

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
CORRESPONDENCE CONTROL TICKET

Date Printed: Sep 04, 2007 11:25

PAPER NUMBER: LTR-07-0573

LOGGING DATE: 08/30/2007

ACTION OFFICE: EDO

AUTHOR: Bob Meyer

AFFILIATION:

ADDRESSEE: Dale Klein

SUBJECT: Concerns feedback from SRO in response to a post on www.NUCPROS.com

ACTION: Appropriate

DISTRIBUTION: Chairman, Comrs

LETTER DATE: 08/24/2007

ACKNOWLEDGED No

SPECIAL HANDLING: Made public available in ADAMS via EDO/DPC

NOTES:

FILE LOCATION: ADAMS

DATE DUE:

DATE SIGNED:

To: Dyer, NRR
cys: EDO
DEDMRS
DEDR
DEDIA
AO

Norma Correa - Mr. Ellis,

From: <robert.meyer@exeloncorp.com>
To: <EllisJO@Inpo.org>
Date: 8/24/2007 1:42:51 PM
Subject: Mr. Ellis,
CC: <Chairman@nrc.gov>, <cmrmcgaffigan@nrc.gov>, <gbj@nrc.gov>, <bglaugh@bellsouth.net>, <cmrmerrifield@nrc.gov>, <pbl@nrc.gov>

Mr. Ellis,

The below quote is actual feedback from an SRO in response to a posting on www.nucpros.com. This drives the point home on the cross-cutting issues the impact of procedures can have at stations.

The survey that was sent yesterday is still in the data collection phase.

As stated earlier, and you may have been at the NRC/INPO meeting this year when I verbalized the top three issues for Operator Concerns. Procedure backlogs are one of them. I asked both the NRC and INPO to create a metric. I have not heard any response, which leads me to believe that neither the NRC nor INPO believe it is their job, or it is being ignored. In either case, this will be pursued until adequate resolution is on the table. The industry cannot afford to have an incident from a preventable latent error situation as poor procedures.

The data that is collected has been collected to date shows the extent of condition. Lets work together to solve this issue.

Bob Meyer

Bob.Meyer@insightbb.com

815-978-6028

"The turnaround time for procedure enhancements is so long that, to a degree, we have given up on our procedures group. If we find an important change is necessary, most of us will mark up a copy with what we want changed, fill out the revision approval sheet, and usually get all the approvals ourselves. Then we will carry it up to the procedures guys for typing."

"If the procedure problem isn't a fatal flaw, (i.e. we can work around the problem without flagrantly violating our standards) then we often won't even bother to request a revision. My crew put in a revision to a surveillance that radically simplified the test methodology. We did all the revision work except the typing, and gave it to the procedures group. Six months later we were on shift again when the surveillance came due, but our revision wasn't in the books yet. We found it in a pile in the procedures group's office. It hadn't made it to the top of their list yet. We have pretty much given up on those guys."

This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain Exelon Corporation proprietary information, which is privileged, confidential, or subject to copyright belonging to the Exelon Corporation family of Companies.

This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this e-mail is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout. Thank You.

>

Mail Envelope Properties (46CF1892.43A : 9 : 62522)

Subject: Mr. Ellis,
Creation Date 08/24/2007 1:41:58 PM
From: <robert.meyer@exeloncorp.com>
Created By: robert.meyer@exeloncorp.com

Recipients

nrc.gov

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

CHAIRMAN CC

CMRMCGAFFIGAN CC

GBJ CC (Gregory Jaczko)

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

PBL CC (Peter Lyons)

nrc.gov

NRGWIA01.NRGWDO01

"cmrmerrifield@nrc.gov" CC