

From: Scott Barber *RI*
To: David Vito
Date: 1/29/03 2:10PM
Subject: My re-review of transcript/allegation file re: the Salem Hilti bolt guy

Thanks for the thorough review. I'm at Salem this week. I'll have to pick this after I return to the office.

RI
>>> David Vito 01/29/03 11:35AM >>>
Scott,

As I indicated at the end of our ARB discussion last week (1/22/03), I wanted to re-review Allegation File RI-2002-A-0137 because it was my impression that at least one of the issues you documented as a new item derived from the OI interview transcript review appeared to be something that we may have already documented and acknowledged. I finished my re-review this morning. The concerns provided on your Allegation Receipt Report form were as follows:

1. Alleger indicated that installed Hilti Bolts should have fire endurance identification markings and should be fire wrapped.
2. Alleger indicated that a fire wrap butt joint was installed in a location installed that called for a lap joint.
3. Alleger indicated that he was directed to install the fire wrap in a configuration other than the design as-drawn configuration on at least one occasion.

After my re-review, I agree that Concerns 1 and 3 are new (I found more detail re: Concern 3 in the alleger's earlier submitted package of information and I will add that to the allegation receipt form). Regarding Concern 2, I believe that it is referring to the Airdrop Cable to Conduit interface matter, and is an issue that was addressd both in the RI-2002-A-0137 acknowledgment letter to the alleger and in the first referral letter to the licensee. Also, in the transcript of the telephone interview between Eileen Neff, Suresh Chaudhary, and the alleger on November 26, 2002, I noticed another statement that we didn't specifically acknowledge as an alleger concern that perhaps we should have. Specifically, the alleger informed Suresh that there were no approved written procedures for the installation of the fire lagging (I will add this to the new allegation receipt form as an additional issue).

Re: Concern 2, the following excerpts from the 12/9/02 interview transcript and the transcript of the 11/26/02 telephone interview are what I believe demonstrate that this issue has already been acknowledged and referred:

From 12/9/02 transcript, pgs 94-96:

"....I made a report on it. I am going from a cable, conduit, forming the conduit.....to a side entry.....It's still called an airdrop on the envelope.....you have to put the first two layers on this before you put the envelope around the cable tray itself."

"(the alleger) looked at it.....the design stated.....you have your 2-4 inch lap, and it's like a funnel and you bring it down."

"the QC engineer came.....I said, "I'm having a problem with this. I was told to put the two layers.....but he (supervisaor) told me not to do it according to design. I'm going to do it according to design." (alleger said)....well, because it's not per design and we were taught that per design means that this had been fire tested, and without fire testing, I can't do this other configuration.It's a butt joint, is what he's trying to tell me to do.... instead of the overlap.... which is a good thing...."

From 11.26.02 telecon transcript, pg. 19:

".... and the interface between the cable and the conduit I spoke (of), if you would step on that conduit, it would break the barrier."

G-10

The corresponding item that was referred to PSEG on 1/3/03 was as follows:

2. Regarding the application of the fire wrap material, it has been asserted that the interface between the air drop cable and conduit is not adequate in that the overlap joint (cable to conduit) will break open if stepped upon. It was also asserted that these applications are not fire tested.

Please review the above informaion. If you agree with my assessment, I will modify the new allegation receipt report accordingly, and start to draft up the referral letter. Le me know what you think.