

**From:** "Robert L Gill Jr" <rgill@duke-energy.com>  
**To:** "Rani Franovich" <RLF2@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 6/7/02 12:15PM  
**Subject:** Re: Fwd: Re: Proposed Text for WOG Request (WCAP-15338)

Rani,

It is correct that we did not reference WCAP-15338 in the LRA. However, in response to RAI 4.3-6 we did reference this WCAP. Please also note that we have this RAI as an open item. Duke's response to the open item, unless resolved by other technical information on vessel manufacture and RG 1.43, will be responsive to Barry. Please make sure that his request is included in the NRC discussion of Open Item 4.3-6.

Thanks, Bob

"Rani  
Franovich" To: <rgill@duke-energy.com>  
<RLF2@nrc.gov cc:  
> bcc:  
Subject: Fwd: Re: Proposed Text for WOG  
Request (WCAP-15338)  
06/07/2002  
09:08 AM

See the attached note from Barry.

Thanks-  
Rani

----- Message from "Barry Elliot" <BJE@nrc.gov> on Fri, 07 Jun 2002  
09:04:37 -0400 -----

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

Subject: Fwd: Re: Proposed Text for WOG Request  
(WCAP-15338)

Rani,

Duke has not referenced WCAP-15338 in their LR application. Therefore the response to the staff open issue by Westinghouse does not affect their application. Is Bob Gill know proposing to utilize WCAP-15338 to resolve the underclad Issue? If they are planning this position, then they must indicate that the number of transients analyzed in the WCAP bound the number of transients at the end of the period of license extension.

Barry Elliot  
Barry

>>> Rani Franovich 06/07/02 08:56AM >>>

See attached note from Bob Gill.

**CC:** "Mary H Hazeltine" <mhhazelt@duke-energy.com>, "Gregory D Robison" <gdrobiso@duke-energy.com>