

**Lew, David**

---

**From:** Burritt, Arthur *AB*  
**Sent:** Friday, April 09, 2010 8:59 AM  
**To:** Lew, David; Clifford, James; Cline, Leonard  
**Subject:** FW: Salem AFW Update - Correction

FYI

**From:** OHara, Timothy  
**Sent:** Friday, April 09, 2010 7:25 AM  
**To:** Ennis, Rick; Lupold, Timothy; Burritt, Arthur; Schroeder, Daniel; Balian, Harry  
**Cc:** Modes, Michael  
**Subject:** FW: Salem AFW Update - Correction

Gentlemen,

FYI. Below is the status I sent last evening and one correction to it sent thid morning.

Tim OHara

**From:** OHara, Timothy  
**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. Please let me know if you have any questions or think I've misconstrued anything from yesterdays meeting with PSEG. Thanks

Tim

**From:** OHara, Timothy  
**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.

*D-12*

(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  
**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) *WHL*  
610-337-6928 (fax)  
[peter.wilson@nrc.gov](mailto:peter.wilson@nrc.gov)