From:

Rani Franovich

To: Date: Robert L Gill Jr 6/20/02 9:19AM

Subject:

Re: Fwd: Catawba McGuire License Renewal Application

Hi Bob.

I agree with you that a conference call is in order. We are not making progress on this with email's back and forth. However, I am not compelled to resolve this before the SER with Ols is issued. We are running out of time. As such, we'll focus on this issue as an SER open item.

Rani

>>> "Robert L Gill Jr" <rigill@duke-energy.com> 06/20/02 06:58AM >>>

Rani

I would like for the staff to review the examination reports which include not only the results but also the details of the examination procedure and calibration rather than simply stating that "it is not likely they would be detected by ultrasonic inspection."

Further, the NRC in MNS SER Supp 4 determined that underclad cracks were not an issue for McGuire 1 - the CE vessel - and the volumetric exam was required only for McGuire 2 prior to license issuance.

Also, Duke does not agree that this is a TLAA because no analysis or calculation of underclad crack growth was ever performed for McGuire.

Can we discuss at some time? Bob

"Rani

Franovich" To: <<u>rlgill@duke-energy.com</u>>

<RLF2@nrc.gov

•

bcc: Subject:

Fwd: Catawba McGuire License Renewal

06/19/2002

Application

04:37 PM

Bob,

Please see the attached note from Barry. It pertains to the information reviewed in your e-mail as well as the docketed correspondence you provided to me on June 12, 2002.

Rani

---- Message from "Barry Elliot" <<u>BJE@nrc.gov</u>> on Wed, 19 Jun 2002 15:42:47 -0400 ----

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

Subject: Catawba McGuire License Renewal Application

The R. Gill e-mail dated 6/17/02 indicates that the staff, at the time of the original license review, did not have confidence in the McGuire 2 fabrication process to conclude underclad cracking was not a concern. If the applicant can not provide conclusive evidence that the fabrication procedure does not result in underclad cracking, the applicant must provide an analysis (TLAA) for the license renewal term. If the McGuire decides to reference WCAP-15338, it must complete the renewal applicant action items. Westinghouse has proposed a satisfactory resolution to demonstrate that 2 and 4 loop plants are equivalent to 3 loop plants. This needs to be included in the McGuire application and the staff McGuire SER. In addition the applicant must review the WCAP to determine whether the number of design cycles and trnasients assumed in the WCAP bounds the number of cycles for the 60 years of operation of the McGuire RPVs. The e-mail discusses the ultrasonic examination perfored by the licensee. Due to the size and location of underclad cracks, it is not likely they would be detected by ultrasonic inspection. For this reason, the resolution of the TLAA needs an analysis and can not be managed per 54.21(c)(iii). Barry Elliot