

From: John Jankovich
To: FCS, CGI *F. Sturz & C. Interrante*
Date: 7/24/96 4:40pm
Subject: Shillinglaw Letter -Forwarded

Fritz, Chuck,

I got this e-mail from NRR. Could Chuck Interrante answer back him directly whether he looked at the burn temperature or not. If not, I suggest to let them know as part of the response that the objectives of the Sierra inspection were (1) to review the design process as it was implemented back in 1989-90; and (2) to see what actions Sierra took following the event. We were not tasked to analyze the event at Point Beach. J.J.

From: Eric Leeds
To: MGB, FCS, WND2.WNP3.WDR *M Bailey, F Sturg*
Date: 07/26/98 10:23a
Subject: response to bulletin 96-04

I just got encouraging info from Palisades. The three VSC-24 users and Sierra are all working together - daily conference calls - to answer the Bulletin.

Notes of interest:

Precipitate is a result of (1) zinc & boric acid reaction and (2) contaminants in the Point Beach cask. Apparently, Point Beach didn't clean the cask prior to putting it in the pool. They are working on quantifying the proportions.

Two testing programs yielding similar results - ANO tests and Sierra Nuclear's tests. They will explain any differences in the response.

ANO will provide full response which will form base for Palisades and Point Beach (site-specific differences). Palisades will give partial response with a schedule for the rest.

I get a STRONG feeling that ANO management is putting ALOT of pressure on their staff to get a response to us ASAP. It was supposed to come in this week and now may come in next week, but they obviously don't have their ducks in a row yet.

FYI -

Eric

CC: WDT, CJH, WND2.WNP3.GXX, WND2.WNP3.AGH, WND2.WNP3....