FEB 1 6 REC'D

PHONE: 869-7111

AREA DODE 713

ELBSone

TEXAS BOLT COMPANY

Manufacturers of Industrial Fasteners

3233 WEST 11/H ST. . P. D. BOX 1211

HOUSTON, TEXAS 77001

February 6, 1989

CABLE: "TEXBOLT"

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Attention: Mr. E. William Brach, Chief

Vendor Inspection Branch

Division of Reaction Inspection & Safeguards

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Reference: NRC Inspection Report No. 99900888/88-01

Dear Mr. Brach:

In reference to your letter dated December 16, 1988, the answers to the following questions are as follows:

- (1) Texas Bolt did not report the chemical analysis overcheck on our mill test report because the material was under 1" diameter where only a certificate of compliance is required. However, the chemistry from the actual mill test report was reported and the chemical overcheck was on file for those heats attached to our file copy of the production ticket.
- (2) Southwest Plating procedures for zinc and cadmium are approved and on file.
- (3) Effective November 1, 1988, all purchase orders for services, plating and calibration will carry the following statement: "This purchase order is to be in accordance with your Q/A Manual, audited and/or approved by Texas Bolt or a statement that the services are to be in accordance with their manual (which is in compliance with ASME interpretation 3-80-132 File NI-79-263)
- (4) Contrary to your statement #4, Texas Bolt may approve stock material for use in Nuclear fasteners by running a chemical analysis on the produce prior to use as described on Page 10 Para. 7.2 sub Para d. This is in accordance with Sectional III NCA 3867.4. (See attached page of QSM)

Continued on Page - 2 -

901:280226 890206 PDR 0A999 EMVTEXB 99900888 PDC

JE09

- (5) Contrary to your statement *5, Texas Bolt procedure TBAP-1 lists under Para. 7 Audit Report "The audit report will be prepared by the auditor and will list the findings and corrective action if needed."
- (6) a) As noted during the audit, this procedure was changed with the February audit of 1988, and will not be used again.
 - b) The audit dated Fibruary 6, 1987, of the quality systems department was reviewed and dated by Edward Charanza, who was and still is supervisor of the Quality Department.
 - c) The audit dated August 5, 1987, of the quality system department was reviewed by Sharon Charanza, a Level III person, who was and still is the assistant to Edward Charanza, the supervisor.
 - d) The audits of the purchasing department preformed in August 1986. and prior, were reviewed and approved by the QA/QC manager, who had responsibility and still has by letter, from the Vice President dated May 20, 1981.
 - e) The deficient item of calibration was corrected during the audit and so noted on the audit form; therefore, a follow-up audit was not needed.
 - 6) Audits were performed in 1988, by the Vice President and general manager due to the 24 years of experience at Texas Bolt and his familiarity with the quality program; as noted during the audit. a letter was added to the file in September 1988, to approve his auditing our system. It was an oversight not adding the letter prior to him preforming the audits.
 - g) Additional information has been added to the auditor's file on A. R. Tomchesson, showing his accomplishments which include being on over fifty (50) external audits and over ten (10) years on internal audits as an observer.
- 7. The two (2) individuals involved in final inspection have only been a) trained in their job, which is visual inspection and so documented. We do not feel it necessary to train them on the entire QSM.
- Purchasing has now read the QSM and has the approved vendors list. He has signed a statement saying that he understands his duties in the manual.

The manufacturing departments that require procedures have them and have signed for same. However, please note that a bolt cannot be checked until completely finished; therefore, proof of conformance becomes the complete responsibility of the final inspection which is completed by the QA Department and this department is trained to the QSM.

- c) 1) The President is a certified internal auditor but has never been used nor is it intended for him to be used.
 - 2) Production supervisor's have nothing to do in the final inspection, therefore; we do not believe they should be trained in the use of the QSM.
 - 3) All sales persons involved in writing or interpreting nuclear inquiries or orders have been trained and we did have them sign a statement acknowledging same.
- 8. 1) Hot dip galvanize and shperodiizing procedures have now been controlled and are posted in the area of work. They have been reviewed by QA/QC, dated and signed.
 - 2) The uncontrolled copy of TB-MT-#1, REv. 6, Magnetic Particle Inspection Procedure has been pulled from the area and destroyed.
 - 3) The outdated Heat Treat proceedures have been destroyed and replaced with the new revision #3. This new procedure is dated, approved, controlled, signed for, and posted in the Heat Treat area.
 - 4) Same as No. 3
- 9. Both visual inspectors have taken the Jarger J-1 eye test and are in their file in the lab.

Respectfully.

w. E. Windt

Vice President of Nuclear

wEw:cp cc:Files

TEXAS BOLT COMPANY

Manufacturers of Industrial Fasteners

3233 WEST :11: ST. . P. D. BOX 1211

PHONE: 869-7111 HOUSTON, TEXAS 77001 AREA DODE 713

DABLE: "TEXBOLT"

January 10, 1989

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555

Docket No. 4990088 "ttention E. William Brack, Chief Vendor Inspection Branch Division of Reaction Inspection & Safeguards Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Dear Mr. Brach:

In reference to your letter, dated December 16, 1988, Texas Bolt Company request that you extend the response time, to this letter, to February 15, 1989, or February 22, 1989, due to the extended shutdown Texas Bolt took during the Christmas and New Year Holi-

Thank you for considering this request. Please advise direct to the writer.

Respectfully.

Vice President of Nuclear

WEW: CP cc: Files

IE09