

From: Gregory Cranston  
To: Internet: ~~Doddcv@~~ <sup>EX 6</sup>  
Date: Wed, Jul 12, 2000 2:15 PM  
Subject: Indian Point 2 SG Data for 1997

Caius,

When you reviewed the 1997 data to determine if you thought that SG24 R2C5 indications were detectable in 1997 did you use the same method and analysis techniques that you would have used or that IP2 could/should have used in 1997?

The reason for the question is that the licensee is saying that the reason we now see the indication when we look at 1997 data is that we may be using analysis techniques different from those available to the analysts in 1997. When we look at the 1997 now (in 2000) we are not seeing what the analysts saw in 1997 and, therefore, are able to detect the 1997 indication when the analysts in 1997 could not.

Also, from a noise standpoint, we believe that the noise levels were sufficiently high to obscure a 70% or greater through wall indication. If the criteria for plugging is greater than 40% through wall then for any tube with a noise level greater than 40% the conservative approach would have been to plug the tube since there could very well be a tube that meets the Tech Spec requirement for plugging, particularly since a U-bend PWSSC indication was detected during the 1997 inspection.

Please let us have your comments.

CC: David Lew, Michael Modes, Peter Habighorst, Wayne Schmidt

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

Item 49

P/6