R 3

Stamm, Eric

From: Tsao, John - NRR
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2009 11:19 AM
To: Michel, Eric; Sabisch, Andrew
Cc: Franke, Mark; Lake, Louis; Riggs, Eric; Ottenberg, Geoffrey; Stang, John
Subject: RE: SSF ASW leak PDO

Duke forwarded a draft relief request to John Stang, the PM, regarding the ASW pipe. I will be reviewing the relief request. John is setting up a phone call with the licensee this week on the relief request.

Thanks.

John

-----Original Message-----
From: Michel, Eric
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2009 10:02 AM
To: Sabisch, Andrew
Cc: Tsao, John; Franke, Mark; Lake, Louis; Riggs, Eric; Ottenberg, Geoffrey
Subject: RE: SSF ASW leak PDO

Andy,

In the big scheme of things John and I believe the PDO is ok, but there are a few issues/questions we have. None of them are of a big enough concern that we're questioning the operability determination. We want to discuss these with you and see if we should be considering any follow up. No wooden plugs this time.

Eric

-----Original Message-----
From: Sabisch, Andrew
Sent: Sunday, September 06, 2009 6:21 PM
To: Michel, Eric
Subject: SSF ASW leak PDO

Eric,

Wanted to follow-up with you to see if there was any additional information we could provide or if you were still looking at a phone call on the repairs / assessment that they have done on the current thru-wall leak on the ASW piping . . . . . hope they are not looking at some of the left-over wooden plugs from Catawba . . . .

Let me know when you get in Tuesday or via E-mail sooner if you are checking from home what we can do for you and John.

Andy

==========

Andrew T. Sabisch
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Senior Resident Inspector
Oconee Nuclear Station
7812B Rochester Highway, Seneca, SC 29672

B/17

(O) 864-885-3001 / (C) 803-554-3630

From: Michel, Eric
Sent: Tuesday, September 01, 2009 1:34 PM
To: Riggs, Eric
Cc: Tsao, John; Franke, Mark; Sabisch, Andrew
Subject: SSF ASW leak PDO

Eric,

John and I have both taken a look the PDO for the SSF ASW leak. John's comments are attached. I've got three comments:

1. 90-05 requires augmented inspections (Enclosure 1.C.4). Specifically it calls for the inspection of 10 most susceptible (and accessible) locations for high energy lines. How is this being accomplished?

2. In the vicinity of the flaw how have they attempted to locate other flaws? I don't think the use of their wall thickness measurements is adequate to detect flaws with a "pinhole" geometry. Flaws in the vicinity of the TW leak may affect the 90-05 analysis.

3. We understand that the ID of the pipe is coated. Was surface prep necessary on the ID to accommodate UT? Please describe the surface condition of the pipe for the exam.

We'd like to have a quick call with you once you've had a chance to take a look at the comments, just to make sure we're all on the same page and see how we'd like to proceed. Sometime this week, if you can support (understand you guys are busy with the SRI turnover and the feed control valve from this morning), would be good on this end. Thanks.

Eric