

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING 1997 SG CONFERENCE CALL WITH IP-2

The following information is based on discussions with Ted Sullivan, Bill Bateman, Pat Millano, Marsha Gamberoni, Ray Wharton, Scott Newberry, Jimi Yerokun, Janice Moore, Jack Goldberg, Dennis Dambly and Mitzi Young. Also, Ted consulted with his staff involved in steam generator reviews.

CONSULTATIONS WITH OGC

I spoke to DE, Projects and OGC staff to determine what conversations occurred with OGC last Summer regarding the issue of the timing of the conference calls verses the identification of the R2C67 U-bend degradation. I spoke directly to Ted Sullivan and Bill Bateman, and Ted asked his staff. I also spoke to Pat Milano, Marsha Gamberoni, Ray Wharton, and Scott Newberry. I also spoke to Janice Moore and Jack Goldberg. No one could recall any discussions with OGC more recently than a meeting in Sam's office about 2 months ago. (Roy and Janice were at this meeting and Sam was there part time - I'm not sure who else was there.) Mitzi Young developed some background information in the mid-September time frame (see attached).

LESSONS LEARNED TASK FORCE ACTIVITIES

Scott Newberry informed ^{me} that when the LLTF met with Con Ed staff, they asked if Con Ed could determine when the R2C67 U-bend indication was identified. Con Ed said they would get back to the task force. Subsequently, the licensee phoned Scott Newberry and told him that they could not determine when the R2C67 U-bend indication was identified. Jimmy Yerokun participated in the ARB a few weeks ago and this information was shared with the ARB.

Jimmy Yerokon pointed out in my discussion with him that the question was not asked in the context of an inspection, but rather in the context of the more "informal" discussion the task force had with the licensee. He believes that if the question is posed in the context of an inspection that the licensee could probably come up with more information.

During consideration of the final LLTF report, Jack Goldberg had recommended that the task force send a memo suggesting that this issue be followed up on. Scott decided not to send that memo as the issue was put into the allegation review process. During my discussions with Jack he indicated that the issue is a potential 50.9. He noted that it may not "pan out" but that he thinks it would be appropriate to determine by inspection what information is available.

VOLUNTARY NATURE OF OUTAGE PHONE CALLS

A few years ago a question was raised regarding regulatory basis/ process for the conference calls on SGs that we have with licensees during outages. As a consequence, we initiated the process of having the PMs inform the licensee when setting up these calls that the calls were voluntary and that the licensee did not have to participate if they chose not to. (A sample e-mail to a PM is available.) This practice was initiated after the 1997 outage calls with IP-2. I discussed with Jack Goldberg if the voluntary nature of these calls would have any impact on a

5

42. m

50.9 determination. He indicated that even though the licensee might enter into the calls voluntarily, once they were participating, 50.9 would apply.