

CHAIRMAN Resource

From: Tom Gurdziel <tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com>
Sent: Sunday, March 18, 2018 9:30 PM
To: Transformation Resource
Cc: ESTRONSKI@aol.com; Bridget Frymire; Baval, Rochelle; Screnci, Diane; CHAIRMAN Resource
Subject: [External_Sender] NRC 2018 Transformation Thoughts #1

Good morning,

I have listened to the recorded RIC 2018 Technical Session 1. Here are my identifications and comments on what I feel are important points brought up by audience members.

At about 33:02, the comment from somebody with South Texas pointed out that you cannot wait to achieve complete consensus.

At 36:57 there was a Rolls Royce comment about why are we nowhere and France is on their 4th generation of digital I & C. What do they have or what are they doing that we are not?

At 38:38. We need to get specific examples of problems from that guy from South Texas.

At 43:54 and at 50:28 it appeared to me that the same point was being made. It is that we need to know what problem we are going to solve if we intend to be effective (and efficient and agile). AND, in particular, I DO NOT accept the argument that these transformation efforts or innovation efforts must be solely related to safety or even related to safety at all.

Perhaps here is a clear need for immediate transformative US NRC change at 54:16. As I heard it, there is at least one high level NRC manager who is so comfortable with the way things are for him or her today, in the year 2018 with a lot of computers and digital stuff, that he or she is content to have his or her employees spent 75% of their time sifting and sorting through information BEFORE actually getting to work on it. Why is this acceptable? I think this was described as an "SES shortcoming". Is there anybody in the NRC today who might suggest that an "extent of condition" needs to be done on management by SES people? If not, let me make that suggestion right now.

Two comments, at 1:11:36 and 1:00:34 may provide an answer to the question asked: "What is the expected outcome?" Since I did NOT hear that the present NRC is facing a 1/3 cut in its budget as sufficient motivation to get this work done, I would have to conclude that it, like the reference at 46:04 to the never completed (or even started) Near Term Task Force Item #1, will end up the same way.

Workers in private industry, even some in government, know that, if they don't do what the boss wants, there will likely be some penalty to pay. Perhaps it would be the loss of employment. So, it really caught my attention to hear, at 1:04:43 that Rulemaking may be needed. The current US president does NOT want any more new requirements initiated, if memory serves me correctly. As I see it, the ONLY way you are going to be able to do this, (rulemaking), is if somebody in the US NRC or that Senate Committee above can show the president that such effort is cost beneficial. Now, if you listened to Commissioner Baran in the morning, he identified a Rulemaking that would benefit both the NRC and, especially, those in the industry intending to decommission their nuclear plant. Yet, NO progress has been made. If you want a quick success, get that rule passed. Then this effort will be believable.

A missing NRC sense of urgency is the clear conclusion to the comments made at 1:16:45, although he used the word "deadline." Here is a thought on how to meet NRC deadlines better. Until any NRC group actually meets a group-

specific deadline fully, they DO NOT “work” from home. Now, I know, some groups might not have a deadline in front of them. The answer is simple: until they fully meet a deadline, they come to the office to work. That would be with no exceptions.

Those are my comments based on ideas from statements made during RIC 2018 Technical Session #1. I will be making additional comments in another e-mail.

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel



This email has been checked for viruses by Avast antivirus software.

www.avast.com