

## Ziev, Tracey

---

**From:** Conte, Richard *RT*  
**Sent:** Monday, April 26, 2010 5:11 PM  
**To:** OHara, Timothy; Tsao, John; Lupold, Timothy; Manoly, Kamal; Burritt, Arthur; Cahill, Christopher; Schmidt, Wayne  
**Cc:** Ennis, Rick; Elliott, Robert  
**Subject:** Need for conference call RE: FEA of Degraded Salem Unit 1 AFW Piping

we are looking to do a conference call on Wednesday at 300pm or 330 NLT 400pm to go over what we know about the number of documents that have come in. we think Unit 1 can safely startup in light of repairs and code compliance.

Hdqtrs is reviewing the FEA that will be used to support at Unit 1 past operability determination and root cause report. not sure when the later two documents will be in but they are not needed for Unit 1 startup.

There is a tech eval on reduced rated pressure to 1275 that was reviewed also in order to support the past operability review. Not sure how it applies to Unit 2.

Unit 2 current operability and risk assessment (with 1.25 year exposure time on risk) is in on draft and we plan to engage licensee representatives tomorrow on what information supports the Jan 21, 2010 start for the 1.25 years to the outage next spring in 2011.

Bottom line is looks like back in the construction days, Unit 2 was properly coated but Unit 1 was not. No definitive answers yet as to why, based on design or documented as left or as found condition back in the 1970s.

We are also trying to deal with the acceptability of the Unit 2 operability determination based on an ASME pressure test that was never done and operational information that support flow measurements but may not be considered the alternate ASME unabated flow test per the same code.

With respect to the previous paragraph, a TIA on Pilgrim (ml 083660174) from ITSB seems to accept, partially, an industry position that the test can be deferred if there is a basis that the test will pass - still a violation for which we could issue NCV is green (preferred) or exercise enforcement discretion (least preferred since they were caught on this issue). Not sure the flow information (not test) is as sensitive as the pressure drop but then again the coating issue seems to be different from Unit 1. I need to talk to someone in TS branch and or Lupold on this issue, perhaps tomorrow before the conference call - what is a reasonable expectation that the pressure drop test will pass in the spring of next year? When we get a less draft oper det. we can forward it.

-----Original Message-----

**From:** OHara, Timothy *M*  
**Sent:** Monday, April 26, 2010 4:47 PM  
**To:** Conte, Richard  
**Subject:** FW: FEA of Degraded Salem Unit 1 AFW Piping  
**Importance:** High

Rich,

Tim, Lupold has asked John Tsao to forward the FEA to Kamal Manoly for review.

Information in this record was deleted in  
accordance with the Freedom of Information Act.  
Exemptions 6  
FOIAPA 2010-0334

-----Original Message-----

From: Tsao, John  
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 4:15 PM  
To: Manoly, Kamal  
Cc: Lupold, Timothy; OHara, Timothy  
Subject: FW: FEA of Degraded Salem Unit 1 AFW Piping  
Importance: High

Kamal,

Tim O'Hara of Region I forwarded me the FEA report for the Salem buried AFW piping. Tim Lupold asked me to forward the FEA report to you (see the first attached file). Attachment No. 2 is my assessment of the FEA report that I sent to Tim O'Hara this morning. Attachments No. 3 and 4 are the preliminary information for the FEA report.

Thanks.

John

-----Original Message-----

From: OHara, Timothy  
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2010 2:23 PM  
To: Tsao, John  
Cc: Lupold, Timothy; Conte, Richard; Gray, Harold; Burritt, Arthur; Schroeder, Daniel; Balian, Harry; Cline, Leonard; Sanders, Carleen; Ennis, Rick  
Subject: FEA of Degraded Salem Unit 1 AFW Piping  
Importance: High

Hello John,

Here is the FEA we've been discussing. Note that PSEG is still reviewing but they have provided this copy which will most likely not change. Please review this and let us know what you think. Thanks.

Tim OHara

-----Original Message-----

From: Berrick, Howard G. [mailto:Howard.Berrick@pseg.com]  
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2010 2:11 PM  
To: Schroeder, Daniel L.; OHara, Timothy  
Subject: Evaluation of Degraded Underground Auxiliary Feedwater Piping (SIA Report 1000494\_301\_RC)  
Importance: High

Attached is the SIA Report RE: Evaluation of Degraded Underground Auxiliary Feedwater Piping

Please note: This report has not been through the PSEG Owners Acceptance or Third Party Review process.

Howard Berrick  
PSEG Nuclear LLC  
Salem Regulatory Assurance  
PSEG Nuclear - Salem Generating Stations  
(W) 856-339-1862  
(Fax) 856-339-1448  
(Bpr) (b)(6)

<<1000494\_301\_RC.doc>>

-----  
The information contained in this e-mail, including any attachment(s), is intended solely for use by the named addressee(s). If you are not the intended recipient, or a person designated as responsible for delivering such messages to the intended recipient, you are not authorized to disclose, copy, distribute or retain this message, in whole or in part, without written authorization from PSEG. This e-mail may contain proprietary, confidential or privileged information. If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender immediately. This notice is included in all e-mail messages leaving PSEG. Thank you for your cooperation.