

To: TThompson@nacintl.com
cc:
Subject: Fwd: MY SAR Revision, 6/19/00

Tom:

See David's attached e-mail on the validity of the existing critical flaw size determination for the new SA-182 material. This remains a structural/materials open item for the Maine Yankee review. You should plan supplement your June 19 submittal in that regard.

Please consult the e-mail I sent on June 7th regarding NAC-UMS responses needed for the rulemaking, and the one dated 6/11 regarding Structural items for Maine Yankee. Some of your 6/19 MY submittal needs to be incorporated in UMS, in particular the SA 182, possibly the retaining ring bolt material, the incorporation, the design basis ISFSI pad and foundation (I believe this also affects the existing UMS Tech Specs), and the transfer cask inspection program clarification.

The 6/7 e-mail was my roadmap to rulemaking, and still stands. I still believe you should take my advice and upgrade the UMS applications discussions on NS-4-FR as I stated on 6/7.

In general, now is a time to be careful about potential confusion between the Maine Yankee submittals and UMS. You have made many UMS public comments, and I have conveyed which we will accept and which we will not. For Maine Yankee, you submitted it on 4/18 with the assumption that we would incorporate all of your UMS public comments, which has not turned out to be the case. Attention to detail is going to be necessary to keep the issues straight, and separate where warranted.

Tim

----- Message from David Tang <DTT@nrcsmtp.nrc.gov> on Tue, 20 Jun 2000 15:38:55 -0400 -----

To:
TJM1@nrcsmtp.nrc.gov
cc:
EJL@nrcsmtp.nrc.gov, EXE@nrcsmtp.nrc.gov, JXG@nrcsmtp.nrc.gov, KAG1@nrcsmtp.nrc.gov
Subject:
MY SAR Revision, 6/19/00

Tim, NAC responded satisfactorily 5 out of the 6 questions we post or communicated to them for their 5/30/00 revision. They missed our first question, however.

In Q1, we asked: "Is the fracture toughness of the alternate material SA-182 comparable to that of SA-240 for its effects on determining critical flaw sizes for the TSC closure plate?" We agree that the austenitic stainless steels SA-240 and SA-182 do not experience a ductile-to-brittle transition for the range of the temperature of interest, as asserted in NAC's response. However, for the analysis based on the J-integral/tearing modulus approach described in SAR Subsection 3.4.4.1.11, NAC still needs to evaluate whether the critical flaw sizes

C/45