



UNITED STATES  
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION  
DIRECTORATE OF REGULATORY OPERATIONS  
REGION I  
970 BROAD STREET  
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07102

*Nelson*  
*3/12*

MAY 3 1973

H. D. Thornburg, Chief, Field Support and Enforcement Branch  
Directorate of Regulatory Operations, HQ

FS&EB ACTION REQUESTS (FSE&B ACTION CONTROL FORM)

The Region I Facility Operations Branch recently received its first action request issued by you under this new system, i.e., Action Code RO:I/73-8, Apparent Uncoupling of Control Rods. As indicated to you in our telephone discussion on April 26, 1973, receipt of the first of these new Action Requests without prior alert and guidance left this office somewhat perplexed as to purpose and procedure. Your words provided some clarification. As I now understand it, this should be a good control system and will fit in well with the system already in effect within Region I. I also understand from our discussion that you do plan to issue instructions to the field on the Action Request system.

One area that in my judgement requires a little more careful attention by you and/or your staff is the assignment of completion-requested-by dates. In the example cited, which was received in Region I on April 23, 1973, a completion by May 1, 1973 was specified. Examination of the originating Action Request by the Operations Branch, HQ (attached to your request) reveals that they recommended that the information be obtained during the next inspection of the subject facilities (operating BWRs--Oyster Creek and later). It would be fortuitous indeed if the routine inspection schedule for the five operating BWRs in Region I would allow completion of the requested action by the specified May 1 date. This is not the case. As presently scheduled, two of the facilities are set to be inspected in May, two in June and the most distant (Pilgrim) in July. As presently planned, and unless your needs dictate otherwise, this office will submit the separate memorandum requested by Keppler summarizing our findings on this action request immediately following the Pilgrim inspection. You indicated in our discussion that the completion-requested-by dates were negotiable, which is as it should be. However, in the interest of avoiding unnecessary communications, I suggest that more reasonable completion dates be assigned where obvious. A phone call by the assigned responsible

*9246*

member of your staff could determine the best guesstimate by the responsible region if needed. I would encourage that a similar procedure be followed for those Action Requests requiring more immediate response. This could also serve to alert the Region in advance of receipt of the documented request, thus allowing immediate incorporation into plans for inspections scheduled for the interim.

The above comments are intended to be constructive and to serve the needs of both HQ and the Regions. Please call if you have any questions.

R. T. Carlson, Chief  
Facility Operations Branch

cc: J. G. Feppler, RO

bcc: J. P. O'Reilly  
RO:I Branch Chiefs  
D. L. Caphton  
H. W. Crocker

MAY 3 1973

F. A. Dreher, Senior Construction Engineer, Field Support &  
Enforcement Branch  
Directorate of Regulatory Operations, RO:HQ

EVELYN J. BARNES

Returned herewith is a copy of the undated letter received from  
Evelyn J. Barnes, a copy of our reply and a copy of Form HQ-32  
USAEC. We consider this matter closed.

James P. O'Reilly  
Director

*For info...*  
*...*  
*Barnes*

~~8305180669~~ 4p.

OFFICE ▶	CRESS: I				
SURNAME ▶	Ryan: pac	O'Reilly			
DATE ▶	5/2/73	<i>M</i>			

*61247*