

From: Ganesh Cheruvenki
To: Christopher Sydnor; Ram Subbaratnam
Date: 07/25/2006 11:39:24 AM
Subject: Re: Fwd: FYI: Forwarding What We Want DCI/CFEB to Look at For the Pilgrim Flaw Growth Analyses

Ram,

We can have a group discussion with Jim Medoff, Chris and Jim Davis before we talk to Kim and Matt.

Ganesh

>>> Ram Subbaratnam 07/25/2006 10:46 AM >>>
Ganesh/Kimberly:

You already have the package 25 for Pilgrim TLAA. I want to discuss this with you and Kim and Mat and want to start a dialogue with Entergy on this expanded scope ASAP, if that is what you think it is ! This is a spill over from the AMP/AMR audit, which James Davis and company just completed. If Kim/Mat agree that this truly a TLAA and that the applicant has to evaluate the effect of the crack growth, we need to deal with it quickly.

Please let me know how you folks want to proceed with this.

Thanks.

Ram Subbaratnam
PM Pilgrim LRA,
(301) 415 1478

I hope Jim plugged you in with this additional scope

>>> James Medoff 07/20/2006 9:16 AM >>>
Ram:

The new work request will be for a DCI/CFEB review of Entergy's amended response to Audit Question 508 on the Pilgrim License Renewal Application (LRA). In that question, we asked the applicant to identify all fracture mechanics and/or flaw growth analyses that comply with definition of a time-limited aging analysis (TLAA) in 10 CFR 54.3. Entergy's initial response to the audit question stated that there were no fracture mechanics evaluations but did identify three flaw growth evaluations with the potential to be TLAA's: (1) that for the control rod drive nozzle-to-end cap weld, (2) that for the reactor recirculation nozzle thermal sleeves, and (3) that for the N2F reactor recirculation nozzle. The applicant stated that none of these analyses met the definition of a TLAA but did not provide their bases for making this determination. We told them that the response to Audit Question 508 would have to include their bases for making their determination.

On Tuesday (July 18, 2006), Entergy gave us the draft amended response to Audit Question 508 and their bases why the applicant felt that the analyses were not TLAA's for the application.

When the draft response are submitted onto the docket as an official amended response to Audit Question 508, we would like DCI/CFEB (Kimberly Gruss' Branch) to perform the following type of review of the amended response to Audit Question 508:

1. Review Entergy's bases for establishing the following flaw growth analyses are not TLAA's for the Pilgrim LRA:

(1) that for the control rod drive nozzle-to-end cap weld, (2) that for the reactor recirculation nozzle thermal

sleeves, and (3) that for the N2F reactor recirculation nozzle.

2. Provide DCI/CFEB's bases for concurring with or disputing Entergy's bases for determining that the stated flaw growth analyses are not TLAAs for the Pilgrim LRA. If DCI/CFEB does concur with Entergy, forward DCI/CFEB's basis for concurrence to us so that we can work it into our audit report.

3. Arrange for these analyses to be docketed as TLAAs on the LRA if DCI/CFEB determines that any of these flaw growth analyses need to be TLAAs for the LRA and request that DCI/CFEB review the TLAAs when they are submitted onto the docket and write an SER input for them. If this is the case, work out the review schedule and the RAI and SER due dates with Kimberly

4. Issue additional Requests for Additional Information (RAIs) on the Work Request if DCI/CFEB needs additional information in making its determination whether or not these analyses are TLAAs.

5. Provide 40 hours of review time if DCI/CFEB concurs with Entergy's determination and additional hours if RAIs need to be issued or if any of these analyses need to be docketed as TLAAs for the LRA (Kimberly Gruss to work out with you how much additional resource hours will be necessary if this is the case).

Please incorporate these elements into the new work request for DCI/CFEB.

Thanks,

Jim Medoff

CC: James Davis; James Medoff; Kimberly Gruss; Matthew Mitchell

Mail Envelope Properties (44C63B2C.FE3 : 1 : 35628)

Subject: Re: Fwd: FYI: Forwarding What We Want DCI/CFEB to Look at For the Pilgrim Flaw Growth Analyses

Creation Date 07/25/2006 11:39:24 AM

From: Ganesh Cheruvenki

Created By: GSC@nrc.gov

Recipients

nrc.gov

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

KAG1 CC (Kimberly Gruss)

nrc.gov

OWGWPO03.HQGWDO01

JAD CC (James Davis)

nrc.gov

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

JXM CC (James Medoff)

MAM4 CC (Matthew Mitchell)

nrc.gov

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

CRS (Christopher Sydnor)

RXS2 (Ram Subbaratnam)

Post Office

OWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

OWGWPO03.HQGWDO01

TWGWPO01.HQGWDO01

TWGWPO02.HQGWDO01

Route

nrc.gov

nrc.gov

nrc.gov

nrc.gov

Files

MESSAGE

Size

5451

Date & Time

07/25/2006 11:39:24 AM

Options

Expiration Date:

None

Priority:

Standard

ReplyRequested:

No

Return Notification:

None

Concealed Subject:

No

Security: Standard

Junk Mail Handling Evaluation Results

Message is not eligible for Junk Mail handling

Message is from an internal sender

Junk Mail settings when this message was delivered

Junk Mail handling disabled by User

Junk Mail handling disabled by Administrator

Junk List is not enabled

Junk Mail using personal address books is not enabled

Block List is not enabled