

Mail Envelope Properties (3EDF3CC8.ADD : 21 : 21146)

Subject: RE: Cooper Relief Request-RP-06-MB6821
Creation Date: 6/5/03 8:51AM
From: Bhalchandra Vaidya

Created By: BKV@nrc.gov

Recipients	Action	Date & Time
nppd.com	Transferred	06/05/03 08:51AM
reroger (Rogers, Ronald E.)		

Post Office	Delivered	Route
		nppd.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5108	06/05/03 08:51AM

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: Rogers, Ronald E.
Date: 6/5/03 8:51AM
Subject: RE: Cooper Relief Request-RP-06-MB6821

John Huang is okay with the e-mail I sent you.

We can have detailed discussions, if necessary, during the next teleconference.

Thanks.

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

>>> "Rogers, Ronald E." <reroget@nppd.com> 06/05/03 08:43AM >>>

Mr. Vaidya, thank you for doing this! This informal communication will be most helpful to the productive conduct of a telephone conference (telecon). I will use this for our meeting as preparation for the telecon.

I will coordinate this with others here at Cooper but I want to obtain Mr. Huang's feedback/comments before doing so. Have you heard back from John?

Thanks again, Ron Rogers

-----Original Message-----

From: Bhalchandra Vaidya [<mailto:BKV@nrc.gov>]
Sent: Tuesday, June 03, 2003 3:01 PM
To: Rogers, Ronald E.; John Huang
Cc: Mohan Thadani
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 is 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 be 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