

Schroeder, Daniel

From: Conte, Richard *RT*
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2010 4:31 PM
To: Burritt, Arthur; OHara, Timothy; Gray, Harold; Schroeder, Daniel; Balian, Harry; Cahill, Christopher
Cc: Cline, Leonard; Douglas, Christopher; Lew, David; Clifford, James; Roberts, Darrell; Lupold, Timothy
Subject: RE: Salem AFW Priorities/Next Steps

nice job well coordinated effort; no surprises.

From: Burritt, Arthur
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2010 4:27 PM
To: Conte, Richard; OHara, Timothy; Gray, Harold; Schroeder, Daniel; Balian, Harry; Cahill, Christopher
Cc: Cline, Leonard; Douglas, Christopher; Lew, David; Clifford, James
Subject: Salem AFW Priorities/Next Steps

Why is Unit 2 Ok

Testing

- Confirm the PSEG risk assessment to delay AFW testing is reasonable - Cahill
- Evaluate pressure drop testing resolution

Operability

- Evaluate the Unit 2 AFW extent of condition operability assessment (focus on the differences between Unit 1 & 2) – Schroeder/O'Hara
- Confirm the finite element analysis for the Unit 1 as found condition is acceptable including the use of appropriate methods and assumptions – O'Hara/HQ
- Confirm the technical evaluation that supports 1275 psig is bounding (including a faulted S/G scenario) – **complete no concerns**

What Needs to be Done Prior to Unit Startup

- Verify hydro/pressure test is code compliant – O'Hara
- Evaluate the 50.59 for AFW modifications – O'Hara
- Verify the ANI reviews and accepts repairs including testing – O'Hara
- Smart samples
 - Verify repairs to the control air system elbow that was replaced (how will PSEG certify the repair) – O'Hara
 - Verify control air pipe coating are repaired including at the support clamps (visual check of the as left condition) – O'Hara

Long Term Concerns

- AFW coating cure time acceptability

Schroeder, Daniel

From: Schroeder, Daniel *rl*
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 11:26 AM
To: Conte, Richard
Subject: RE: Salem AFW Priorities/Next Steps

Rich,

I copied Wayne and Chris on the updated risk assessment when I sent it to Art.

Dan

From: Conte, Richard
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 11:24 AM
To: Burritt, Arthur; OHara, Timothy; Gray, Harold; Schroeder, Daniel; Balian, Harry; Cahill, Christopher
Subject: RE: Salem AFW Priorities/Next Steps

I never got the revised risk assessment or Unit 2 operability determination from Friday, I only have the one related to 7 day extension.

Did our SRAs Chris or Wayne get the one that extends them to next outage and is that acceptable in light of never doing the test - there is a TIA for another plant found by John Richmond that accepts this even though the test was never done.

From: Burritt, Arthur
Sent: Friday, April 23, 2010 4:27 PM
To: Conte, Richard; OHara, Timothy; Gray, Harold; Schroeder, Daniel; Balian, Harry; Cahill, Christopher
Cc: Cline, Leonard; Douglas, Christopher; Lew, David; Clifford, James
Subject: Salem AFW Priorities/Next Steps

Why is Unit 2 Ok

Testing

- Confirm the PSEG risk assessment to delay AFW testing is reasonable - Cahill
- Evaluate pressure drop testing resolution

Operability

- Evaluate the Unit 2 AFW extent of condition operability assessment (focus on the differences between Unit 1 & 2) – Schroeder/O'Hara
- Confirm the finite element analysis for the Unit 1 as found condition is acceptable including the use of appropriate methods and assumptions – O'Hara/HQ
- Confirm the technical evaluation that supports 1275 psig is bounding (including a faulted S/G scenario) – **complete no concerns**

What Needs to be Done Prior to Unit Startup

- Verify hydro/pressure test is code compliant – O'Hara
- Evaluate the 50.59 for AFW modifications – O'Hara
- Verify the ANI reviews and accepts repairs including testing – O'Hara
- Smart samples
 - Verify repairs to the control air system elbow that was replaced (how will PSEG certify the repair) – O'Hara
 - Verify control air pipe coating are repaired including at the support clamps (visual check of the as left condition) – O'Hara

Long Term Concerns

- AFW coating cure time acceptability