

Kael → wtz summary

~~TO BE WITHHELD FOR EXEMPTION 5~~

From: John Richmond, RI
Sent: Tuesday, November 18, 2008 1:55 PM
To: Doug Tiff; Marjorie McLaughlin; Nancy McNamara; Darrell Roberts; Marsha Gamberoni; David Pelton
Cc: Diane Screnci; Neil Sheehan; Richard Conte; Ronald Bellamy; Stephen Pindale; Jeffrey Kulp; Justin Heinly
Subject: OC Update to NJ DEP

I provided an update to Rich Pinney and Ron Zak this morning. They are the NJ state inspectors for OC.

They strongly expressed "concern" that our issued PN had withheld important and significant information from the public!

As examples, they cited the fact that the PN did NOT discuss:

1. Strippable coating de-lamination
2. disconnected tubing from sand bed drain line poly bottles
3. 1/2 inch deep standing water in the sand bed bays
4. no confidence [sic] in AmerGen's monitoring of sand bed drains, while the plant is on-line (e.g., water could enter a sand bed bay and go undetected)
5. brightly rust colored water found in bay 17, on Friday 11/14 [in other bays, the water was not described as brightly rust colored]
6. no proof that there is not large [entire surface] areas of rust under the epoxy coating (e.g., the issue may have been mischaracterized as only a small area of one identified blister, versus significant corrosion that has not been evaluated)
7. corrosion rate of steel shell, in a broken blister, would be the same as uncoated steel, and will be significantly higher than the predicted corrosion rate of the same steel inside an unbroken blister, because in the past, the sand bed region experienced the loss of at least 1/2 inch of steel due to corrosion

They also expressed concern for the long time to get the inspection report issued (mid Jan, based on an exit date of 1st week of Dec). They said that "kept a gag order" on them, and prevented them from informing the public!

We also discussed whether two specific commitments had been met (i.e., strippable coating to prevent water leakage, and monitoring of sand bed drains). They characterized both issues as clear examples of AmerGen's failure to meet LR commitments. We also discussed the ROP program concepts for documenting performance deficiencies, findings versus NCVs (violations), the more-than-minor thresholds typically used in ROP inspections, and inspection observations (separate from a finding).

I cautioned them, that our discussions were pre-decisional, and that there has been no discussion with the licensee regarding any potential report observations, findings, or conclusions of inadequate commitment implementation.

Of the 7 examples they cited above, there is an element of fact in each statement, but for the most part, they've attempted to inflate the significance of an item, by taking facts out of context or changing the circumstances. A few of things they said were just plain and simple, factually wrong.

Any thoughts on where we go next with the State?
John R.

B/85