

From: "Dan Williamson" <Dan@Williamson.net>
To: "Nanette Gilles" <NVG@nrc.gov>
Date: Thu, Nov 30, 2000 8:26 AM
Subject: RE: TSTF-360 Correction Pages

Nan

(I did not work on the changes for your comments, ... But...) I know Don is aware of the need to get to this; but the only copy of the package is the one you have (and Don's original). I think we may need to wait for Don to get back to make corrections to the original.

In the mean time, RE: #5 issue. I had not noticed this disconnect between the re-typed and the markup even going back to Rev 0. There was never any intent to eliminate the "or more required". In Rev 0 it was left in the markup version. I think when Don was incorporating your comments from 11/17/00 the effort to remove the phrase (which was incomplete as you are noting now) was, I think, the wrong way to go. Because:

3.8.5 LCO is setup such that maybe only one division is required (TSTF-204 emphasizes these options). As such, it would be appropriate to use "required" if only one division is required, and it would be appropriate to us "or more" if two (both) divisions are required. The TSTF-204 bracketing and reviewers notes are the right way to go. For TSTF-360, we should not be trying to deal with this since 204 dealt with it. My take is that the typed version has always been deficient (and unknowingly so), and the markup is and has been correct. Further, there was never any attempt to encompass or revise TSTF-204 changes.

For what it is worth - my \$0.02
Dan

-----Original Message-----

From: Nanette Gilles [mailto:NVG@nrc.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, November 29, 2000 12:54 PM
To: dan@williamson.net
Cc: donaldh@excelsvcs.com; Robert Dennig
Subject: TSTF-360 Correction Pages

Dan,

I know that Don is out of town and I wanted to get some information about the TSTF-360 corrections that I received. I have reviewed the package and only have two comments. The first is that, under item #5 (All OGs LCO 3.8.5 markup, Condition B), the correction was not made exactly as I had stated. I had asked that the words " or more required" be deleted from the Condition statement so that it reads, "One DC electrical power subsytem inoperable . . ." to be consistent with the earlier versions and the clean copy. However, in all of the markups the word "required" was left in the Condition. Was this deliberate and , if so, why was it left in? The clean version does not

have the word "required" in it.

The second comment is that, for item #8, the BWR/4 corrected markup was missing altogether.

If these two items can be corrected, I think we can go forward and approve TSTF-360. Let me know what you think.

Nan

CC: "Brian Mann" <bmann@erols.com>, "Robert Dennig" <R...

Mail Envelope Properties

(3A265572.4F4 : 13 : 50420)

Subject: RE: TSTF-360 Correction Pages
Creation Date: Thu, Nov 30, 2000 8:24 AM
From: "Dan Williamson" <Dan@Williamson.net>

Created By: GWIA:Dan

Recipients

Post Office OWFN_DO.owf4_po
NVG (Nanette Gilles)
RLD CC (Robert Dennig)

Post Office GWIA
donalddh CC

Post Office GWIA
bmann CC (Brian Mann)

Domain.Post Office

OWFN_DO.owf4_po
GWIA
GWIA

Route

OWFN_DO.owf4_po
GWIA:excelsvcs.com
GWIA:erols.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	2516	Thursday, November 30, 2000 8:24 AM
Header	1063	

Options

Expiration Date: None
Priority: Standard

Reply Requested: No
Return Notification: None

Concealed Subject: No
Security: Standard