



Log # TXX-91013
File # 10130
Ref # 10CFR2.201

TU ELECTRIC

January 10, 1991

William J. Cahill, Jr.
Executive Vice President

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555

SUBJECT: COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION (CPSES)
DOCKET NOS. 50-445 AND 50-446
NRC INSPECTION REPORT NOS. 50-445/90-43; 50-446/90-43
RESPONSE TO NOTICE OF DEVIATION

Gentlemen:

TU Electric has reviewed the NRC's letter dated December 12, 1990, concerning the inspection conducted by Mr. W. M. McNeill during the period November 13-16, 1990. This inspection covered activities authorized by the NRC Operating License NPF-87 and Construction Permit CPPR-127 for CPSES Units 1 and 2, respectively. Attached to the December 12, 1990, letter was a Notice of Deviation.

The subject of this deviation, transfer of engineering activity surveillances and evaluations from the Engineering Assurance Section within the Engineering Department to the Quality Assurance Section within the Nuclear Engineering Department, was discussed with members of the NRC Office of Special Projects in June 1989. The response to this deviation further clarifies this transfer of responsibility and others that have occurred.

TU Electric hereby responds to the Notice of Deviation in the attachment to this letter.

Sincerely,

William J. Cahill, Jr.

By: Roger D. Walker
Roger D. Walker
Manager of Nuclear Licensing

TLH/daj

Attachment

c - Mr. R. D. Martin, Region IV
Resident Inspectors, CPSES (3)

9101160002 910110
PDR ADOCK 05000445
G PDR

LEO
111

Notice of Deviation
446/9043-01

Attachment A to TU Electric letter TXX-88373 dated April 14, 1988, to the NRC states, in part, "Enhancements already embodied in TU Electric's Engineering and QA Departments will provide additional assurance that the review and completion of the design and construction of Unit 2 will fully comply with licensing commitments and QA requirements. For example, the Engineering Assurance (EA) Section . . . Conducts technical evaluations and surveillance of engineering activities to assure technical adequacy and compliance with design control procedures and licensing commitments."

Contrary to the above, technical evaluations and surveillance of Unit 2 engineering activities were not being conducted by EA to assure technical adequacy and compliance with design control procedures and licensing commitments.

Response to Notice of Deviation
446/9043-01

TU Electric accepts the deviation with the following clarification.

1. Reason for the Deviation

In early 1989, TU Electric management completed a study which concluded the technical evaluation and surveillance function of Engineering Assurance (EA) should be consolidated with and implemented by the Quality Assurance (QA) Department. This was based on the conclusion that duplication of EA and QA functions in this area would thereby be eliminated without reducing any functional commitments. Consequently, the personnel and manager in EA responsible for performing the technical evaluation and surveillance function were transferred into the QA Department, and these personnel and manager remained responsible for performing this same function. The transfer was documented internally, however, a docketed letter was not transmitted to NRC because the committed function (performing engineering evaluations and surveillances) continued to be satisfied albeit by a different department.

2. Corrective Steps Taken and Results Achieved

Corrective actions and results achieved are discussed in Section 3 below.

3. Corrective Steps Which Will be Taken to Avoid Further Deviations

Although the above change was evaluated at the time it took place, it was re-evaluated in response to this Notice of Deviation. In addition, other commitments originally carried out by EA and changes in functions and responsibilities used to satisfy those commitments were also reviewed for Unit 1 and Unit 2 activities.

EA was originally responsible for carrying out the following six general functions to satisfy the commitments made in correspondence to NRC:

- a) Perform technical evaluations and surveillance of engineering and contractor activities, including interfaces, to assure compliance with applicable regulatory and quality requirements.
- b) Prepare, maintain, control and review engineering design control procedures.
- c) Provide and document training for CPE personnel regarding engineering procedures.
- d) Perform the regulatory compliance role for design and construction activities. Perform prompt review of corrective action documents for reportability.
- e) Act as the interface between the QA and Engineering Departments.
- f) Trend surveillances and design changes.

Discussions with personnel associated with the formation of EA indicated that function a) above was intended to provide a level of overview that went beyond regulatory requirements to help assure an enhanced engineering product. Functions b) through f) were intended to facilitate a management function. Specifically, TU Electric believed at the time that consolidation of functions into a single section (EA) within Engineering regarding procedure control, training, trending and regulatory/QA interface would be of benefit to the overall engineering effort and would enhance management controls.

A review was performed of past EA functions and responsibilities related to commitments a) through f). These functions were then compared with present day practices for Units 1 and 2. The review concluded that the above commitments remain satisfied with one exception (interface between QA and Engineering Unit 1) where, as explained below, the commitment is no longer applicable. In some cases, the functions previously carried out by EA are now the responsibility of others. The history of these functional changes, responsibilities and present day activities are discussed in the following sections.

- a) Perform technical evaluations and surveillances of engineering and contractor activities, including interfaces, to assure compliance with applicable regulatory and quality requirements.

From 1987 to 1989 the EA Section performed surveillances and evaluations (titled as surveillances only) of CPSES Engineering and contractor design activities.

Because of the similarity and potential redundancy with the QA audit function under the QA program, the functional requirements and personnel involved with this commitment were transferred to the QA Department in June 1989. TU Electric took that action after considering the following factors. First, overall engineering activity had decreased and the Corrective Action Program (CAP) was near completion. Secondly, the Quality Assurance Department would continue to carry out the regulatory function of audit, surveillance and evaluation and its capabilities would be further enhanced by the addition of personnel from EA with engineering expertise. Third, the two departments were previously performing activities which, in many cases, were potentially duplicative and improvements in efficiency could be obtained by consolidating these activities.

