

From: Michael Modes
To: Wayne Schmidt
Date: Fri, Jul 28, 2000 12:14 PM
Subject: Re: Counter Point to Con Ed

Thanks for the comments.

I'll pass your first one on to Cass who wrote that section

As for the POD ... they are only required to detect 11 flaws in a sample set of 16. Because it is listed doesn't mean it was detected. Even if it was the sample set is chosen based on 80/90 at 60 or better. Therefore that is what they proved and any claim beyond that would require another sample set.

>>> Wayne Schmidt 07/28 12:06 PM >>>

I agree with all the points made and I think we have good technical arguments. However, I think that point number 1 needs to have a better lead-in. I would suggest "The actual noise levels were not an issue in tube 2-67 since the flaw signal was removed from the areas of tube noise - as seen on the c-scan plots. Of major concern are tubes like 2-5 where the flaw is obscured within the ridge of noise."

Also the POD sheet for the u-bend technique lists a circ falw down to 27% TW - I don't know about the statement that no techniques is qualified to less than 60%.

Allen