



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION V

1450 MARIA LANE, SUITE 210
WALNUT CREEK, CALIFORNIA 94596

August 24, 1989

Docket Nos. 50-275, 50-323

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
77 Beale Street, Room 1451
San Francisco, California 94106

Attention: Mr. J. D. Shiffer, Vice President
Nuclear Power Generation

Gentlemen:

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR 10 CFR 50.54(f) INFORMATION

By letter dated July 27, 1989, the NRC requested certain information regarding PG&E's activities associated with vendor audits. The purpose of this letter is to inform you of our evaluation of your response contained in letter number DCL-89-207, dated August 7, 1989. The NRC questions regarding your submittal are detailed below.

1. Your JCO 89-18, page 4 of 12, references JCO 88-07 as containing the justification for continued operation of inadequately heat treated ASW pump impellers with commercial grade parts. Please provide JCO 88-07 for our review.
2. Your JCO 89-18, page 7 of 12, paragraph C, lacks sufficient detail to allow a completion of our assessment. For example, you say that Barton testing results in loadings which are more severe than those experienced during normal operation without providing any statement as to whether the tested loadings envelope all design accident and transient conditions. Please provide this additional detail.
3. Your JCO 89-18, page 9 of 12, identifies that Dresser Industries supplied you with certain non-pressure retaining material, for use in safety-related applications, which was purchased commercial grade. We note that you do not indicate whether this situation applies to other Dresser supplied non-pressure retaining material in addition to that identified in your JCO. Please identify what other non-pressure retaining material was purchased from Dresser Industries and whether a boundary can be established on the time frame when Dresser was supplying such commercial grade parts for safety-related applications.
4. Your JCO 89-18, page 1 of Attachment 1, states that the basis for acceptability for 21 vendors was a review of contractor generated audit reports. Based on problems not identified by contractor audits at Sultzer-Bingham and PSA, what is the basis for having any confidence that a review of the audit reports would detect inadequacies in the vendors' QA program?

8908300286 890824
PDR ADOCK 05000275
P PDC

MA4
IE-01 / Ce

Your plans and actions to resolve this situation will be examined during future inspections. Additional questions regarding your response to our request may result from those inspections.

Please submit the above requested information by August 28, 1989. Thank you for your cooperation in this matter.

Sincerely,

J. B. Martin
Regional Administrator

bcc: W. Brach, VIB
E. Baker, VIB
D. Kirsch, RV
R. Huey, RV

*see prev p2
his Telecon*

EBaker/VIB
8/10/89

DKirsch
8/10/89

ACHaffee
8/21/89

RZimmerman
8/1/89

MBTume
8/24/89

REQUEST COPY	REQUEST COPY	REQUEST COPY	REQUEST COPY	REQUEST COPY
YES / NO	YES / NO	YES / NO	YES / NO	YES / NO
<i>7</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>YES</i>

AJohnson
8/10/89

MMendonca
8/10/89

JBMartin
8/21/89

REQUEST COPY	REQUEST COPY	REQUEST COPY
YES / NO	YES / NO	YES / NO
<i>YES</i>	<i>YES</i>	<i>YES</i>

SEND TO PDR
YES / NO

