

John Richmond

From: Richard Conte , *RD*
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 10:07 AM
To: Michael Modes; Glenn Meyer; John Richmond
Subject: RE: LR Inspection Plan Public

I don't see the need to put the plans in PDR nor give them to the licensee or applicatn in light of our current mode.

Richard J. Conte
Chief, Engineering Branch No. 1, DRS, Reg. [(b)(6)] Off. 610-337-5183

Ex. 6

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Modes
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 9:56 AM
To: Richard Conte; Glenn Meyer; John Richmond
Subject: RE: LR Inspection Plan Public

Here is what I understand:

If the inspection shows up in IP report 21, then it is announced and no further action is required of the lead.

If the inspection does not show up in IP report 21 it is not announced and the lead has to take action:

- 1) Call the applicant contact and verbally announce the inspection or,
- 2) Generate an inspection plan, call the contact and tell him it is coming, send it and put the document into ADAMS as public. Then change the status of the inspection entry in IP to make sure it is marked "announced". Make sure the DLR PM gets a copy. Make sure PAO RI is made aware of the public pronouncement. Remind the BC to tell the front office about the announcement.

Because Mike Gallagher and Rich Conte discussed the TMI and OC inspections yesterday both inspections have been "announced" regardless of the above.

From: Richard Conte
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 9:26 AM
To: Michael Modes; Glenn Meyer; John Richmond
Subject: RE: LR Inspection Plan Public

all the schedules sent out by DRP did not have the LRI stuff because the activities were marked "unannounced" in RPS.

Mike Gallagher called me yesterday to confirm plan on TMI and we discussed OC a little. LM application was discussed also, see me privately on it - no announcement on LM until Jan 09.

We need to ensure they are all announced even OC under the authority of App. C of 2515.

John do you know how to extend the BV LRI report do a tentative end on 9/5/08, revisit the issue then.

Richard J. Conte
Chief, Engineering Branch No. 1, DRS, Reg. [(b)(6)] Off. 610-337-5183

Ex. 6

N/79

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Modes
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 9:18 AM
To: Glenn Meyer; John Richmond
Cc: Richard Conte
Subject: RE: LR Inspection Plan Public

Thanks for the input ... things evolve.

The new LR PM for TMI wanted to know if I had sent anything to TMI confirming the inspection. I'll follow recent precedent and give TMI a call.

From: Glenn Meyer
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 8:16 AM
To: John Richmond; Michael Modes
Cc: Richard Conte
Subject: RE: LR Inspection Plan Public

For Pilgrim, Fitz, IP, and Susquehanna, I have followed roughly the same approach as John mentioned - communicated inspectors and AMPs but not the plan. To my thinking IP 71002 covers the "what we plan to do" part. Beyond the inspectors and AMPs, much of the plan is just general stuff and coordination.

-----Original Message-----

From: John Richmond
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 7:42 AM
To: Michael Modes; Glenn Meyer
Cc: Richard Conte
Subject: RE: LR Inspection Plan Public

For BV, I did not share the Inspection Plan with FENOC, and did not make it a Public Document. I provided FENOC a list of AMPs we intended to inspect, with the associated assigned inspector's name.

If you previously told me that we made these inspection plans public, then it must have slipped my mind. anyway, I didn't.

-----Original Message-----

From: Michael Modes
Sent: Wednesday, August 06, 2008 7:22 AM
To: Glenn Meyer; John Richmond
Cc: Richard Conte
Subject: LR Inspection Plan Public

Because License Renewal is a painfully public process I have always sent the applicant the inspection plan two or three weeks prior to arriving on site. It was a decision we all made when implementing Calvert Cliff's inspection. The logic was something like a public exit should be preceded by a public inspection plan.

Region III was adamantly opposed to this idea and instead wanted to continue sending a formal request for information letter they apparently send to every licensee prior to every inspection.

Region II didn't want to share the inspection plan publicly and, you shouldn't be surprised, wanted to keep the process less formal.

My question: what have you done for the inspections you lead?

And what do you suggest I do for TMI?

Received: from R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov ([148.184.99.7]) by R1MS01.nrc.gov
([148.184.99.10]) with mapi; Wed, 6 Aug 2008 10:06:36 -0400
Content-Type: application/ms-tnef; name="winmail.dat"
Content-Transfer-Encoding: binary
From: Richard Conte <Richard.Conte@nrc.gov>
To: Michael Modes <Michael.Modes@nrc.gov>, Glenn Meyer <Glenn.Meyer@nrc.gov>,
John Richmond <John.Richmond@nrc.gov>
Date: Wed, 6 Aug 2008 10:06:35 -0400
Subject: RE: LR Inspection Plan Public
Thread-Topic: LR Inspection Plan Public
Thread-Index:
AQHI97aXxMn411Qrik6XtTAz1mCJbl5dgkUQgAAJ4rCAABItGoAAAWBggAAHRM+AAASsAA=
=
Message-ID: <2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841CB12001@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>
References: <2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841C9F6ECC@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>

<2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841CB11DD5@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>, <2856BC46
F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841CB11E47@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>

<2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841C9F6ECE@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>, <2856BC46
F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841CB11F82@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>
<2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841C9F6ED3@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>
In-Reply-To: <2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841C9F6ED3@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>
Accept-Language: en-US
Content-Language: en-US
X-MS-Has-Attach:
X-MS-Exchange-Organization-SCL: -1
X-MS-TNEF-Correlator:
<2856BC46F6A308418F033D973BB0EE72841CB12001@R1CLSTR01.nrc.gov>
MIME-Version: 1.0