

From: Wayne Lanning
To: David Lew
Date: Thu, Mar 23, 2000 8:34 AM
Subject: Fwd: IP2 Onsite SG Inspection Technical Oversight

ITEM # 70

A/40

2

From: Pete Eselgroth
To: Bill Bateman, Edmund Sullivan, Suzanne Black
Date: Wed, Mar 22, 2000 11:32 AM
Subject: IP2 Onsite SG Inspection Technical Oversight

I believe it's very important that NRR have some knowledgeable tube inspection presence on site at IP2 while Con Ed is gathering and analyzing additional data to establish a technical basis for a SG operational assessment.

As an agency, we are stretched and we do sampling inspections, judiciously selected for looking at significant activities - right? - how can this not be one of the most important to be looking at on an ongoing basis (particularly when Con Ed is considered to be one of the technically weakest licensees in the SG tube inspection area)? I know that NRR has had folks up there recently, but what about now when Con Ed is endeavoring to supplement the picture in an area of weakness for them, high significance for us and and them and in light of the fact that Con Ed has apparently submitted stuff on the docket in the past that is questionable?

Peter

CC: A. Randolph Blough, Brian Holian, Hubert J. Miller, Jack Strosnider, Richard Crlenjak, Wayne Lanning