

OHara, Timothy

From: OHara, Timothy *RI*
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2010 3:56 PM
To: Manoly, Kamal
Subject: RE: Salem Unit 2/1 AFW Pipe Degradation

Kamol,

Thanks for the information. Appreciate the help.

Tim OHara

From: Manoly, Kamal *NRA*
Sent: Thursday, May 13, 2010 3:42 PM
To: Conte, Richard
Cc: DeFrancisco, Anne; Balian, Harry; Bowman, Eric; Brown, Michael; Cahill, Christopher; Chernoff, Harold; Gardocki, Stanley; Gray, Harold; Hardies, Robert; Hoffman, Keith; Holston, William; Modes, Michael; Pelton, David; Robinson, Jay; Sanders, Carleen; Schmidt, Wayne; Thorp, John; Taylor, Robert; Ennis, Rick; Lupold, Timothy; OHara, Timothy; Patnaik, Prakash; Schroeder, Daniel; Schulten, Carl; Tsao, John; Burrirt, Arthur; Basavaraju, Chakrapani; Khanna, Meena
Subject: RE: Salem Unit 2/1 AFW Pipe Degradation

Rich,

With support from Chakrapani Basavaraju of EMCB/DE, we examined the two calculation packages we received regarding the evaluation of corroded AFW piping at Salem. We didn't identify any further questions or discrepancies. As such, we find the evaluation acceptable from a technical (design and ASME Code implementation) perspective. Whether the degradation in the Salem unit 1 AFW piping is bounding for unit 2, is an entirely different matter beyond the material we reviewed and I believe the regional office is making the determination in this regard.

Kamal

From: Conte, Richard *RI*
Sent: Friday, May 07, 2010 4:10 PM
To: Burrirt, Arthur; Ennis, Rick; Lupold, Timothy; Manoly, Kamal; OHara, Timothy; Patnaik, Prakash; Schroeder, Daniel; Schulten, Carl; Tsao, John
Cc: DeFrancisco, Anne; Balian, Harry; Bowman, Eric; Brown, Michael; Cahill, Christopher; Chernoff, Harold; Gardocki, Stanley; Gray, Harold; Hardies, Robert; Hoffman, Keith; Holston, William; Modes, Michael; Pelton, David; Robinson, Jay; Sanders, Carleen; Schmidt, Wayne; Thorp, John; Taylor, Robert
Subject: Salem Unit 2/1 AFW Pipe Degradation

We need another Conference to discuss developments since the April 28 telecon. See attached file for summary and actions along with residual actions. I am looking for Monday pm since Region I is in a counterparts meeting for Tues thru Thursday, can do Thursday pm. I am off Friday.

Some of you may have gotten emails today on entering the TS LCO related to structural integrity and how well it does or does not mesh with rule and code per 10 CFR 50.55a. These residual issues are right after the problem summary in the attached file. During the call we can summarize discuss point and counterpoint.

1. Does the licensee need a code relief request to cover:
 - a. Time from now to the outage in 2011 IAW 10 CFR 50.55a (g) (5) (iii) as impractical to perform?
 - b. Cover the first two periods of the current 10 year interval IAW 10 CFR 50.55a (g) (5) (iii) impractical to perform (they could have done it during there outages) or (iv), post ISI interval review?

2. Should staff inform PSEG they are violating TS LCO on structural integrity regardless of how ambiguously it is written. Do we really understand the consequence of this action.
3. For this case, do the rule/code requirements stand alone and what are they – evaluation of suitability for service in light of not doing the pressure drop test for Unit 2.

I hope to have a conference bridge all afternoon. Hopefully key players as noted in addressee list can communicate their availability in the pm preferably 300pm but I am open to 1 2 or 3pm. If you want to be considered as a key player let me know.