

C A S E

(CITIZENS ASSN. FOR SOUND ENERGY)

1426 S. Polk
Dallas, Texas 75224

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

214/946-9446

August 14, 1984

Geary S. Mizuno, Esq.
Office of Executive Legal Director
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Maryland National Bank Bldg. - Room 10105
7735 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

update
DOCKETED
USNRC
'84 AGO 17 P3:2OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

Dear Geary:

Subject: In the Matter of
Texas Utilities Electric Co., et al.
Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station,
Units 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-443 and 50-446 *OL*

Information Promised by CASE Regarding
Applicants' Motion for Summary
Disposition Regarding Gaps

You will recall that during the 6/6/84 Applicants/Staff/CASE telephone conference call, you had asked us to supply you with information when we could about any instances of which CASE was aware where a pipe support which had been classified as class two was reclassified as class one. (See 6/6/84 conference call Tr. 88-91; see also discussion on page 7, Item 10, of attachment to CASE's 8/13/84 letter to William A. Horin, Subject: Open Discovery Items for Motions for Summary Disposition.)

Now that we have been allowed to present the ANI documents to the Board, we are able to supply you with that information. This was the instance when CASE asked "When a pipe support that was classified as class two is reclassified as class one, is its stiffness also considered?" Applicants stated that they were not aware of any such reclassifications. However, as discussed in our 8/13/84 letter to Bill Horin, Applicants, including their attorneys, have been aware of this information at least since our 6/30/84 letter, under subject of Documents Obtained by CASE in Rate Hearings Which Are Also Relevant and Material for Operating License Hearings, and our 6/30/84 Request to Applicants for Admissions, to which were attached a summary of each ANI document as well as a copy of each such document.

The information is contained in CASE Exhibit 1,056, ANI SIS Record 939 371, dated 2/6/84 (see attachment to CASE's 8/14/84 Motions Regarding ANI Documents). As discussed therein, the ANI identified several instances where NCR's were written to upgrade supports from Class 2 to Class 1. It appears from the ANI document that the specific items identified were struts for supports (it is not clear from the document whether or not these were for pipe supports), and this is what led to our question.

It also appears that the only concern which was addressed was regarding preparation and dispositioning of NCR's and that neither the ANI nor the Applicants addressed whether or not the stiffness was also considered when the supports are upgraded. As stated previously, it is not clear from the ANI document whether or not these are pipe supports. However, we believe that this is still a question which needs to be addressed.

Sincerely,

CASE (Citizens Association for Sound
Energy)

Juanita Ellis
(Mrs.) Juanita Ellis
President

cc: Service List