

## Hernandez, Pete

---

**From:** Hernandez, Pete  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2011 3:49 PM  
**To:** Sanchez Santiago, Elba  
**Subject:** FW: C-111A Drawing Inconsistency?

---

**From:** Briley, Thomas  
**Sent:** Tuesday, November 29, 2011 11:48 AM  
**To:** Neurauter, James; Hills, David  
**Cc:** Cameron, Jamnes; Smagacz, Phillip; Rutkowski, John; Hernandez, Pete  
**Subject:** C-111A Drawing Inconsistency?

Jim/Dave,

Pete Hernandez brought to my attention some inconsistencies regarding the mapping/core bore drawing C-111A (DB 11-22-11 13:45) between the crack location tables and the actual physical locations of the core bores themselves. Not sure if there is any significance or not, but wanted to pass them along to make sure the tables / drawing locations are accurate and consistent.

Here are a few examples:

S11-663.75-30 is listed in the Flute 6 table as shoulder 11; however, the physical location shown on the drawing is Shoulder 10, Flute 5

S11-663.75-32 is listed in the Flute 6 table as shoulder 11; however, the physical location shown on the drawing is Shoulder 10, Flute 5

S9-650.0-9 \*\* is listed in the Flute 5 table as shoulder 9; however, the physical location shown on the drawing is Shoulder 11, Flute 6

S9-653.0-11 is listed in the Flute 5 table as shoulder 9; however, the physical location shown on the drawing is Shoulder 11, Flute 6

\*\* Listed in FENOC commitment letter L-11-353 Rev 3a dated 11/23/11.

Lastly, the licensee's response to SB-0054 in NRC Questions 11-23-11 indicates 70 total core bores and only 13 measured cracks. Is it appropriate for the licensee to extrapolate all of their assumptions from only 13 measured cracks?

Please let me know if you have any questions or comments. Thank you very much.

Tom

---

**Thomas Briley**

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Region III / Division of Reactor Projects / Branch 6 (Dresden, Davis-Besse, Fermi)

[thomas.briley@nrc.gov](mailto:thomas.briley@nrc.gov)

630-829-9734

D / 25