

PA-LR

From: "Mogolesko, Fred" <fmogole@entergy.com>
To: "Ram Subbaratnam" <RXS2@nrc.gov>
Date: 8/23/2006 9:29:11 AM
Subject: Questions

After reviewing the 2 recent rai's, we thought you might wan to consider a few wording changes. Please see attached.

Fred

Mail Envelope Properties (44EC581E.D52 : 16 : 40274)

Subject: Questions
Creation Date 8/23/2006 9:28:47 AM
From: "Mogolesko, Fred" <fmogole@entergy.com>

Created By: fmogole@entergy.com

Recipients

nrc.gov

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

RXS2 (Ram Subbaratnam)

Post Office

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	129	8/23/2006 9:28:47 AM
TEXT.htm	1481	
Additional AMR questions-suggested wording changes_1 WayneandErach08212006.doc	26112	
Mime.822	1	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard
ReplyRequested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is eligible for Junk Mail handling
This message was not classified as Junk Mail

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User
Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator
Junk List is not enabled
Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled
Block List is not enabled

Additional AMR questions

- 1) The piping of the Reactor Core Isolation Cooling System is subject to flow accelerated corrosion. The PNPS LRA Table 3.2.1-19 - ESF and Table 3.2.1 credit the plant-specific Periodic Surveillance and Preventive Maintenance Program for the management of loss of material (wall thinning). The GALL report recommends using the Flow-Accelerated Corrosion Program, XI.M17, to manage wall thinning. The Periodic Surveillance and Preventive Maintenance Program provides for inspection for wall thinning every 5 years but no Monitoring and Trending activities to predict areas of high wall thinning rates or for trending of thinning as does XI.M17. Please provide justification for not providing for monitoring and trending of wall thinning for RCIC piping.

Comment [a1]: Suggest deleting the first sentence. Since the system is normally in standby, why should it be subject to FAC? The question stands alone without the first sentence.

Deleted:

Deleted:

Deleted: a

- 2) In Table 3.2.1 Item 18 of the PNPS LRA, it is stated that none of the ESF system components are within the scope of the BWR Stress Corrosion Cracking Program. Please provide the details that justify this statement.

Deleted: t

Deleted: not