Mike

February 5, 1990

To Dennis Rathbun
From Henry Myers HM

Re: February 2 Answer to January 18 Question XI (I)

The answer to Question XI-B-5 refers to Inspection Report 82-01 as a document that addresses the Seabrook cadweld matter. As far as I can determine, 82-01 does not state that NRC inspectors believed that cheating occurred during tests of cadwelders at Seabrook. The 82-01 omission of discussion of this matter is an example of obfuscation of important information; i.e. 82-01 obscures the fact that cheating had occurred during cadwelder tests. [Such concealment of facts makes it virtually impossible for senior NRC officials to conduct reviews necessary for proper licensing decisions and it makes it equally impossible for State officials and intervenors to keep on top of what is going on.]

Question XI-B-5 requested the assessment of NRC staff of the comments on the Seabrook cadeweld matter presented in the QTC report. The answer to XI-B-5 does not provide this assessment.

Questions:

What were the specifics of discovery of the falsified tests? Was the discovery, as QTC indicates, a result of an investigation initiated following a failure of a sleeve during a test?

Since it appears that the cheating would not have been discovered through Quality Control inspections required per Appendix B had it not been for the unusual sleeve failure, what is the basis for NRC staff having concluded that there were no deficiencies in the Seabrook QA program and that "This isolated event demonstrates the effectiveness of the QA program?"

Why did Quality Control inspectors fail to monitor the tests of the cadwelders? Why did the QC inspectors fail to observe that the tests were improper?

[Note: QTC believes that the failure to monitor the testing and detect the falsifications implied failures to comply with Appendix B Criteria VII, IX and XI.]

How did the 7 sister splices lead to a conclusion that "at most 153 sister splices were potentially defective?"

Which NRC officials, following discovery of the cheating on the cadwelder tests, decided that cadwelders could be qualified after the fact on the basis of tests of production welds?

9004270097 900410
PDR ADOCK 05000259
P PDC

Did testing of production cadwelds violate codes applicable to the construction of Seabrook?

> [QTC states that testing of curved cadwelds, removed from the containment structure, is not an accepted practice per ANSI N45.2.5.]

What was the basis for the determination that testing of seven production welds was sufficient to compensate for the cheating which occurred during testing? What was the basis for the determination that cadwelds produced by the cadwelders prior to discovery of the cheating complied with applicable requirements?

What was the rationale for deciding the problem was not reportable pursuant to 50.55(e)? What NRC official reviewed the matter and decided it was not reportable?

> [Note: QTC believes it was reportable since it was a deficiency, which if uncorrected, could have affected adversely the safe operation of the plant.]