

**From:** Christopher Grimes  
**To:** Brian Sheron  
**Date:** Thu, Mar 10, 2005 8:00 AM  
**Subject:** Re: UFM Closure

I tried to describe the additional tasks that will be necessary to translate the position in the allegation response into NRR's product lines, and into the public arena. Implicit in the allegation response is a view that the staff should not invest more effort to gather information about calibration practices in order to settle the dispute over use of laboratory data or in-situ testing to calibrate the instruments, and the Task Group's recommendation for a generic letter. These additional tasks need to be completed so that the responsible divisions can make an informed decision about whether there is anything further to accomplish with a generic communication.

>>> Brian Sheron 03/09/05 01:00PM >>>

Chris, why is it going to take another 4 months to determine if and what sort of generic communication is needed?

>>> Christopher Grimes 03/09/05 09:22AM >>>

Brian: I promised you a date for completing the generic UFM action - that date is **June 30, 2005**. This date will provide sufficient time to review the Ft Calhoun revised amendment, complete the topical SER for the Westinghouse X-beam version of Crossflow, decide on any clarifications to the update review standard for MURs to memorialize the LT basis for the allegation responses, dispose the UFM Task Group findings, and ultimately decide what kind of, or whether a, generic communication is warranted.

Chris

**CC:** Bruce Boger; Evangelos Marinos; Gregory Cwalina; James Lyons; Jared Wermiel; John Stang; Jose Calvo; Michael Case; Michael Johnson; Michael Mayfield; Patrick Hiland; Robert Taylor; Stephen Alexander; Suzanne Black; Tad Marsh; Theodore Quay; William Ruland

A-69