



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

APR 01 1986

Docket Nos. 50-445  
and 50-446

APPLICANT: Texas Utilities Electric Company (TUEC)  
et al.

FACILITY: Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON MARCH 18, 1986 TO  
DISCUSS STATISTICAL MATTERS

On March 18, 1986, the NRC staff met with representatives of Texas Utilities Generating Company (for TUEC) and its consultant to discuss statistical matters discussed by the Licensing Board in its November 11, 1985 Memorandum (Statistical Inferences from CPRT Sampling). Those in attendance are identified in the Attachment. Highlights of the meeting are discussed below. The meeting was recorded by a representative from intervenor CASE, the NRC staff, and the applicant. A copy of the NRC staff's recording is in the custody of the NRC project manager who attended the meeting.

The meeting served to clarify some of the statements made in Applicants' Memorandum (Statistical Inferences from CPRT Sampling) dated January 31, 1986, and Appendix D to the CPRT Program Plan, "Sampling."

1. Table 1, App. D of the Program Plan has a 6-stage sampling table. Texas Utilities (TU) explained that it intends to expand sampling at most once.
2. Two-stage sampling results in less than 95/5 assurance in the classical sense (about 93/5 with the numbers given). TU stated that this would not be true for the Bayesian approach to statistical analysis. In addition, other factors tend to increase the actual assurance:
  - a. The sampling plan assumes a population of infinite size, yet obviously the populations are finite in size.
  - b. TU conducts an engineered (biased) sample which focuses on important safety systems, in addition to the random sample.
  - c. Any deficiencies found are corrected.
  - d. The root cause/generic implication analysis would strongly tend to root out other deficiencies of the same type.

B604070507 B60401  
PDR ADDCK 05000445  
A PDR

3. TU was questioned on the use of one-sided tolerance limits (App. D, Attachment 2). TU said that no ISAPs currently use this method. However, it was included in App. D to be used if needed in evaluating discrepancies.
4. Conduit supports and small-bore piping issues do use sampling per App. D.
5. Two deficiencies with the same attribute and some root cause would lead to be 100% inspection for that attribute.
6. TU was questioned about its statement of the null and alternative hypothesis as presented in the Applicants' Memorandum of January 31, 1986. TU explained that the same conclusion can be reached by looking at it another way, and that they would explain this further in a supplement to the January 31 memo.
7. TU was requested to consider a revision to App. D to show, for example, that at most 2-stage sample expansion is being used. The appendix also contains other material which is not applicable to actual CPRT activities.

TU will supplement the January 31 memo in a few days.

*Charles M. Trammell*

Charles M. Trammell, Project Manager  
PWR Project Directorate #5  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

Attachment:  
List of Attendees

Texas Utilities Electric Company

Comanche Peak Electric Station  
Units 1 and 2

cc:

Resident Inspector - Comanche Peak  
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P.O. Box 1029  
Granbury, Texas 76048

Mr. John W. Beck  
Vice President  
Texas Utilities Electric Company  
Skyway Tower  
400 North Olive Street, L. B. 81  
Dallas, Texas 75201

Mr. Jack Redding  
Licensing  
Texas Utilities Generating Company  
4901 Fairmont Avenue  
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

William A. Burchette, Esq.  
Heron, Burchette, Ruckert & Rothwell  
Suite 700  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20007

GDS Associates, Inc.  
25 Cumberland Parkway  
Suite 450  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

Administrative Judge Peter Bloch  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Elizabeth B. Johnson  
Administrative Judge  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
P.O. Box X, Building 3500  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Dr. Kenneth A. McCollom, Dean  
Division of Engineering, Architecture  
and Technology  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dr. Walter H. Jordan  
881 Outer Drive  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

W. G. Council  
Texas Utilities Generating Company

Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station  
Units 1 and 2

CC:

Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq.  
Bishop, Liberman, Cook,  
Purcell & Reynolds  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Resident Inspector/Comanche Peak  
Nuclear Power Station  
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 38  
Glen Rose, Texas 76043

Robert A. Wooldridge, Esq.  
Worsham, Forsythe, Sampels &  
Wooldridge  
2001 Bryan Tower, Suite 2500  
Dallas, Texas

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive Suite 1000  
Arlington, Texas 76011

Mr. Robert E. Ballard, Jr.  
Director of Projects  
Gibbs and Hill, Inc.  
11 Pen Plaza  
New York, New York 10001

Lanny A. Sinkin  
Christic Institute  
1324 North Capitol Street  
Washington, D. C. 20002

Mr. R. S. Howard  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Ms. Billie Pirner Garde  
Citizens Clinic Director  
Government Accountability Project  
1555 Connecticut Avenue N. W.  
Suite 202  
Washington, D. C. 20009

Renea Hicks, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station  
Austin, Texas 78711

David R. Pigott, Esq.  
Orrick, Herrington, & Sutcliffe  
600 Montgomery Street  
San Francisco, California 94111

