

From: Paul Narbuty *NMSS*
To: Robert O'Connell
Date: 6/5/02 3:40PM
Subject: Assessment of New input NMSS-2002-A-0002

Assessment attached
No further action planned at this time.
Wayne reviewed and had no objections

CC: Frank Jacobs; M. Wayne Hodges; Michael Tokar

C/19

June 4, 2002

Assessment of Additional Information Provided by Concerned Individual
Allegation NMSS-2002-A-0002

The concerned individual (CI) provided additional information to Bob O'Connell in 6/3/02. Bob requested that SFPO/TSSI review the information and advise him of its impact.

Telephone information

1. The CI stated that he had not been saying there was a violation of the COMED procedures, but rather a violation of the ASME Code.

Response: No impact on the inspection findings. The inspectors addressed the fact that the ASME Code and ANSI N45.2 had slightly different definitions of rework and repair. Our assessment addressed the underlying reason for the requirements; that is to involve the design engineer when departures from the engineered design drawings are made by the fabricator. This was found to be properly implemented

2. The CI stated that he was not concerned with his findings in 1999 but was concerned with all repair and rework issues.

Response: No impact on the inspection findings. No examples of improper rework or repair design issues have been identified by the CI or subsequent NRC inspections.

Information Faxed to Region III

3. The CI faxed a chart from the Dresden/Quad Cities pipe support analysis procedure which shows that the yield strength for common steels decreases when the service temperature increases.

Response: No impact on the inspection findings. There is no question that the yield strength for common steels decreases when the service temperature increases. The CI did not provide any examples where this concept was improperly applied. The CI's testimony with RIII might suggest that the CI has a concern about increased steel temperatures induced by weld repairs, but temperature changes due to welding are temporary and reverse as the steel cools. The inspectors' review of weld repair controls found them to be adequate.

June 3, 2002

NOTE OF TELEPHONE CONVERSATION



RECEIVED BY: Bob O'Connell

SUBJECT: NMSS-2002-A-0002

U. S. Tool & Die // Holtec

On June 3, 2002, I received a telephone call from the allegor which he stated was in response to our closure letter of May 28, 2002.

He stated that he had not been saying there was a violation of COMED procedures, but that there had been a violation of the Code [ASME?]. He stated that he was not concerned with his findings in 1999, as reviewed by the staff. He is concerned with all the design, which is affected by the rework and repair issues. He stated that we need to have engineers review the issues, not QA people. He stated that he will write up his comments and send them to us.

I told the allegor that when we receive his written comments they will be forwarded to the technical staff for evaluation, and that he would receive a response.

He also stated that he had faxed some information to RIII which was to have been forwarded to us. He said it shows a chart of material yield strength that demonstrates that the material loses strength at a certain temperature, and that shows that the design calculations will be affected by the repairs that are done under rework and repair. I said that material would be forwarded to the technical staff for evaluation, and that he would receive a response.