

From: Evangelos Marinos
To: Christopher Grimes
Date: Fri, Jun 4, 2004 8:43 AM
Subject: Re: UFM Bulletin

Ok

>>> Christopher Grimes 06/04/04 08:15AM >>>

Let's meet at 10:00 in my office to discuss a logistic strategy. Thanks

>>> George Dick 06/03/04 02:55PM >>>

Chris,

Either time is ok with Angelo and me. I have been assembling information for the Communication Plan.

With regard to the technical issues, we are having a meeting on Monday with Jerry, Jose, Warren, and Angelo to get an agreement on the technical content of the bulletin. Iqbal is scheduled to be on CWS that day, but he may come in for the meeting.

I had a brief discussion with Tony McMurtray (the lead PM for power uprates) this afternoon. He said that his understanding is that the Commissioner's TAs are interested in the Ft. Calhoun experience as well as general AMAG.

George

>>> Christopher Grimes 06/03/04 02:32PM >>>

George: We need to update the schedule to include the communication plan. At the ET meeting this morning, Jim Dyer informed us that Commissioner Merrifield has requested that we arrange a TA briefing on AMAG ... which we'll also need to include in the schedule. I'd like to meet with you and Angelo to discuss how we'll establish a consensus staff position to prepare for a TA brief and complete the communication plan messages. Are you available tomorrow at 10:00 or 2:00?

>>> Warren Lyon 06/02/04 02:15PM >>>

Attached is my strikeout / redline response to your email asking for comments on the draft UFM bulletin. My changes, which do not necessarily reflect the views of others, address the following:

1. In the Task Group review, we found that there were problems with W/AMAG at some plants. We have little information to reasonably ensure similar problems do not exist at other plants that use W/AMAG UFM's. Hence, in our previous draft input to the bulletin, we insisted on a 30 day response that reflected the need regarding W/AMAG. We do not have these concerns with Caldon spool piece designs, and a 120 day response time is adequate.
2. We have a concern with licensees who did a one time test and found that use of UFM's would require operation at a lower power level, so nothing was done. Since this might indicate an overpower condition, we incorporated it into our previous draft input as a 30 day response. I continue to believe the bulletin should address this situation.
3. The second sentence of the Required Response starts with "Licensees may confirm UFM accuracy by comparing the instrument performance in operating plant conditions against measurement ..." I've deleted this sentence. Let the licensees decide what confirmation is necessary and let them then submit that confirmation. Further, this sentence could imply that we will accept confirmation of UFM's on the basis of instrumentation that has a larger uncertainty than the UFM.

I've made additional changes to more precisely define the specific UFM designs that are being discussed and have made a few other changes. I did not address such editorial changes as spacing consistency between sentences - I assume this will be covered by editing.

A-29

>>> George Dick 06/01/04 10:09AM >>>
Warren,

Attached is a version of the UFM bulletin which was revised after receipt of your comments on the first draft. The major difference between your comments and the attached version is in the requested actions from the licensees. The attached copy requests that licensees may confirm the accuracy of their UFM's by comparing them to clean flow nozzle or other tests of known accuracy (e.g., tracer tests).

If you wish we could set up a meeting between EEIB and SRXB discuss any remaining differences.

Please let me know.

Thanks,

George

CC: George Dick