

**From:** Stephanie Coffin *NRR*  
**To:** Wayne Schmidt *RT*  
**Date:** Wed, Jul 19, 2000 12:49 PM  
**Subject:** Re: Info. Notice 97-26

none from me Wayne.

>>> Wayne Schmidt 07/19 10:17 AM >>>  
Stephanie -lan - Greg any disagreements?

Hi Jimi - we look at this - they received it a little after the inspection began (about the time of the inspection) - I think they believed 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 indication 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 credibility to the technique and some possible crack information based on the post test exam, prior to plugging. If it leaked they would have had more questions to answer.

The overall issue is that they believed that the plus point technique was qualified and that it did find one flaw and that pressure testing was not warranted.

*OK to release*

*M) 41*  
*[Signature]*