From: John Grobe
To: Anthony Mendiola; Beth Wetzel; Geoffrey Grant; Ho Nieh; Ian Jung; James Caldwell; Jim Dyer; John Jacobson; Paul Krohn; Roger Lanksbury; Ronald Langstaff; Roy Caniano; Steven Reynolds; Tad Marsh; William Reckley
Date: 12/14/01 1:27PM
Subject: Fwd: Re: Point Beach

Beth,

Thanks for the outstanding summary.

Only one perception difference from my perspective.....I believe you are correct that on 5 of the 7 prior opportunities for discovery (those before 1997), they did not feel strongly that they would have expected to find the issue because the focus of the CRs or generic correspondence at that time was somewhat oblique to the specific issue of failure states of the AFW recirc valve.

However, I felt that they agreed with us on the two examples in 1997:

1. When they were looking at the AFW discharge valve failure on loss of air and discovered that they needed to make modifications to assure operability on loss of air and reported it to us in an LER

2. When their IST contractor identified in 1997 that there were different loss of air failure mode safety considerations for the recirc valves included in the IST program as contrasted with the Design Basis Document for AFW

I thought they pretty much threw in the towel on those two examples. I believe that the two in 1997 are directly on target, and moreover those occurred after the licensee implemented their improved corrective action program. I also believe that the other five have merit.

Also, just a premonition....I expect that once we put together the licensing basis history for AFW, we will probably need to have conversations with NRR regarding whether this is a design/operability issue that the agency wants to go to the mat on or simply a procedural issue.

Thanks again.

Jack

A/137