Roberts, Darrell

From:

Roberts, Darrell

Sent:

Roberts, Darrell /C/ Wednesday, April 28, 2010 6:33 PM

To:

Modes, Michael

Cc: Subject: Conte, Richard; Gray, Harold RE: Salem AFW Piping

Thanks, Michael.

DJR

From: Modes, Michael

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2010 4:36 PM

To: Roberts, Darrell

Cc: Conte, Richard; Gray, Harold Subject: Salem AFW Piping

The issues were extensively discussed during a lengthy telephone conference with NRR staff this afternoon.

There are no immediate safety issues.

We are going to engage the licensee technical staff on four residual questions.

Was the seismic input considered in the structural integrity analysis?

What was the basis for the averaging of loads on the piping analysis?

What documented evidence can you supply to show a coating was applied to the Unit 2 AFW piping?

What does the supplier of the coating suggest is the life of the coating?

The issue of technical specification, ASME vs surviellance, was resolved with the Tech Spec Branch on the line. ASME is invoked "in isolation" in the tech spec and does not connect to surviellance nor, in turn, LCO.

All this was conveyed to Art Burret who agreed with the stated postion and agreed to assist in setting up a staff-to-staff discussion on the above points with PSEG.