

withhold in part - file

From: Edmund Sullivan *ES*
To: David Lew, INternet:DoddCV@[REDACTED] EX. 6
Date: Tue, May 30, 2000 9:28 AM
Subject: Summary from last week

The following is a summary that I wrote up based on our visit last week to Waltz Mill. At this stage I would like to have your comments and then I will send it out as a final document to a wider distribution. David, I would also appreciate it if you would let me know how you would like to receive this, e.g., email, as a note, or as a memo.

Note to: David Lew

From: Edmund Sullivan

Subject: Inspection Report Input from May 24th and 25th , 2000, at Waltz Mill

After David Lew and I arrived at Waltz Mill on May 24th, 2000, representatives from NRC, Consolidated Edison, and Westinghouse gathered to discuss what we expected to accomplish. Those present included Jimmy Mark and John McCann (by telephone) from Con Ed, Don Adamonis from Westinghouse, David Lew and Wayne Schmidt from Region I, Caius Dodd and myself.

On May 23th, 2000, Wayne Schmidt had explained the overall purpose of the inspection in terms of a follow on to the February and March 2000 on-site inspection of the 1997 and 2000 steam generator (SG) activities. I indicated that we were also interested in assessing Con Ed's plans for addressing the shortcomings of the inspection of the sludge pile area. NRC staff concerns with this inspection arose from a missed call in tube 34/51 in SG 22 of a flaw that subsequently did not sustain 3 delta p during an in-situ tube test. This missed call was one of four missed +Point calls from the original inspection of the sludge pile region. The +Point inspection was based on Cecco/bobbin calls. The licensee subsequently performed a +Point reanalysis of the sludge pile and crevice region of all four generators.

Following this discussion, Don Adamonis summarized the results of the SG inspections using the attached vugraphs.

On May 25th I met with Don Adamonis. He explained that Con Ed Westinghouse was in the process of reviewing the missed calls from the expanded +Point inspection of the sludge pile and crevice regions. He said the purpose of this data rereview was to assess analyst performance and, in particular, to identify "monkey tubes." (A "monkey tube" is a tube with a flaw that is very easy to identify from the eddy current data.) He indicated that any further actions had not been defined and would be determined based on the results of this rereview.

On May 25th Dr. Dodd focused on reviewing the data from the two sludge pile missed calls from the expanded +Point inspection. His assessment of these calls was that (1) tube 34/41 in SG 21 contains a real flaw that should have been called by both analysts although he would not consider it a monkey tube and (2) tube 35/52 in SG 22 had a more difficult indication to call, the indication has some characteristics that resemble noise rather than a flaw, and the call could have gone either way. Dr. Dodd examined the signal taken from tube 35/52 after in-situ testing. This signal was easier to call and was clearly flawlike. Dr. Dodd also examined the record from the original sludge pile inspection of the missed +Point indication in tube 35/51 in SG 22 that failed in-situ testing. The indication in this tube can safely be termed a monkey call. The record showed that the analyst most likely recognized the flaw because the Lizajous figure indicated the placement of the two node points. Dr. Dodd indicated that the analyst may have been distracted and mislabeled the tube as NDD. He also indicated that eddy current analysts are not known for their keyboard skills. He said that he has personally witnessed production analysts make entry errors during inspections.

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act, exemptions 6
FOIA- 2001-0256 ITEM #

43

[Handwritten signatures and initials]
A12
②

Prior to leaving David Lew and I asked to meet with the Con Ed and Westinghouse representative. Jack Parry from Con Ed joined by telephone. We summarized our review of the eddy current data, discussed above. Dr. Dodd recommended a rereview of all the tubes analyzed by the analyst who missed the indication in tube 34/41 since he believed that it was reasonable to expect this indication to be called by both analysts. I stated that Westinghouse should complete their assessment of analyst performance and take whatever actions are appropriate based on that work. I also indicated that I considered Dr. Dodd's recommendation to be the minimum data reanalysis that should be performed. I said that staff at NRR staff would discuss this recommendation the following week to determine whether or not the staff would consider it a sufficient next step in resolving concerns with the sludge pile inspection. The representatives from Con Ed and Westinghouse indicated that they would like to meet to discuss the recommendation before commenting.