Mrs. Juanita Ellis, President  
Citizens Association for Sound Energy  
1426 South Polk  
Dallas, Texas 75224

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.  
Trial Lawyers for Public Justice  
2000 P Street, N. W.  
Suite 611  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Ms. Nancy H. Williams  
CYGNA  
101 California Street  
San Francisco, California 94111

Nancy E. Wieggers  
Spiegel & McDiarmed  
1350 New York Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005-4798

Robert P. Lessy, Jr.  
Morgan, Lewis & Bokius  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Suite 700, North Tower  
Washington, D. C. 20036

ATTACHMENT

NRC/TUGCO  
MEETING RE: STATISTICS

DATE: 3/18/86

ATTENDANCE

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
C. Trammell	NRC
E. Marinos	NRC
P. Tymon	NIRS* (for CASE)
J. Redding	TUGCO
G. Gower	IE/NRC
T. Tyler	TUGCO
J. Beck	TUGCO
R. Webster	JBA (consultant)
D. Lurie	NRC
G. Mizuno	NRC/EID
I. Chandler	NRC/OEID
D. Norkin	NRC/IE

---

\*Nuclear Information and Resource Service

APR 01 1986

Meeting Summary Distribution

Docket or Central File

NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
PD#5 Reading File  
J. Partlow (Emergency Preparedness only)  
V. Noonan  
Project Manager C. Trammell  
OELD  
E. Jordan  
B. Grimes  
ACRS (10)  
M. Rushbrook  
A. Vietti-Cook  
C. Early

NRC Participants

C. Trammell  
E. Marinos  
G. Gower  
D. Lurie  
G. Mizuno, ELD  
L. Chandler, OELD  
D. Norkin, IE

cc: licensee and Plant Service  
List

APR 01 1986

Meeting Summary Distribution

Docket or Central File

NRC PDR

Local PDR

PD#5 Reading File

J. Partlow (Emergency Preparedness only)

V. Noonan

Project Manager C. Trammell

OELD

E. Jordan

B. Grimes

ACRS (10)

M. Rushbrook

A. Vietti-Cook

C. Early

NRC Participants

C. Trammell

E. Marinos

G. Gower

D. Lurie

G. Mizuno, ELD

L. Chandler, OELD

D. Norkin, IE

cc: Licensee and Plant Service  
List



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

APR 01 1986

Docket Nos. 50-445  
and 50-446

APPLICANT: Texas Utilities Electric Company (TUEC)  
et al.

FACILITY: Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON MARCH 18, 1986 TO  
DISCUSS STATISTICAL MATTERS

On March 18, 1986, the NRC staff met with representatives of Texas Utilities Generating Company (for TUEC) and its consultant to discuss statistical matters discussed by the Licensing Board in its November 11, 1985 Memorandum (Statistical Inferences from CPRT Sampling). Those in attendance are identified in the Attachment. Highlights of the meeting are discussed below. The meeting was recorded by a representative from intervenor CASE, the NRC staff, and the applicant. A copy of the NRC staff's recording is in the custody of the NRC project manager who attended the meeting.

The meeting served to clarify some of the statements made in Applicants' Memorandum (Statistical Inferences from CPRT Sampling) dated January 31, 1986, and Appendix D to the CPRT Program Plan, "Sampling."

1. Table 1, App. D of the Program Plan has a 6-stage sampling table. Texas Utilities (TU) explained that it intends to expand sampling at most once.
2. Two-stage sampling results in less than 95/5 assurance in the classical sense (about 93/5 with the numbers given). TU stated that this would not be true for the Bayesian approach to statistical analysis. In addition, other factors tend to increase the actual assurance:
  - a. The sampling plan assumes a population of infinite size, yet obviously the populations are finite in size.
  - b. TU conducts an engineered (biased) sample which focuses on important safety systems, in addition to the random sample.
  - c. Any deficiencies found are corrected.
  - d. The root cause/generic implication analysis would strongly tend to root out other deficiencies of the same type.



3. TU was questioned on the use of one-sided tolerance limits (App. D, Attachment 2). TU said that no ISAPs currently use this method. However, it was included in App. D to be used if needed in evaluating discrepancies.
4. Conduit supports and small-bore piping issues do use sampling per App. D.
5. Two deficiencies with the same attribute and some root cause would lead to be 100% inspection for that attribute.
6. TU was questioned about its statement of the null and alternative hypothesis as presented in the Applicants' Memorandum of January 31, 1986. TU explained that the same conclusion can be reached by looking at it another way, and that they would explain this further in a supplement to the January 31 memo.
7. TU was requested to consider a revision to App. D to show, for example, that at most 2-stage sample expansion is being used. The appendix also contains other material which is not applicable to actual CPRT activities.

TU will supplement the January 31 memo in a few days.

