

**Jonathan Rowley - RE: 10/20/07 call summary**

---

**From:** "Devincentis, Jim" <jdevinc@entergy.com>  
**To:** "Jonathan Rowley" <JGR@nrc.gov>  
**Date:** 10/24/2007 2:54 PM  
**Subject:** RE: 10/20/07 call summary

---

Only two minor comments

Brian Ford

NRC=s

Jim

---

**From:** Jonathan Rowley [mailto:JGR@nrc.gov]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, October 24, 2007 2:50 PM  
**To:** Devincentis, Jim  
**Subject:** 10/20/07 call summary

Attached is the summary for the 10/20/07 call. Please review and comment as soon as possible.

**Mail Envelope Properties** (471F94D6.555 : 23 : 25941)

**Subject:** RE: 10/20/07 call summary  
**Creation Date** 10/24/2007 2:53:27 PM  
**From:** "Devincentis, Jim" <[jdevinc@entergy.com](mailto:jdevinc@entergy.com)>

**Created By:** [jdevinc@entergy.com](mailto:jdevinc@entergy.com)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

TWGWPO03.HQGWDO01  
JGR (Jonathan Rowley)

**Post Office**

TWGWPO03.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	327	10/24/2007 2:53:27 PM
TEXT.htm	3716	
Mime.822	6673	

**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

**From:** David Jeng  
**To:** Jonathan Rowley  
**Date:** 10/23/2007 2:58:02 PM  
**Subject:** VY Cooling Tower Cell 2-4 Failure Impact Upon Adequacy of Sec 2.4 License Renewal Scoping

I have reviewed your write up on the subject matter and determined that your safety evaluation needs to be reinforced in one substantive area, i.e., how and what specific steps the licensee has committed to improve on the structural inspection/monitoring program for safety related cells C 2-1.C 2-2 in order to adequately answer one of the three questions I suggested the RI staff to provide the VY licensee for an adequate resolution, i.e.:

"3. The fact that failure did occur in C 2-4, which has been subject to the existing VY inspection program, does raise a concern that the similar failure could have occurred in C 2-1 and C 2-2 (the cells are basically of similar design). Therefore, VY licensee should reassess the current inspection program applicable to C 2-1.C 2-2, and determine if the program should be enhanced in terms of its inspection frequency/details etc, in order to reasonably preclude the occurrence of C 2-4 type unexpected failure."

In your evaluation, you merely stated that the VY licensee has committed to enhance the structural monitoring program... This kind of vague, non-specific commitment on the part of the licensee, in my opinion, is inadequate to resolve the above listed question. Therefore, I am suggesting that you should work with RI staff to get a satisfactory resolution of the above question prior to drawing the safety conclusion presented in the last paragraph of the write up. Let me know if you have further questions regarding my comments. Thanks.

David

**CC:** Rajender Auluck; Sujit Samaddar

**Mail Envelope Properties** (471E4434.9FF : 24 : 34910)

**Subject:** VY Cooling Tower Cell 2-4 Failure Impact Upon Adequacy of Sec 2.4  
License Renewal Scoping  
**Creation Date** 10/23/2007 2:57:56 PM  
**From:** David Jeng  
  
**Created By:** [DCJ@nrc.gov](mailto:DCJ@nrc.gov)

**Recipients**

nrc.gov

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
RCA CC (Rajender Auluck)

nrc.gov

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01  
SKS3 CC (Sujit Samaddar)

nrc.gov

TWGWPO03.HQGWDO01  
JGR (Jonathan Rowley)

**Post Office**

OWGWPO01.HQGWDO01  
TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01  
TWGWPO03.HQGWDO01

**Route**

nrc.gov  
nrc.gov  
nrc.gov

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
MESSAGE	2131	10/23/2007 2:57:56 PM

**Options**

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

**Concealed Subject:** No  
**Security:** Standard

**Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results**

Message is not eligible for Junk Mail handling  
Message is from an internal sender

**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