

October 7, 1998

MEMORANDUM TO: Frederick H. Burrows, Electrical Engineer
Electrical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Samuel J. Collins, Director Original signed by:
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: CONCERNS RELATED TO DYNAMIC TESTING OF INSTRUMENT
CHANNELS AT BRAIDWOOD

I am responding to the memorandum you sent me on October 2, 1998, regarding the resolution of the follow-up actions for the NRR differing professional view (DPV) panel on dynamic testing of instrumentation at Braidwood. In your memorandum you concluded that the staff's follow-up action efforts fell short of completely addressing your concerns and provided specific comments for my consideration.

I have reviewed your comments and consider the review of this DPV by NRR to be concluded. As you requested, I will ensure that your DPV and October 2, 1998, memorandum be made public. The staff position is as indicated in the September 21, 1998, memorandum from Lee Spessard to Brian Sheron and I intend to take no further actions based on this DPV. It is fully expected that not all DPVs will be resolved to everyone's satisfaction and that reasonable people will occasionally disagree. The purpose of the DPV process is to provide a fair and open forum for this disagreement to be aired and an informed decision to be made. I would like to thank you for submitting your concerns.

I would also like to express the important part that the DPV and Differing Professional Opinions (DPO) process plays in our safety-conscious work environment. It is the policy of the NRC and the responsibility of all NRC supervisory and managerial personnel to maintain a working environment that encourages employees to make known their best professional judgements even though they may differ from a prevailing staff view, disagree with a management decision or policy position, or take issue with proposed or established agency practices. Both the general public and the NRC benefit when the agency seriously considers DPVs/DPOs. In your memorandum you expressed frustration and implied detrimental effects resulting from the DPV/DPO process. As indicated, this is not the intent of the DPV/DPO process, and as a result we are forwarding your concerns to the Office of the Inspector General for appropriate action.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Brian Sheron if you have any questions.

cc: H. Bell, OIG
P. Bird, HR

Distribution

SCollins/FMiraglia
BSheron
SPeterson

PFoust
ADT R/F
PDR

LSpessard
Central Files

DF 01/0

#1 10/7

Document Name:p: *See previous page for concurrence

OFFICE	*NRR	*A:ADT:NRR	D/NRR		
NAME	SPeterson	BWSheron	SJCollins		
DATE	10/6/98	10/6/98	10/7/98		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

100000
9810130097 981007
PDR ADOCK 05000456
P PDR

98-001
NRC FILE CENTER COPY

MEMORANDUM TO: Frederick H. Burrows, Electrical Engineer
Electrical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Samuel J. Collins, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: CONCERNS RELATED TO DYNAMIC TESTING OF INSTRUMENT
CHANNELS AT BRAIDWOOD

I am responding to the memorandum you sent me on October 2, 1998, regarding the resolution of the follow-up actions for the NRR differing professional view (DPV) panel on dynamic testing of instrumentation at Braidwood. In your memorandum you concluded that the staff's follow-up action efforts fell short of completely addressing your concerns and provided specific comments for my consideration.

I have reviewed your comments and consider the review of this DPV by NRR to be concluded. As you requested, I will ensure that your DPV and October 2, 1998 memorandum be made public. The staff position is as indicated in the September 21, 1998 memorandum from Lee Spessard to Brian Sheron and I intend to take no further actions based on this DPV. It is fully expected that not all DPVs will be resolved to everyone's satisfaction and that reasonable people will occasionally disagree. The purpose of the DPV process is to provide a fair and open forum for this disagreement to be aired and an informed decision to be made. I would like to thank you for submitting your concerns.

I would also like to express the important part that the DPV and Differing Professional Opinions (DPO) process plays in our safety-conscious work environment. It is the policy of the NRC and the responsibility of all NRC supervisory and managerial personnel to maintain a working environment that encourages employees to make known their best professional judgements even though they may differ from a prevailing staff view, disagree with a management decision or policy position, or take issue with proposed or established agency practices. Both the general public and the NRC benefit when the agency seriously considers DPVs/DPOs. In your memorandum you expressed frustration and implied detrimental effects resulting from the DPV/DPO process. As indicated, this is not the intent of the DPV/DPO process, and as a result we are forwarding your concerns to the Office of the Inspector General for appropriate action.

Please do not hesitate to contact me or Brian Sheron if you have any questions.

cc: H. Bell, OIG
P. Bird, HR

Distribution

SCollins/FMiraglia PFaust LSpessard
BSheron ADT R/F
SPeterson PDR

Document Name:p:

OFFICE	NRR	A:ADT:NRR	D:NRR		
NAME	SPeterson	BWSheron	SJCollins		
DATE	10/6/98	10/6/98	10/ /98		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY