

From: Rani Franovich
To: Robert L Gill Jr
Date: 6/6/02 10:05AM
Subject: Re: Notes for Metal Fatigue telecon summary

Okay, Bob. You will definitely see this before it is issued. Thanks for the input; I'll share it with John Fair as well.

>>> "Robert L Gill Jr" <rlgill@duke-energy.com> 06/06/02 09:15AM >>>
Rani, here are some words for you to use in your telecon summary. Revise as necessary, but we would like to review the final draft prior to issuance. Thanks, Bob

In a telecon on 6/4/02, Mike Davis, Bob Gill, Mary Hazeltine and Greg Robison discussed staff follow-up questions associated with RAI's 4.3-4, Parts (2) and (3), and RAI 4.3-5 with John Fair and Rani Franovich.

At issue for Duke on RAI 4.3-4 was the reasoning behind the NRC request for additional information on a report (WCAP-14574) that was not used in or referenced by the McGuire-Catawba license renewal application. It was unclear to Duke why the NRC needed to ask questions concerning information in a document not relevant to the application review. The NRC reviewer explained to the group that he understood that the WCAP report is not a part of the Duke application, but pointed out that the report is a publicly available reference that raises issues related to the Westinghouse fatigue design. He also explained that he needed to compare Duke's situation to the report as an additional step in doing his application review. From the call, Duke gained an appreciation of how the reviewer is conducting his reviews.

Additionally, while Duke has a technical disagreement with the report in question and sees no technical merit in providing a comparison to the information in Table 2-10, such a comparison by the NRC can assure that this aspect of the public record is properly considered. Duke went on to explain why we do not agree with various aspects of the report and why we distanced ourselves from it by not using it or referencing it in our work. As stated in the application, the Thermal Fatigue Management Program credited for license renewal will assure that all fatigue-related issues are managed for the period of extended operation, including environmentally assisted fatigue. Because of this a Duke comparison to the WCAP report is not needed; however, an NRC comparison to this report can provide additional confidence and show completeness.

In order to support this NRC review, Duke will provide specific cumulative usage factors associated with the design of the pressurizer as requested by RAI 4.3-4, Part (2). With respect to Part (3), the pressurizer locations associated with these usage factors will be considered by Duke along with other component locations in the reactor coolant system for consideration of environmentally assisted fatigue under the process described in the application Section 4.3.1.2. environmentally assisted fatigue is the topic of RAI 4.3-5.

Concerning RAI 4.3-5, the reviewer indicated that he was fine with the usage factor information for the NUREG/CR-6260 six locations that Duke had

previously indicated that it will provide. Both sets of information will be provided formally by Duke. This RAI is confirmatory pending the formal submittal of the table previously provided by email.

(Rani, will the table sent via email be attached to this telecon summary?)

CC: John Fair