From: G. Scott Barber - [illegible]
To: LEN (Larry Nicholson, RI
Date: 8/13/96 4:13pm
Subject: Input on NRR Assessment of Salem Unit 2 SGs tube integrity-Forwarded -Forwarded -Reply -Reply

>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>
Is it time for NRR to present to the SAP their reasons for accepting the U2 SG?? I agree with you that this is without basis. Not sure this provides enough assurance for the CAL letter, does lenny agree?
<<<<<<<<<<<<<<<
Yes, it's time. I don't know if Lenny agrees. I copied him on this E-mail.

I think there is a well understood technical basis for accepting this item. However, it was not articulated in the writeup. I specifically commented on this to Ted Sullivan during last week's call. WE need to have some level of detail regarding the anomalous indications (SODs, etc.) seen during the U-2 SG UT and testing done on these tubes. I understood that the licensee pressure testedsome of these flawed tubes and that the results were similar to new tubes. This important detail was left out of the writeup and is important for us to accept the licensee's position with some level of confidence. Certainly, a better basis will have to be provided in writing before the SAP can accept this item.

CC: CDB, WND2.WNP3.LNO, WND2.WNP3.JFS3, ALD1, WND2.WNP...

K/47

9701160164 970113
PDR FOIA
O'NEILL96-351 PDR