

CHAIRMAN Resource

From: Tom Gurdziel <tgurdziel@twcny.rr.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 28, 2018 9:41 PM
To: CHAIRMAN Resource
Cc: 'Ed Stronski'; Screnci, Diane
Subject: [External_Sender] My 10/28/2018 Comments on the Digital I & C Meeting held on 10/25/2018

Good morning,

I finished listening to the entire meeting. First, let me say that eliminating the wait the viewer used to have to endure during the adjournment between panels is much appreciated. So is being able to speed up the viewing when you want to go back to a comment you just missed.

I have not read, in fact, do not even have a link, to the transformation(?) paper by Dan Dorman. Lacking that, my information on the NRC digital I & C effort(s) are solely the result of what I have heard in this meeting. Here is what it looks like to me.

You have two groups of people. The group handling digital I & C for new reactors has approved some. The group handling digital I & C for the operating reactors is effectively a consistent, demonstrated major obstacle to installing digital I & C in any operating nuclear plant. These people, and others before them, have been assigned to this task for 30 years and still do not have an expected completion date! (3:06:31)

You have too many people. So, your high level NRC agency management has decided to combine both groups.

This is going to lead to continuing failure. And it will be complete.

Here is what those high level NRC people should have recommended. Transfer OUT of any digital I & C involvement all personnel currently assigned to the operating reactors digital I & C activity. This would include all of their supervisors, managers, and anybody of higher position; in other words, go right up the chain of command. Let the former(?) new reactors people now do the work.

Other Comments

While working for United Engineers & Constructors in Pennsylvania, I was told that they, (UE&C), had been kicked off one of the Indian Point nuclear plant construction jobs. And, at that time, I could tell you of two other big construction companies that had been kicked off other nuclear plant construction jobs. In these cases, the owners were looking to make changes resulting in improved performance.

Another case that comes to mind involves not improved performance on the same assignment, (accepting that performance was already adequate), but acceptable performance on a different assignment. I was in an Air Science class in the 1962 – 1963 college year when I recall being told how the US Air Force preferred to obtain pilots for newer types of aircraft. Rather than having their present pilots unlearn at least some of what they knew for the older aircraft and then learn what was different for the new aircraft, the preference was to just train new people for the new aircraft.

Doesn't it makes sense, when you see an obstacle to getting a job done, to remove the obstacle(s)?

Thank you,

Tom Gurdziel



Virus-free. www.avast.com