

Salem NRC Punchlist

Ref #	Action Req'd	Comments
25	What is the soil difference between yard and 'no mans land' area?	
32	How long was 1994 repair designed to last?	
33	In 1994, when repair was done, were future inspection requirements established to check coating? Was repaired pipe re-inspected?	
34	In 1994, was there a corrosion rate calibrated based on time in ground and was this applied going forward to determine how long it would last?	
35	Was remaining wall thickness calculated in 1994?	
36	What percent of pipe inspected in 1994? If only three locations, is it representative of total length?	Only specific locations were inspected. Lining appear intact except those areas that were repaired - this could be indicative of the pipe coating being effective in protecting buried pipe. Specific locations [The inspector calculated that PSEG inspected about 45' of AFW pipe from a total of 340' AFW pipe in 1994 - Do we agree with his deduction - this would be around 13% of pipe inspected]
46	Regarding the FEA, please be prepared to provide detail on the remaining margins in the AF piping design and how this has affected the margin.	[Similar to Ref# 110 - Inspector looking for something in writing.]
55	Please provide the FSAR design basis and system description for the original AFW system?	Copy of UFSAR write-up provided.
59	Please provide the basis for the 1950 psi design pressure for the AFW system.	
93	Please provide copy of documentation for new coating on piping and how long coating is good for.	
94	Salem Unit 1 coating - What are parameters for coating? How do we know it will meet our needs?	
103	NRC ISI Inspector needs signed off copies of the backfill procedure verifying that cure times have been met.	Copy provided at 05/04 meeting with PSEG staff.
110	Can you have M. Ahmed explain how the results of this analysis affected the margin on the system?	M. Ahmed discussed this with NRC Inspector. No additional follow-up questions. [Similar to Ref# 46 - Inspector looking for something in writing.]

G-21

Salem NRC Punchlist

112	Inspector requested flow calc evaluation that evaluated the addition of new pipe / fittings, etc.	Copy provided at 05/04 meeting with PSEG staff.
117	For high point fill/vent as result of pipe rerouting - air ion the line - Water Hammer concern / Air binding concerns - Has PSEG considered these in the design.	Discussed with Inspector. PSEG has considered these impacts. Should not be issue . [Inspector looking for A. Johnson follow-up on this item.]
118	Missile Protection - What are we planning on doing with respect to missile shields?	This was discussed on Friday 04/30. Engineering believes this is a matter of margin management. The increase in probability without shielding is slightly greater but within a very low probability range, and proceeding without the shields is acceptable. The missile shields will be added to the roof of FHB to add margin back to AFW pipe above ground. [Inspector looking for A. Johnson follow-up on this item.]



Ultrasonic Examination

N2J

Site/Unit: SSES / 2 Procedure: NDE-UT-060 Outage No.: U2-14R10
 Summary No.: 2-R1.14.0009 Procedure Rev.: 0 Report No.: VE-09-068
 Workscope: ISI Work Order No.: 601079 Page: 1 of 1

Code: ASME XI 1998/2000 Add Cat./Item: R-A/R1.16 Location: R-516
 Drawing No.: C-205719 Description: SE-NOZ
 System ID: RPV-E
 Component ID: N2J NOZ-SE Size/Length: _____ Thickness/Diameter: _____
 Limitations: _____

Comments:

APPROVAL SIGNATURES PER ATTACHED GE HITACHI EXAMINATION SHEET

Results: NRI RI Info

Percent Of Coverage Obtained > 90%: Yes

Reviewed Previous Data: Yes

Examiner	Level	Signature	Date	Reviewer	Signature	Date
Raymond, Tyler	I-L		4/21/2009	HEALEY, ROBERT/LEVEL III		4/28/2009
Fish, Cody	II		4/21/2009	LINDEN, RANDY T/LEVEL III		4/28/2009
N/A	N/A			TILLERY, DELTON E		4/30/2009

Vendor Examination For UT