

From: Jack Strosnider *NRP*  
To: Bill Bateman *NRP*  
Date: Mon, Apr 3, 2000 8:14 AM  
Subject: Re: NRC View of IP2 SG '97 inspection

Bill,

have you an your staff talked to Pete on the issues in his e-mail, below? Sounds like he needed the info last Friday, so I'm not sure if Ted et. al. got to talk to him or not. Please get with him and find out if he has all he needs.

Thx,  
Jack

>>> Pete Eselgroth 03/31 6:02 PM >>>  
Hi Jack,

One of these days we'll get to talk on the phone again, but since it didn't work out this afternoon and the phone sys wasn't offering to take messages here's an email.

We're putting together our SMM IP2 book inputs and our recommended course of action hinges a lot on whether the '97 tube inspection is a performance issue, or not - i.e. do we enter the SDP, or not. There are three components, as I see it, to what was done in '97 that would relate to performance on the SG eddy current inspections: 1) use of acceptable technique, 2) acceptable application of the technique, and 3) acceptable determinations from the data. From what I understand, #1 is a yes.

On #2, I've heard that Con Ed's calibration of equipment may not have been acceptable

On #3, I've heard that the S/N ratio of the data was not good, that the noise level may have been such that it could mask small signals that alert an analyst to the possible presence of PWSCC and that the data contained such signals. I've got mays and could's here that I'm uncertain of, but the bottom line question appears to be: Was there something about the data ConEd got in '97 that should have led to "hey, we're not getting a level of clarity here that would allow us to see a problem if there was one.

Obviously, what I'm hearing may not be valid stuff, but can you shed some light on whether #2 and #3 look like they're yes or no answers? We had a meeting with Hub this afternoon on where we stand on the SMM preparations and it's really important to our input on a recommended course-of-action to know what these answers are. I've mentioned some things above that I've heard and can remember (I think there's more), but what you folks "know" is more important.

Please give us your insights so that we have a SMM input that is as NRC integrated as possible prior to the meeting deliberations. Thanks

Peter

CC: A. Randolph Blough, Brian Holian, David Gamberoni, David Lew, Hubert J. Miller, Pete Eselgroth, Suzanne Black, Wayne Lanning(...)

*30-24 M/18*