From: "Robert L Gill Jr" <rlgill@duke-energy.com>
To: "Rani Franovich" <RLF2@nrc.gov>
Date: 6/6/02 9:29AM
Subject: Re: Fwd: Regarding the intent of the response to RAI B.27-2

Rani,
I have discussed with Mary. We agree that the recast sentence provided by Jim more accurately conveys our intent. The affected sentence provided in our RAI response was poorly worded and confusing. We agree to make it confirmatory. Bob

"Rani Franovich" <RLF2@nrc.gov> 06/06/2002 07:52 AM

To: <rlgill@duke-energy.com>
cc:
bcc:
Subject: Fwd: Regarding the intent of the response to RAI B.27-2

----- Message from "James Medoff" <JXM@nrc.gov> on Wed, 05 Jun 2002 15:47:49 -0400 -----

To: "Rani Franovich" <RLF2@nrc.gov>

Subject: Regarding the intent of the response to RAI B.27-2

Ask Bob whether the intent of the last sentence in the second paragraph of the response to RAI
B.27-2 is that "The visual inspection method selected for the inspection of RV internal plates, forging, and welds will be sufficient to detect cracks in the components prior to any growth to a size that is greater than the critical crack size (critical crack length) for the material.

Tell him critical crack length is a material property that is calculated or determined by engineering analysis, not a flaw that exists in a material. Inspections can detect flaws prior to reaching a size equivalent to the critical crack size, but not the critical crack size itself.

If the answer to the intent question is yes then we'll make it a confirmatory item.

Jim