

From: Darrell Roberts
To: Jon Hopkins
Date: 5/27/03 1:22PM
Subject: question from RIC to be posted on NRC web page

Jon,

I left you a voice mail message as well. I'm trying to compile answers to several questions raised at the RIC back in April, which are to be posted on our website shortly. One of these questions is best suited for you and is the following:

Q: UCS's review of Davis Besse indicated that the Boric Acid Corrosion Generic Letter had not been incorporated into the design basis. First - [Did FENOC sign] the [10 CFR 50.54] (f) letter that the design basis would be maintained? [Secondly], Why has NRC failed to take enforcement action [citing 10 CFR 50.54(f)]?

I've added brackets where I made interpretations or changes for grammatical and technical accuracy. Anyway, Bill Ruland suggested that you have been in dialogue with the licensee on the whole 50.54 (f) matter and would be the best point-of-contact. Could you please provide a short answer to this two-part question and email it back to me as soon as you can? Two or three sentences (small paragraph) should suffice. It may be predecisional to say we're considering enforcement. And that may be all that's needed to be said. But send me whatever you think is appropriate to address this.

(Bill R. also mentioned that he might raise this issue at the 0350 panel meeting this week).

Thanks,
Darrell Roberts
NRR TA
415-1669

CC: James Andersen; William Ruland

D/6