

Conte, Richard

V2 Draft of RD

From: OHara, Timothy
Sent: Monday, April 26, 2010 1:15 PM
To: Conte, Richard
Subject: FW: Comments On Salem Unit #2 (DRAFT) Operability Determination - 10-005

FYI

From: OHara, Timothy
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2010 1:05 PM
To: OHara, Timothy; Burritt, Arthur; Schroeder, Daniel
Cc: Conte, Richard
Subject: RE: Comments On Salem Unit #2 (DRAFT) Operability Determination - 10-005

Correcting the dimensions on comment 2.

From: OHara, Timothy
Sent: Sunday, April 25, 2010 1:01 PM
To: Burritt, Arthur; Schroeder, Daniel
Cc: Conte, Richard
Subject: Comments On Salem Unit #2 (DRAFT) Operability Determination - 10-005

Comments:

(1) Page 1, Section 1.7, third paragraph says that the buried "pipe travels approximately 30' underground". However, the latest drawing which I have shows that the piping run from the FHB to the Mechanical Penetration room is 86'6".

(2) Page 1, Section 1.7 also ignores the fact that there is an additional approximately 80' of each header buried in the FHB Room to Nowhere. The approximate length of each header alone is actually 166'6" a total buried piping length of approximately 333' - way more than 30'.

(3) Page 3, Section Titled: December 1994 Inspection, says, in part, "...#22 and #24 Aux. Feed Lines appeared to be in excellent condition". Report SCI-94-0877 which is the only report I'm aware of from 1994 does not contain the word excellent anywhere. The report says that 2 of the 3 excavated areas were open when inspected but the 3rd had been restored. The following words are in the report: "From visual observations, some of the coating has adhered very well, and in other areas it had flaked off".

(4) Page 4, Section Titled: Upper AFW Pipe (#24) The conclusion is drawn that the UT thickness variations were not the result of corrosion, however, no basis for the conclusion is given.

(5) Page 4, Section Titled: Upper AFW Pipe (#22) The conclusion is drawn that the UT thickness variations were not the result of corrosion, however, no basis for the conclusion is given.

(6) Page 4, Section Titled: Post-inspection: There is no QC record for this repair of the coating.

Tim OHara