Prior to engineering restart of Unit 2, Project Management believed the integrated approach under the QA program was also appropriate for Unit 2 because of reduced engineering activity (when compared to Unit 1 during 1986-1989), reduced level of design development and established upper level design documents and drawings.

Since this EA function was combined with QA in 1989, a number of organizational changes have taken place during the transition from Unit 1 Construction to Unit 1 Operations and under Unit 2 Construction. For Unit 1, the responsibility for completing surveillances of a technical nature (i.e., technical evaluations) has transitioned through CPSES NL Organizations as follows: EA Evaluations Unit to QA Engineering Surveillance Unit (June 1989) to Quality Surveillance Unit (Sept. 1989) to Quality Technical Support Unit (Jan. 1990) to Independent Safety Engineering Group (ISEG) Surveillance and ISEG Assessment Units (Nov. 1990). In each transition, part of the Unit's purpose has been to review, evaluate, or surveil technical activities with qualified engineering personnel. In the present organization, ISEG Surveillance accomplishes the shorter term, ongoing, real-time technical overview, whereas ISEG Assessment accomplishes larger scale evaluations utilizing team efforts to perform in-depth evaluations of plant activities including technical and engineering areas. Throughout the organizational changes, controls have remained essentially unchanged. However, these changes were made to accommodate a logical shift from engineering design activities to monitoring of plant operations activities that have occurred since the licensing of Unit 1.

For Unit 2, audits, surveillances, and document reviews of a technical nature are performed by the Quality Engineering Area reporting to the TU Electric Construction QA Manager. These technical activities were combined into one organization during June 1990 to provide more efficient utilization of technical audit personnel in performance of surveillances and document reviews in addition to technical audits. Although technical surveillances are less formal and of smaller scope than technical audits, technical surveillances are performed by the same type of personnel utilized in technical audits. Technical surveillances supplement rather than replace technical audits. The primary function of the Quality Engineering Area is to provide coverage on a sample basis of TU Electric and contractor design activities, such as Design Basis Document implementation, technical procedure and specification development, and development of design analyses and calculations. Additionally, the Quality Engineering Area staff also reviews and verifies effectiveness of design contractor internal quality program audits and technical reviews.

In summary, although the responsibility for surveillances and evaluations has changed, TU Electric believes the quality of this function has improved steadily since late 1986. The number of actual surveillances and evaluations has fluctuated due to increases or decreases in engineering activity or because of problem identification and trending. TU Electric line and Nuclear Overview management continues to monitor plant activities and adjust audit and surveillance schedules as necessary to help assure the quality of hardware and programs.

- b) Prepare, maintain, control and review engineering procedure development.
- c) Provide and document engineering training in the use of engineering procedures.
- d) Perform the regulatory compliance role. Perform prompt reviews.
- e) Act as the interface between QA and Engineering.
- f) Trend surveillances and design changes.

The TU Electric review concluded that these commitments (related to management functions) were satisfied functionally (with one exception, commitment e, related to audit interface for Unit 1 which no longer applies) and that a number of responsibilities and controls had changed regarding commitments b, c, d and f. However, the exception and changes were justified and appropriate as discussed below. Other minor changes in procedural controls and methods were noted and these were found to be adequate or enhanced when compared to previous practices.

Regarding commitments b) and c), a significant shift in responsibility had occurred in the procedure development and training areas. When EA was originally developed, it controlled nearly all aspects of engineering procedure development, control and distribution. In addition, EA administered and retained documentation of TU engineering training.

As the total number of engineering personnel and contractors was being scaled down as Unit 1 approached licensing and as the Corrective Action Program (CAP) finalized, the overall responsibility for procedures was shifted from EA to Engineering Department Managers. However, EA remained responsible for procedure reviews. In the case of training, responsibility was changed from EA to the Department Managers or the Training Department. In general these changes in responsibility have continued for Unit 2 activities. TU Electric believes these changes were and are appropriate when compared with the level of ongoing engineering activity and the existing organizational structure.

Regarding commitment d), the regulatory compliance function had been transferred from the Engineering Department to the Nuclear Licensing Department. This change was made to facilitate the interface between all NEO Departments and the NRC.

Regarding commitment e), the EA Manager previously provided an interface between QA and Engineering Managers to coordinate and prepare audit finding responses. The EA Manager also attended QA Department entrance and exit meetings. The interface was established to improve responses from the various Unit 1 contractors and TU Electric Engineering to the QA Department. This function is no longer performed by the Unit 1 EA Manager. TU Electric does not believe that Unit 1 EA Manager participation is necessary since little or no contractor activity exists in Unit 1. However, at this time the function continues to be performed by the Unit 2 EA Manager.

Regarding commitment f), the EA Manager previously reviewed surveillance results and design changes for adverse trends. Trending is now done primarily by the Quality Assurance Department, and results are reviewed by the EA Managers and identified through the Quality Accountability Program and Plant Performance Overview Report.

At this time, the Unit 2 EA Manager primary responsibilities include the maintenance of the Unit 2 design control procedures, coordinating the activities of the Engineering contractor QA/EA organizations, and advising the Project Engineering Manager on quality related matters. This last responsibility is accomplished through monitoring engineering activity, analyzing trends, and conducting engineering quality accountability meetings. Additionally, the manager directs the development and issuance of Unit 2 Project Procedures.

The Unit 1 EA Manager is responsible for maintenance of the Unit 1 design control procedures as well as conducting the Unit 1 engineering quality accountability process. Coordinating activities similar to the Unit 2 EA Manager are not necessary on Unit 1 because of the organizations size and absence of engineering contractors.

4. Date of Full Compliance

TU Electric is in full compliance with the commitments stated above.