

60

September 13, 2005

~09:30

On August 30, 2005, Joe Burns, Pat Milano, and I met with licensee and AMAG vendor representatives at the Calvert Cliffs station. The purpose was to discuss information relative to the licensee's request for a power uprate that credits the perceived increased accuracy of AMAG for determining feedwater flow rate. As part of our activities, during a visit to the control room, we discussed use of AMAG at Calvert Cliffs; discussions that continued while we walked down the feedwater systems at both units and during our meetings with licensee and vendor personnel.

On arriving at my office on September 13, 2005, I learned that thermal power and electrical output had just been reduced at both Calvert Units following conduct of a tracer test to determine feedwater flow rate - a test that apparently established that AMAG was providing an incorrect feedwater flow rate that subsequently was used to recalibrate the feedwater venturis to recover power believed lost due to venturi fouling. It is also my understanding that the AMAGs have been used for this purpose for at least several months. I recalled no knowledge that AMAGs were actually in use at Calvert Cliffs prior to September 13, 2005 and, although I knew they were in operation at least some of the time, I did not believe they were being used for any operational purpose.

Joe Burns arrived at the office later than me on September 13, 2005, and had no knowledge of the power reduction situation at Calvert Cliffs. I consequently asked him of his recollections regarding our plant trip prior to informing him of the recent changes at the plant. My questions and his response were as follows:

Question: Was there any mention of a tracer test during our trip?

Response: No.

Question: When we were in the control room, what was our understanding of the usage of UFM's?

Response: Calvert Cliff's individuals, I believe to be a shift supervisor and another individual, knew of the existence of the AMAGs. Warren posed a question of how they would know if the UFM's were not operating correctly. In response, the other gentleman explained that they were not using UFM's, had not been trained in their use, and did not have operational procedures in place for use of UFM's.

Question: Any other information you recall regarding use of UFM's?

Response: In response to Warren's comments that he did not like "surprises" and would prefer that licensees provide complete information, licensee representatives stated that they were compiling data and using it for comparison to other secondary plant parameters. The licensee referred to this data as "pie" data because it was stored on the "pie" server. As part of a side discussion about the theoretical basis of the AMAG flow meter when Warren was not present, the licensee told me in some detail about the acquisition and storage of "pie" data. They may have mentioned that they were using it to recalibrate the venturis in addition to using it for comparison to other secondary plant parameters but I did not, at the time, fully grasp the gravity

Information in this record was deleted in accordance with the Freedom of Information Act. Exemptions 2008-0046 FOIA/PA

N-6

and implications of this statement.

End of Questions and Responses.

Joe and I have read the above material and certify it is correct. I have no recollection of knowledge that the AMAGs were actually in use, but I have not re-reviewed the information submitted on the docket to determine if we were previously informed that the AMAGs were actually in use. Regardless of our knowledge, I am concerned that, if the AMAGs were indeed being used for venturi recalibration and if the operators were being relied upon to use this information and to provide an input regarding AMAG malfunction, then our brief information would indicate that the operators were not aware of this reliance nor were they prepared to accomplish the necessary actions. Further, I am concerned regarding our not being aware that the AMAGs were actually in use although I would anticipate this would become "knowledge" during our planned pursuit into the licensee's experience with AMAGs.

15:30 Telecon with W, Calvert Cliffs, Region I, NRR

They consider the (b)(4) and stated it showed all AMAGs (the Unit 1 calibration, both AMAGs, and both X-Beams) to be incorrect and that the uncorrected venturis were providing accurate data. Consequently, the Unit 2 AMAGs are also believed to be incorrect. The tests were conducted in August and test results became available on ~Monday.

On usage and control room aspects, they stated that the power recovery usage has been documented in information provided to NRC and that control room personnel do not need to be involved in that application due to the methodologies that are in place.