

Roberts, Darrell

From: Roberts, Darrell *DR*
Sent: Friday, April 09, 2010 7:31 AM
To: OHara, Timothy; Wilson, Peter
Cc: Conte, Richard
Subject: RE: Salem AFW Update - Correction

Let's make sure that NRR's OpE folks are aware of this issue. They have not yet reported out on it in their daily reader, and this issue is going to garner agency-wide attention given the broader regulatory implications associated with buried safety-related pipe inspections.

Also, has the licensee looked at its service water systems?

DJR

From: OHara, Timothy *RT*
Sent: Friday, April 09, 2010 6:51 AM
To: OHara, Timothy; Wilson, Peter
Cc: Conte, Richard; Roberts, Darrell
Subject: RE: Salem AFW Update - Correction

Pete,

Please note that item (7) should say "QUALITATIVE" rather than "quantitative". Sorry for the confusion.

Tim

From: OHara, Timothy *RT*
Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 10:26 PM
To: Wilson, Peter
Cc: Conte, Richard; Roberts, Darrell
Subject: RE: Salem AFW Update

Pete,

I will call tomorrow between 6:30 and 7:00 AM to discuss and answer any questions you have.

Here is a brief summary of a meeting I had on Thursday PM with Len Rajkowski (sp?), Salem Engineering Director and with Bill Mattingly and Howard Berrick of Reg. Affairs:

(1) Unit 1 AFW Piping: UT measurements from 4/7 on the 2nd and 3rd excavation turnout to have many measurements which are below calculated min wall of 0.278". Based on these readings, PSEG decided that they cannot show operability for an additional cycle.

(2) Unit 1 AFW Piping: PSEG is pursuing 2 possible options: (a) replace the piping in the same location as presently, i.e. buried, or (b) replace the piping and redesign it to be above ground.

(3) Unit 1 AFW Piping: Each option will use new pipe. Preliminary schedule: 2 weeks to procure piping, 15 days to fab. and install. Replacement would be per PSEG design change process (50:59) and be accomplished per ASME Section XI. **Decision on which option to follow is to be made on 4/9/10.**

(4) Unit 1 AFW Piping: PSEG has decided that the coating on the present piping has either failed or was not applied, however, they felt that a separate Notification was not necessary because they will address the issue and corrective actions during their present EQ ACE process.

(5) Unit 2 AFW Piping: PSEG feels that they have inspection data on the Unit 2 pipe coating which will demonstrate that the piping is operable until the next planned inspection in Spring 2011. I've been given access to their Shared drive which has pictures and documentation on past inspections - I need to check this out tomorrow. I have not seen their inspection documents and they will decide on the exact strategy on Unit 2 in parallel with the choice of replacement options on Unit 1. I understood that they would provide justification to wait until 2011 or inspect now by Friday or Monday.

(6) Unit 1 AFW Piping: Engineering is working on a justification that Unit 1 met past operability requirements. This is a lower priority than the replacement options.

(7) Buried Piping in General: They agree that Guided Wave (GW) can only be used as a quantitative tool and cannot be used to measure wall thickness. They will use Code approved UT techniques for wall thickness measurements.

Talk to you tomorrow.

Tim OHara

From: Wilson, Peter *PT*
Sent: Thursday, April 08, 2010 3:29 PM
To: OHara, Timothy
Cc: Conte, Richard; Roberts, Darrell
Subject:

Tim,

Please call me first thing in the morning to discuss where we are with the Salem piping issues, especially licensee plans for Unit 2 AFW piping.

Pete

Peter R. Wilson
Deputy Director
Division of Reactor Safety, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
610-337-5126 (W)
(b)(6) (C) *W*
610-337-6928 (fax)
peter.wilson@nrc.gov