

From: Wayne Schmidt *W Schmidt*  
To: "Doddsv@ [REDACTED]" *D. Sullivan*  
Holian, David Lew, Edmund Sullivan  
Date: Tue, Jul 11, 2000 4:58 PM  
Subject: Call with Con Ed

EX 6  
Bran

Here is some food for thought, based on my prelim phone deprief with John McCann today.

We have some work to do .

I'll be out of the office on Wed, but will be back in on Thurs.

If we need to talk call me on my cell phone [REDACTED] EX 6

information in this record was deleted  
in accordance with the Freedom of Information  
Act, exemptions 6  
FOIA- 2001-0256

6/11/00

I just got off the phone with John McCann - I discussed the preliminary team findings with him - I used the most recent summary performance issues as an outline.

1. Leaving Tubes in service with indications that they have said could have been identified. Con Ed has a CR and a CMOA indicating that there were indication in the U-bend and sludge pile that would have been > 40 % TW in 1997.

He stated that the current that they currently believe that the four U-bend indications they reported in the CR were not detectable - I asked him then why was the issue sent to be dispositioned in the CR for the C-3 determination, without any discussion as to them believing that the reported condition was not correct. He did not have an answer. He said that the CMOA dealt with this, but that he would look at it.

With Respect to the sludge pile CMOA - he said that the indications in 1997 were looked at with 2000 inspection setups and analysis techniques and that this made them easier to see.

He said that to sight the TS for leaving tubes in service is not correct since the POD assumes that you may leave things in service with possibly greater than 40 % TW.

We had previously discussed this with the licensing engineer several times.

2. In effective identification of U-bent indications. We went over the noise, R2C67 in action, and the dent/hourglassing issues - leading to the fact that some additional actions should have been taken in 1997 to cause the defects to be identified.

He stated that we needed to make sure that we used the 1997 analysis techniques on the 1997 data to actually see what the analyst saw - I told him that I was fairly sure that this was what we had done.

He added that they knew that there was PWSCC in the SGs and that at the time finding one indication was not unexpected. He said that Westinghouse has taken this position and that they (West.) believe that nothing more should have been done (imagine that).

From the noise standpoint I added that we believe that the noise in 2-5 could have obscured a 70 -100 % TW indication, I told him that this was a major concern for POD, and that we believe that it should have been addressed at the time. He started to get into individual analyst performance, but I said that we were looking at the program in an overall view.

3. With respect to the Plus Point Set up - he said that there was no requirement for

them to have had the phase angle and calibration standard as per the EPRI Performance Demonstration Database ETTS sheet. He said that this was discussed in the responses to the questions. I said that we believed that the response was poorly worded and confusing and that they we believe that they needed to follow the EPRI.

4. With respect to not having a criteria or method of measuring significant hourglassing he had no questions.
5. I then talked about the overall conclusion and the fact that it appeared to us based on the above that the root cause had not been thorough.

I left it with him that we would look at what standards we used to look at the 1997 data - he added that there had been a lot of data manipulation done on the 1997 data to make it easier to find the indications. I said that I would verify that our look at this data was done as near as the 1997 data analysis as we possibly could do.

I also said that I would take a look at the 1997 setup issue