

OHara, Timothy

From: OHara, Timothy *RI*
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2010 1:08 PM
To: 'Berrick, Howard G.'
Subject: RE: NRC Inspector Questions AFW Buried Pipe

Howard,

Thanks for the response.

I'll need a copy of the DCP which Allan references. Also, need the basis for his statement that the original coating was good for the life of the plant.

I'm keeping the questions on the new coating and the designed life open until I see more engineering data and analysis.

Also, I've not seen the Guided Wave data which Bob Montgomery said was being sent about a week ago.

Thanks.

Tim OHara

From: Berrick, Howard G. [mailto:Howard.Berrick@pseg.com]
Sent: Wednesday, May 19, 2010 9:54 AM
To: OHara, Timothy
Subject: RE: NRC Inspector Questions AFW Buried Pipe

Responses below

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

246

From: Johnson, Alan A.
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2010 1:45 PM
To: Berrick, Howard G.
Subject: RE: NRC Inspector Questions AFW Buried Pipe

From: Berrick, Howard G.
Sent: Friday, May 14, 2010 1:17 PM
To: Johnson, Alan A.; Colville, Kerry A.
Cc: Rajkowski, Leonard J.; Speer, Samuel E.; Hennessy, Philip; VanHorn, Patrick; Mattingly, William F.
Subject: NRC Inspector Questions AFW Buried Pipe
Importance: High

D-102

I received a call from Tim OHara late this morning. He is looking for answers to some follow-up questions:

Q1 - From the Apparent Cause Charter for degraded pipe coatings, in Interim Corrective Actions section the following statement is made: "...Significant areas were cleaned, prepared and recoated using a two part epoxy compound (ENECON CL+) determined to be an engineering equivalent to the original coating, as defined on Drawing 207483 revision 11." Tim asked where it was determined that the ENECON coating used was engineering equivalent?

Response: DCP

Tim was also looking at an email from ENECON (M. Goldberg) to P. Hennessey. In that email, ENECON states that the coating is good for 8 to 10 years (with a caveat that this will vary (plus or minus) based on surface preparation.

Tim asked, based on a logic that says if the ENERCON product was an "equivalent replacement to the original coating" (as stated by Engineering) and this ENERCON coating was good for 8 - 10 years (+/-), **was the original coating good for 8 - 10 years??** He is looking for response from Engineering.

Alan's Answer: The original coating was good for life of plant.

He also asked me to send him a copy of 207483 R11 [DONE].

Q2 - He is also looking at the WO for painting of AFW Pipe [60089561]. He had questions on the completed package we (P. VanHorn) had provided to him. He saw a lot of pages lined through with NA [he referred me to page 11 of 25 of package]. His question was 'how does this effect the coating life? Who evaluated that it was okay?

Response: I did not have the package with me when you called. After the call I got my package - When I looked at the packages, many of those lined through sections are NA'd because they refer to an ENERCON product (e.g., CP+) that were not being applied. I can have Pat Van Horne walk you through this W.O. is you want.

Howard Berrick

PSEG Nuclear LLC

Salem Regulatory Assurance

PSEG Nuclear - Salem Generating Stations

(W) 856-339-1862

(Fax) 856-339-1448

(Bpr) (b)(6)

Ex 6

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.