

From: Steven Long *NRL*
To: Bill Bateman; Brian Sheron; Charles Casto; Douglas Pickett; Jack Strosnider; John Grobe; Michael Mayfield; Niles Chokshi
Date: 8/12/02 6:20AM
Subject: Re: Davis-Besse RPV Not to be Encapsulated

Stephanie,

Since, Davis-Besse treated nozzle #46 as a leaking penetration, and since Allen & Keith (at least) told Davis-Besse personnel on repeated occasions that nozzle #46 was to be considered as part of the quarantine, it seems that treating it as such is consistent with both the wording of the CAL and the position previously expressed by the staff. *Allen & Keith*

Steve

>>> Stephanie Coffin 08/09/02 08:48AM >>> *NRL*
Jack G.,

Bill Bateman asked me to respond to your email below regarding quarantine of the RV head.

The CAL states that the licensee shall "quarantine components or other material from the RPV head and CRDM nozzle penetrations that are deemed necessary to fully address the root cause of the occurrence of degradation of the leaking penetrations."

My personal view is that the licensee has appropriately quarantined all the components and materials that address the leaking penetrations. The remainder of the head would therefore NOT be considered under quarantine.

I was looking at the original CAL, not the revised CAL, but I didn't think this first part was changed with the revision.

Stephanie

>>> John Grobe 08/05/02 04:53PM >>> *RTH*
Jack,

I believe that we still control the head under the quarantine. Bill, what's your thought

Jack

>>> Jack Strosnider 08/05/02 07:07AM >>> *Dean Lippa*

Following up on my comments, below, is there any hold still in place on what the licensee does with the head based on the CAL?

Jack

At this point, I feel compelled to make a comment. NRC/RES contacted NEI/MRP some time ago (several months) to discuss if there was any value in conducting research on the D-B head. RES staff has been ready to discuss this issue with NEI/MRP for some time. They - NEI/MRP - have been setting the schedule for this interaction - not NRC. And, to my knowledge, NRC has not put any hold on the licensee's actions/activities. If the licensee wants to complain, they should complain to their industry counterparts i.e., NEI and MRP not the NRC.

*W
8/11/02*

Jack

>>> John Grobe 08/02/02 03:03PM >>>
Folks,

RTH

It is unfortunate that they had to change their plans to accomodate the dialogue between NEI/EPRI and us. The good news is that it gives us more flexibility regarding the decision time frame for the potential additional research activities. We (the Panel) will try to do a better job anticipating scheduler nodes like this and try to avoid a repeat of this situation.

Thanks.

Jack

>>> Douglas Pickett 08/02/02 12:23PM >>>

NRA

The Davis-Besse licensee just informed me of their decision not to encapsulate the reactor pressure vessel (RPV) head prior to removing it from containment. They intend to wrap the RPV head and store it on the dry fuel storage pad located outside containment in the protected area. The licensee noted that due to delays in encapsulation due to NRC's continued interest in taking further samples from the RPV head, their window of opportunity had passed such that their schedule would not allow encapsulation inside containment.

A - Grobe

This message originated from Dave Baker who is the owner of the Reactor Head Resolution building block of the licensee's Return to Service Plan.

CC: Allen Hiser; Anthony Mendiola; DB0350; Kenneth Karwoski; Stephanie Coffin;
Steven Bloom