From: Wayne Schmidt
To: Jimi Yerokun, Stephanie Coffin
Date: Wed, Jul 19, 2000 10:17 AM
Subject: Re: Info. Notice 97-26

Stephanie -Ian - Greg any disagreements?

Hi Jimi - we look at this - they receiced it a little after the inspctin began (about the time of the inspectiion)- I think they belived that they had done what was acceptable (expected?) (i.e., found one PWSCC and plugged it) as was described in Palo Verde and St Lucie 1.

I don't think they ever looked at this with a critical eye - like we are now. Also they have been asked - by NRR - why they did not pressure test the PWSCC indictaion they said that it did not meet the criteria so they did not do it. This clearly would have been a good thing to do - but alas they didn't do it. If it had held it would have lent credability to the techniqie and some possibel crack information based on th epost test exam, prior to plugging. If it leaked they would have had more questions to answer.

The overall issue is that they belived that the plus point technique was qualified and that it did find one falw and that pressure testing was not warrented.

CC: "tees@airmail.net"@GATED.nrcsmtp, Gregory Cranston

A/22