

From: Peter Habighorst
To: Wayne Schmidt
Date: Mon, Jul 10, 2000 10:19 AM
Subject: Re: IP2 SG Summary

Wayne,

Thanks for the Summary.

My comment is that potential NOVs A. and B are of the same issue. I think it would be appropriate to issue violation A instead of both. The second point is that violation E is a good present day performance issue, (failure to determine the cause), whereas violation B is failure to identify the same issue in 1997.

All the more reason to remove violation B.

In the conclusion/root cause first paragraph we state "steam generator tube failure occurred within approximately 23 months of operation." It would be more accurate to account for the time when steam generators were required as pressure boundary and heat removal. More specifically during those 23 months the facility was in cold shutdown (no requirements for SG between October, 1997 and September, 1998). Therefore, a better wording, "steam generator tube failure occurred within 12 months of steam generator operation. I believe that this issue should also be considered in the risk significance determination.

>>> Wayne Schmidt 07/07 4:27 PM >>>

Hello all, please find attached my revisions to the previous summary, based on the discussions yesterday in headquarters. I hope this clears up some of the tech staff's concerns.

This is very draft and has not received Region I management review, but due to the time constraints involved I am sending it out.

A/246

Bare in mind that we are not complete with the sludge pile issue, but the write-up reflects our current