SOLICITATION OF PUBLIC COMMENTS ON THE 2006 IMPLEMENTATION OF THE REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS

Participant Name:

James H. Sniezek

Company. Nuclear Management Consultant

5486 Nithsdale Drive Salisbury, MD 21801 James Sniezek Overizon, net

Address:

E-mail:

Phone Number: 410-749-9783

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

10/10/06 71FR 59339

OUNSI Beview Complete Templote = ADM-013

1 1

E-RIDS=ADH-03 Odd=Batt Fw (Zbf)

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 a	(As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)							
(1)	The Performance Ir	ndicator 1 □	Prograi 2 □	3	des usef 4	ful insigh 5 □	ts to help ensi	ure plant safety.
Com	ments:							

Comm	nents:					
(2)	Inspection Program.				ormance	Indicator Program and the
Comments:						
(3)	guidance regarding Perl	forman	ice Indi	cators.	ance In∉	dicator Guideline" provides clear 5 □
Comm	nents:					
(4)	The Performance Indica	ator Pro	ogram,	includir	ng the M	litigating Systems Performance

(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

Comments:

(5)			correction of	s important to safety, and is effective any performance deficiencies. 5	in	
Comm	nents:					
(6)	The information contain English.	•	etion reports is	s relevant, useful, and written in plain 5	l	
Comm	nents:					
(7)	The Significance Dete response across all Ro	OP cornersto		n appropriate and consistent regulate 5	ory	
Comm	nents:					
(8)	The NRC takes appropulation outside of the License		Column of the 3 4	erformance issues for those plants Action Matrix. 5		
Comm	ments:					
(9)	The information conta English.		sment reports	s is relevant, useful, and written in pla	ain	
Comn	nents:					
Questions related to the efficacy of the overall ROP. (As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)						
(10)		(i.e., based or		., controlled by the process) and acts, rather than relying on subjective		
Comn	nents:					

(11)	graduated on the basis of increased significance.					
	1 2 3 4 5					
Comm	nents:					
(12)	The ROP is understandable and the processes, procedures and products are clear and written in plain English. 1 2 3 4 5					
Comm	nents:					
(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 1 D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D D					
(14)	The ROP safety culture enhancements help identify licensee safety culture weaknesses and focus licensee and NRC attention appropriately. 1 2 3 4 5					
Comn	nents:					
(15)	The ROP is effective, efficient, realistic, and timely. 1 2 3 4 5					
Comn	The ROP is effective, efficient, realistic, and timely. 1 2 3 4 5 ments: it is efficient but not effective or realistic in reporting precuser cisues. It opposess that identifying and reporting precuser cisues hands are tied a the inspectors hands are tied a The ROP ensures openness in the regulatory process. good eferyple is Dawis Berne even					
(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 re	esponsiv 1	/e to pu 2 □	ıblic inpı 3	uts and 4	comments on the ROP. 5			
Comm	ents:								
(19)	The NRC has implem	ented th	ne ROP 2	as defi	ned by p	program documents. 5			
Comm	ents:								
(20)	The ROP minimizes u	unintend	led con 2 □	sequend 3	ces.	5 □			
Comm	ents:								
(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									
Comm	ents:								
(22)	Please provide any a Process.	dditiona	l inform	ation or	comme	ents related to the Reactor Oversight			
	The rement ,	proce le 1	he (inclu publ	designed in	ith insight into certical			
	Please provide any additional information or comments related to the Reactor Oversight Process. The sument process, including impaction reports do not provide the public with insight into certical not provide the public with insight into certical perfermance usines with the plants. The impaction reports are sterile and do not identify the reports are sterile and do not identify the								
	inspectors and site personnel. They (inspection uports)								
	give the stription since is found). The								
	intrection reports one virtually not worth. by reaple looking for recommence insights. The foregoing said I believe the plants are generally releasing with good attention to safe performance.								
	20		1		J				