

From: Tim McGinty
To: internet:SWhitsett@nacintl.com, internet:TThompso...
Date: Mon, Apr 17, 2000 7:50 AM
Subject: Various Issues on NAC reviews

1) As a follow-up to the many issues discussed during our conversation on 3/29, pertaining to fuel assemblies with damaged or missing hardware components: The reason why we were surprised when it was mentioned that there were many of these assemblies that you did not intend to can, at least according to what we heard, is Tech Spec Table 12B2-7, item B.5.c. If your intent was otherwise than what was submitted, or you intend to move that provision to specify that you did not intend to can these types of assemblies, we will need to communicate amongst the staff, and again with you.

2) Kim Gruss will be out of the office for a week starting next Friday. While you mentioned that you would send in the NAC-MPC for submittal for morning arrival on April 5, any additional time we can get it to her for review would be appreciated. I suggest a fax that I can docket and provide to Kim prior to the QA review, if at all possible.

3) Have you decided if you are going to supplement the current NAC Maine Yankee amendment application to allow partial heat loadings (and thus longer times in the tech specs)? If so, when will you forward the early info that I can docket and get to Ron regarding the analysis you have done on this?

4) On the NAC-LWT high burnup submittal, a 4/10 submittal jeopardizes our ability to approve it by the end of April. When I put the schedule together, without a formal PAI and the time that takes, I allotted and informed you that we would need a response in one week in order to meet your requested approval date. Based on your response date (and I know there is a lot of work you are doing, and it will also result in a lot of work here after we get it), it looks like the best we can do is move our approval date back two weeks also. So, we plan on trying to meet an approval date of May 12. I have spoken to my management about this. If May 12 is something that you cannot live with, then we'll have to have a conference call with my management.

5) I am getting questions for scheduling purposes on both the NAC-UMS transport review, and the NAC-MPC CY amendment. Please look into providing me your latest submittal schedule for these, and how they fit into your desired prioritization (like which one do you want us to work first with the NAC team). Please note that the team has a near-term large scale, but relatively short-length (one month, not full time) effort to resolve public comments on the NAC-UMS also coming up.

That's about it. No real new issues over the last couple of days, which I'm sure you are glad of. If you want to talk, I'm here.

Tim

CC: David Tang, Donald Carlson, Kimberly Gruss, Ron...

4/9/00