

Mail Envelope Properties (3EDCFE98.F45 : 21 : 21146)

Subject: Cooper Relief Request-RP-06-MB6821
Creation Date: 6/3/03 4:01PM
From: Bhalchandra Vaidya

Created By: BKV@nrc.gov

Recipients	Action	Date & Time
nppd.com Reroger (<u>Reroger@nppd.com</u>)	Transferred	06/03/03 04:01PM

nrc.gov owf2_po.OWFN_DO JXH (John Huang)	Delivered Opened	06/03/03 04:01PM 06/03/03 04:10PM
--	---------------------	--------------------------------------

nrc.gov owf4_po.OWFN_DO MCT CC (Mohan Thadani)	Delivered Opened	06/03/03 04:01PM 06/03/03 05:01PM
--	---------------------	--------------------------------------

Post Office	Delivered	Route
owf2_po.OWFN_DO	06/03/03 04:01PM	nppd.com
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	06/03/03 04:01PM	nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3282	06/03/03 04:01PM

Options

Auto Delete: No
Expiration Date: None
Notify Recipients: Yes
Priority: Standard
Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

To Be Delivered: Immediate
Status Tracking: Delivered & Opened

From: Bhalchandra Vaidya
To: John Huang; Reroger@nppd.com
Date: 6/3/03 4:01PM
Subject: Cooper Relief Request-RP-06-MB6821

I had a telephone conversation with Ron Rogers of Cooper, 402-825-5304 this afternoon(3:30pm).

The following the summary of the discussion :

I tried to explain to him, in my own words, what I understand to be the staff's concerns.

I pointed out that there are following concerns :

a) On page 1 of 15, the submission states that Cooper wants to follow the "normal test frequency" to avoid subjecting the pumps to unnecessary wear, potential challenge to the plant, and entry into TS LCO. . . BUT on page 4 of 15, it states that vibrations at these low frequencies should not be detrimental to either the pump or the motor . . .

These two arguments do not support each other !

b) The submission does not provide any basis for presumption that the observed vibration levels historically have not been detrimental to the performance of the pumps nor would they detrimental to the performance of the pumps in the future(until next test).

c) The Variation in the vibration results need to be explained and the basis for raising the "Alert Level" need to be provided in the submission This includes the basis for the "Revised Alert Level".

d) My explanations are subject to corrections by the NRC staff.

Ron is going to talk to the appropriate person(s) in his organization and get back to me.

Further, teleconversations/teleconferences may be needed.

**John Huang,
Please let me know if I have mis-understood the subject.**

Thanks.

Bhalchandra Vaidya
NRR/DLPM
Licensing Project Manager, PDIV-1
Grand Gulf Nuclear Station, Unit 1
301-415-3308
M/S: O-7D1

CC: Mohan Thadani