*Charles M. Trammell*

Charles M. Trammell, Project Manager  
PWR Project Directorate #5  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

Attachment:  
List of Attendees

Texas Utilities Electric Company

Comanche Peak Electric Station  
Units 1 and 2

cc:

Resident Inspector - Comanche Peak  
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P.O. Box 1029  
Granbury, Texas 76048

Mr. John W. Beck  
Vice President  
Texas Utilities Electric Company  
Skyway Tower  
400 North Olive Street, L. B. 81  
Dallas, Texas 75201

Mr. Jack Redding  
Licensing  
Texas Utilities Generating Company  
4901 Fairmont Avenue  
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

William A. Burchette, Esq.  
Heron, Burchette, Ruckert & Rothwell  
Suite 700  
1025 Thomas Jefferson Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20007

GDS Associates, Inc.  
25 Cumberland Parkway  
Suite 450  
Atlanta, Georgia 30339

Administrative Judge Peter Bloch  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, DC 20555

Elizabeth B. Johnson  
Administrative Judge  
Oak Ridge National Laboratory  
P.O. Box X, Building 3500  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

Dr. Kenneth A. McCollom, Dean  
Division of Engineering, Architecture  
and Technology  
Oklahoma State University  
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Dr. Walter H. Jordan  
881 Outer Drive  
Oak Ridge, Tennessee 37830

W. G. Council  
Texas Utilities Generating Company

Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station  
Units 1 and 2

cc:

Nicholas S. Reynolds, Esq.  
Bishop, Liberman, Cook,  
Purcell & Reynolds  
1200 Seventeenth Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Resident Inspector/Comanche Peak  
Nuclear Power Station  
c/o U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 38  
Glen Rose, Texas 76043

Robert A. Wooldridge, Esq.  
Worsham, Forsythe, Sampels &  
Wooldridge  
2001 Bryan Tower, Suite 2500  
Dallas, Texas

Regional Administrator, Region IV  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
611 Ryan Plaza Drive Suite 1000  
Arlington, Texas 76011

Mr. Robert E. Ballard, Jr.  
Director of Projects  
Gibbs and Hill, Inc.  
11 Pen Plaza  
New York, New York 10001

Lanny A. Sinkin  
Christic Institute  
1324 North Capitol Street  
Washington, D. C. 20002

Mr. R. S. Howard  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Ms. Billie Pirner Garde  
Citizens Clinic Director  
Government Accountability Project  
1555 Connecticut Avenue N. W.  
Suite 202  
Washington, D. C. 20009

Renea Hicks, Esq.  
Assistant Attorney General  
Environmental Protection Division  
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station  
Austin, Texas 78711

David R. Pigott, Esq.  
Orrick, Herrington, & Sutcliffe  
600 Montgomery Street  
San Francisco, California 94111

Mrs. Juanita Ellis, President  
Citizens Association for Sound Energy  
1426 South Polk  
Dallas, Texas 75224

Anthony Z. Roisman, Esq.  
Trial Lawyers for Public Justice  
2000 P Street, N. W.  
Suite 611  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Ms. Nancy H. Williams  
CYGNA  
101 California Street  
San Francisco, California 94111

Nancy E. Wiegiers  
Spiegel & McDiarmed  
1350 New York Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20005-4798

Robert P. Lessy, Jr.  
Morgan, Lewis & Bokius  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Suite 700, North Tower  
Washington, D. C. 20036

ATTACHMENT

NRC/TUGCO  
MEETING RE: STATISTICS

DATE: 3/18/86

ATTENDANCE

<u>NAME</u>	<u>AFFILIATION</u>
C. Trammell	NRC
E. Marinos	NRC
P. Tymon	NIRS* (for CASE)
J. Redding	TUGCO
G. Gower	IE/NRC
T. Tyler	TUGCO
J. Beck	TUGCO
R. Webster	JBA (consultant)
D. Lurie	NRC
G. Mizuno	NRC/ELD
L. Chandler	NRC/OELD
D. Norkin	NRC/IE

---

\*Nuclear Information and Resource Service

APR 01 1986

-2-

3. TU was questioned on the use of one-sided tolerance limits (App. D, Attachment 2). TU said that no ISAPs currently use this method. However, it was included in App. D to be used if needed in evaluating discrepancies.
4. Conduit supports and small-bore piping issues do use sampling per App. D.
5. Two deficiencies with the same attribute and some root cause would lead to be 100% inspection for that attribute.
6. TU was questioned about its statement of the null and alternative hypothesis as presented in the Applicants' Memorandum of January 31, 1986. TU explained that the same conclusion can be reached by looking at it another way, and that they would explain this further in a supplement to the January 31 memo.
7. TU was requested to consider a revision to App. D to show, for example, that at most 2-stage sample expansion is being used. The appendix also contains other material which is not applicable to actual CPRT activities.

TU will supplement the January 31 memo in a few days.

Charles M. Trammell, Project Manager  
PWR Project Directorate #5  
Division of PWR Licensing-A

Attachment:  
List of Attendees

CM  
CTrammell  
A 11/86