

**From:** Gary Claxton, *GT*  
**To:** Joseph Petrosino, Robert Pettis *TRR*  
**Date:** Fri, Sep 17, 1999 12:31 PM  
**Subject:** W ice basket screws/ IR 98-02

Bob  
Joe

RE: OI case 2-1998-023

Presently my investigation of this matter centers on how / why Westinghouse provided TVA a response that was not in keeping with the corrective action report. and why TVA accepted such an evaluation as closure for their PER.

As you know, Westinghouse did not reference the metallurgical report, but rather provided a statistical evaluation of how many IC basket screws could be missing in order for the Watts Bar ice condenser to remain operable.

- TVA accepted the statistical approach with no apparent regard for the metallurgical approach as required
- by their own Corrective Action Plan.. Essentially, the cognizant TVA managers say they can't reconcile why they closed the PER based on the response from W.

Did either of you come across any information that would suggest that there were any communications that authorized or requested W to provide a statistical rather than metallurgical evaluation?

Was there ever any explanation from W as to why this happened?

Was there a contract specifically laying out what TVA wanted W to evaluate in regard to the ice basket screws?

I'd appreciate any insight that either of you have.

Thanks,  
Gary  
404-562-4873

*J/22*