety.

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

Comments:

(2) Appropriate overlap exists between the Performance Indicator Program and the Inspection Program.

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

Comments:

(3) NEI 99-02, "Regulatory Assessment Performance Indicator Guideline" provides clear guidance regarding Performance Indicators.

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

Comments:

(4) The Performance Indicator Program, including the Mitigating Systems Performance Index, can effectively identify performance outliers based on risk-informed, objective, and predictable indicators.

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

Comments:

(5) The Inspection Program adequately covers areas important to safety, and is effective in identifying and ensuring the prompt correction of any performance deficiencies.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(6) The information contained in inspection reports is relevant, useful, and written in plain English.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(7) The Significance Determination Process yields an appropriate and consistent regulatory response across all ROP cornerstones.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(8) The NRC takes 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:

(9) The information contained in assessment reports is 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.)

(10) The ROP oversight activities are predictable (i.e., controlled by the process) and reasonably objective (i.e., based on supported facts, rather than relying on subjective judgement).

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(11) The ROP is 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:

(12) The ROP is understandable and the processes, procedures and products are clear and written in plain English.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(13) The ROP provides adequate regulatory assurance, when combined with other NRC regulatory processes, that plants are being operated and maintained safely.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(14) The ROP safety culture enhancements help identify licensee safety culture weaknesses and focus licensee and NRC attention appropriately.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(15) The ROP is effective, efficient, realistic, and timely.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(16) The ROP ensures openness in the regulatory process.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(17) The public has been afforded adequate opportunity to participate in the ROP and to provide inputs and comments.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(18) The NRC has been responsive to public inputs and comments on the ROP.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(19) The NRC has implemented the ROP as defined by program documents.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(20) The ROP minimizes unintended consequences.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

(21) You would support a change in frequency of the ROP external survey from annually to every other year, consistent with the internal survey, as proposed in SECY-06-0074.

1 2 3 4 5

Comments:

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