

47

**From:** Richard Barrett  
**To:** Calvo, Jose; Marinos, Evangelos  
**Date:** Mon, Sep 27, 2004 10:45 AM  
**Subject:** Re: UFM Allegations

Jose, Angelo:

Chris' request was that you work with Ted and Jerry to find a common basis for responding to the allegation. This is a high priority item which we need to get done by Thursday.

--Rich

>>> Evangelos Marinos 09/27/04 10:01AM >>>

Chris,

Since the allegation closure letters are based solely on conclusions reached by the Independent Task Force report, which principally addresses the fluid dynamics associated with the development of the instrument, the Division of Engineering and particularly EEIB should not be in concurrence, in my opinion. As you know the Task Force was created to address erroneous claims made by Caldon that the Instrumentation staff (EEIB) reviewed areas outside their discipline (fluid dynamics) in approving the Crossflow instrument. Furthermore, we were specifically told that we will not be requested to comment on the report and we were not asked. We were, however, requested to prepare a Bulletin on the basis of the conclusions reached by the Task Force in their final report. Notwithstanding the request for no formal comment on the Task Force activities, I offered my personal opinion (Attached) on the preliminary conclusions presented to Management by the Task Force.

>>> Christopher Grimes 09/24/04 02:14PM >>>

Jose: I've forwarded the proposed closure letters for the two ufm allegations to you and Angelo for concurrence. Since I'll be away next week, I suggest that you work with Jerry & Ted to see if you can find a common basis to respond to the allegation issues, without predisposing the outcome of the generic communication process. If you achieve agreement on the responses before 9/30, please ask Rich to concur for me so NRR can at least get credit for completing these responses in FY04.

After the meeting on 9/17, I got feedback from Caldon, Tim Long (WOG), Ellis, and Diablo Canyon (who provided info about their PTC-6 efforts). When George returns from travel and I return from leave, I think it would be useful for us to get together to discuss reflections on the meeting, and expectations for the future. Many folks who attended the meeting seemed to hear what they wanted to hear. I heard several different licensees describe very different Crossflow installation challenges and solutions, while the LEFM users simply think ASME nozzles are too expensive, hard to install and unnecessary for the chordal technology. After the public meeting, the Caldon participants (Ernie, Cal, Herb, one other and Hugh), described their assessment of reported UFM problems which they believe demonstrate that the Crossflow device is unreliable and inaccurate; I attempted to explain that, regardless of whether there is statistical significance to their analysis, licensees get an opportunity to take corrective actions and that is their prerogative. The Crossflow licensees seem prepared to expend additional resources and effort and do whatever testing and calibration is needed to address the flow profile and noise effects, while Caldon believes that those services should be included in the price and capability of the UFM.

Since a bulletin after all of this public feedback would upset the process, I suggest we reconsider the form of the generic communication. Tim Long promised to check on the status of their generic activities and send us an update to the plans described in their June 04 letter.

The Commission and EDO are asking about the status of the UFM issue, probably because of all the media attention. When I return from leave, I'll make another attempt to contact the ASME folks and I'll arrange a meeting for us to develop an "end game" strategy for the generic communication.

>>> Gregory Cwalina 09/21/04 02:00PM >>>

I understand that Steve Alexander has left the two closure letters with you. I have discussed with my

A-47

management and we would like to offer to meet with you, your staff, and the Task group (if necessary) to discuss the closure letters. We believe that meeting should be held at the Division Director or deputy level in order to expedite the closure of the issues and help preclude any back-and-forth discussions among the reviewers. Please let me know if you'd like a meeting and provide some acceptable dates.

**CC:** Boger, Bruce; Grimes, Christopher; Sheron, Brian