

Jel

From: Terence Chan
 To: Joseph Petrosino
 Date: Thu, Jun 17, 2004 6:29 PM
 Subject: Re: Green Ticket 20040361 - Allegation NRR-2004-A-0026

Attached is the version I signed. However you should really use the ADAMS version since there may be some formatting, typos, grammar and other revisions after she proofs it. Our secretary should have the document into ADAMS tomorrow. I'll ask her to email you the ML number.

>>> Joseph Petrosino 6/17/2004 4:42:47 PM >>>
 Can I also have a copy of your draft SE so I can cut and paste narrative for the closeout letter??

>>> Terence Chan 06/17/04 04:38PM >>>
 Joe, Our input is attached.

Harold - I signed out the SE today.

>>> Joseph Petrosino 6/16/2004 12:50:50 PM >>>
 Thank You Terence !!

>>> Terence Chan 06/16/04 11:59AM >>>
 Yes, there will be sufficient detail to disposition the CI's concern.

>>> Joseph Petrosino 6/16/2004 11:50:28 AM >>>
 Terence:

I can understand that you do not want the SE to specifically address or justify the concerns in a manner that makes it appear the SE is addressing the CI. However, the SE will serve as our main source of objective evidence to either refute or substantiate the CI's concern. Consequently, the SE should discuss the flaw analysis as well as the assumed flaw size in enough detail to provide reasonable assurance that we have adequately evaluated the matter.

With that said, do you believe that the SE will have adequate detail and conclusions to support the disposition of concern 2 ??

Also, FYI, Cathy Jaeger said that GT20040361 is not closed until we provide the Commission with a copy of the closure letter to the CI.

Thanks,
 Joe

>>> Terence Chan 06/15/04 02:24PM >>>
 Joe,

The SE will briefly discuss the flaw analysis as well as the assumed flaw size , but it won't attempt to justify it in a manner that makes it appear the SE is addressing the CI.

Terence

>>> Joseph Petrosino 6/15/2004 2:20:37 PM >>>
 Terence:

Thanks for confirming that your input should be completed by 6/18. I have the closeout letter outlined

B-49

and ready for EMCB's input. Rich Barrett has the technical concurrence responsibility and I have also added Raghavan on for concurrence.

I would prefer to hold off on issuing the closeout letter to the concerned individual until the Safety Evaluation is issued by the Agency.

I was also curious as to whether the SE will specifically address the CI's flaw size/analyses concerns (Concern 2)?

Thanks,
Joe

J>>> Terence Chan 06/15/04 11:32AM >>>
Joe,

MHC

We'll be able to meet the 6/18 input date. However, in our response to Concern No. 2, it was my intent to reference our Safety Evaluation as the response to that concern. That SE should be issued out of the branch on 6/18, but likely won't be issued out of the agency to the licensee by that date. In DIPM's closeout letter, you will have to get the actual issuance date of that letter from Harold Chernoff.

Terence

J>>> Joseph Petrosino 6/15/2004 8:19:03 AM >>>
Terence:

MHC

Cathy Jaegers wants a commitment date from DIPM of when we will be able to provide the Commission a copy of the allegation close-out letter. (Cathy tells me that the EDO wants to keep the GT open until NRR provides the closeout memo to the Commission).

So I wanted to ask if EMCB will be able to meet its "Input to closure letter" due date of June 18th?? If you will be able to meet that date, I'll go ahead and give Cathy a due date that will be reasonable.

Thanks,
Joe

FYI: The TAC numbers for the GT are MC3315=Unit 1 / MC3316=Unit 2
Allegation TAC# MC3234

CC: Carol Brown; Harold Chernoff