> >

<< File: Pages from AMP-210-2.pdf >>

```
From:
                  <George.Beck@exeloncorp.com>
                  <dia1@nrc.gov>, <rkm@nrc.gov>
To:
                 04/05/2006 5:15:19 PM
Date:
Subject:
                 RE: Audit Q & A (Question Numbers AMP-141, 210, 356)
Attached is third part of AMP-210. (third of three)
 << Pages from AMP-210-2.pdf>>
> ----Original Message-----
                Beck. George
> From:
                Wednesday, April 05, 2006 5:02 PM
> Sent:
> To: Donnie Ashley (E-mail); 'Roy Mathew (E-mail) ' (E-mail)
        Ouaou, Ahmed; Hufnagel Jr, John G; Warfel Sr, Donald B; Polaski, Frederick W
> Cc:
                FW: Audit Q & A (Question Numbers AMP-141, 210, 356)
> Subject:
> Note: As originally transmitted this email was undeliverable to the NRC; it exceeded the size limit. It is
being retransmitted without the AMP-210.pdf. This file will be reconstituted and sent in smaller ".pdf"s; the
first 11 pages are attached.
> George
> ----Original Message-----
> From:
                Beck, George
> Sent:
                Wednesday, April 05, 2006 4:39 PM
> To: Donnie Ashley (E-mail); 'Roy Mathew (E-mail) ' (E-mail)
> Cc: Ouaou, Ahmed; Hufnagel Jr, John G; Warfel Sr, Donald B; Polaski, Frederick W
> Subject:
                Audit Q & A (Question Numbers AMP-141, 210, 356)
> Donnie/Roy,
> Attached are the responses to AMP-210 and AMP-356 in an updated version of the reports from the
AMP/AMR Audit database. Also included is a revised version of AMP-141. These answers have been
reviewed and approved by Technical Lead, Don Warfel.
> Regarding AMP-210, please note:
> As pointed out in our response to NRC Question AMP-210, (8a)(1), "The 0.806" minimum average
thickness verbally discussed with the Staff during the AMP audit was recorded in location 19A in 1994.
Additional reviews after the audit noted that lower minimum average thickness values were recorded at
the same location in 1991 (0.803") and in September 1992 (0.800"). However, the three values are within
the tolerance of +/- 0.010" discussed with the Staff."
> Regarding AMP-141, please note:
> Our response to AMP-141 has been revised to reflect additional information developed during the
ongoing preparation of RAI responses.
> Please let John Hufnagel or me know if you have any questions.
> George
```



This e-mail and any of its attachments may contain Exelon Corporation proprietary information, which is privileged, confidential, or subject to copyright belonging to the Exelon Corporation family of Companies. This e-mail is intended solely for the use of the individual or entity to which it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient of this e-mail, you are hereby notified that any dissemination, distribution, copying, or action taken in relation to the contents of and attachments to this e-mail is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this e-mail in error, please notify the sender immediately and permanently delete the original and any copy of this e-mail and any printout. Thank You.

Page 1

**Mail Envelope Properties** (44343353.D56 : 16 : 7510)

Subject:

RE: Audit Q & A (Question Numbers AMP-141, 210, 356)

**Creation Date:** 

04/05/2006 5:14:15 PM

From:

<George.Beck@exeloncorp.com>

**Created By:** 

George.Beck@exeloncorp.com

## Recipients

nrc.gov

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

DJA1 (D. Ashley)

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

RKM (Roy Mathew)

exeloncorp.com

fred.polaski CC

donald.warfel CC

john.hufnagel CC

ahmed.ouaou CC

**Post Office** 

Route

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

nrc.gov nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

exeloncorp.com

Files

Size

Date & Time

**MESSAGE** 

3191

05 April, 2006 5:14:15 PM

TEXT.htm

6929

Pages from AMP-210-2.pdf

4635176-ML060960602

Mime.822

6356158

**Options** 

**Expiration Date:** 

None

Priority:

Standard

**Reply Requested:** 

No

**Return Notification:** 

None

**Concealed Subject:** 

No

**Security:** 

Standard