

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

TUGCO-NRC PUBLIC MEETING

February 6, 1986

Arlington, Texas

Taken By: Carmen Gooden, CSR, RPR February 6, 1986

B603040523 860225
PDR ADOCK 05000445
T PDR

Carmen Gooden

4403 STEEPLECHASE COURT
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 76016

PENGAD CO., BATONNE, N.J. 07002 FORM 404

NAME

Juanita Ellis
Gary Lee Ellis

John Streeter
Clyde Wisner
Howard Levins

ORGANIZATION

CASE
Case

TUGCO
NRC RIV
TERA

CPSES STATUS MEETING

2/6/86

<u>NAME</u>	<u>ORGANIZATION</u>
Annette Vitti-Cook	NRC
Thomas F. Westerman	WRC RIC
David Terao	NRC
JOHN CRAGIN	TELEPHONE
JOHN L. HANSEL	ERC / TUGCO
TERRY G. TYLER	TUGCO
JOHN BECK	TUGCO
W. G. COUNSIL	TUGCO
R. D. MARTIN	NRC RIV
E. H. JOHNSON	NRC RIV
R. F. HASTMAN	NRC IE
D. P. NORKIN	NRC IF
STEVE KARPYAK	TUGCO
JACK REDDING	TUGCO
MICHAEL D. SPENCE	TUGCO
David Fiorelli	Texas Utilities
DICK KAMSEY	TEXAS UTILITIES
DAVID CARLINGTON	SOUTHERN ENGINEERING
BOB GAD	R+G
HA HARRISON	TUGCO
RE CAMP	TUGCO (Impall)
R. P. KLAUSE	STARR & WESTEL
Jack Booth	Dallas Times Herald
DAVID REAL	Dallas Morning News

(CONTINUE ON REVERSE)

PROCEEDINGS

1
2
3 (This meeting commenced at 8:30 a.m.,
4 Thursday, February 6, 1986, at the
5 Region 4 office of the Nuclear Regulatory
6 Commission, Arlington, Texas.)
7

8 MS. VIETTI-COOK: I think we can go ahead and get
9 started. My name is Annette Vietti-Cook, and I'm the
10 Project Manager at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission for
11 Comanche Peak.

12 Today's meeting is for Texas Utilities to provide a
13 status on activities on the implementation of the Comanche
14 Peak Program Plan.

15 Bob, do you have any announcements that you'd like
16 to make before we turn it over to the Utility?

17 MR. MARTIN: The only point that I feel might be worth
18 making at this moment, at my right is Eric Johnson. Eric
19 has not been a regular participant in these meetings
20 previously, but will be for me in the future. Mr. Johnson's
21 selection as Director of the Reactor Safety Division in this
22 region has just been endorsed by the Executive Director for
23 Operations. So from this point on, he will be in that
24 capacity full time. That's just by virtue of identifying
25 him to the rest of you. Beyond that, I think we might as

1 well go ahead and get started.

2 MR. BECK: Thank you very much. John Beck, TUGCO,
3 Chairman of the SRT.

4 To open our comments this morning, I've asked Bill
5 Council to update the parties on some staff changes and
6 meetings that we've been having at the site. Without further
7 adieu, Bill?

8 MR. COUNCIL: As far as management staff changes at
9 Texas Utilities, there have been two that we have made in
10 the recent past. One, Gil Keeley of our staff, senior
11 consultant in engineering and administration, has been named
12 the manager of licensing for Texas Utilities. It's a position
13 we've had open for some time. Gil has many years of ex-
14 perience in nuclear power all the way back to Shipping Port,
15 and has worked most recently at Consumer Power in the
16 Midland Project for many years. He joined us approximately
17 three years ago as a senior consultant, and as of Monday,
18 February 3rd, he became manager of licensing.

19 The next change will take place on February 17th, and
20 that is my executive assistant, John Streeter, who joined us
21 in December, and most recently of NRC, Region 3, is becoming
22 the Director of QA as a permanent TUGCO employee.

23 Jim Wells of Duke Power, who has been filling that
24 position under contract for approximately a year, will stay
25 on for a period of time to overlap as a consultant to John

1 Streeter, and then John takes over fully. That date is
2 February 17 that that change becomes effective.

3 One other item that we should discuss now: General
4 meetings we've held with the employees working on Comanche
5 Peak -- this is management employees, management-supervisory
6 employees. John Beck and I held two meetings on site, one
7 in the morning approximately a month ago and one in the
8 afternoon. We covered at each meeting about 110 supervisory
9 personnel. The basic purpose of the meeting was information
10 flow, but also during both meetings I talked specifically
11 about what I expect of our employees: The quality first
12 attitude; following procedures, and that we will, in fact,
13 follow all procedures, and so forth. John covered the SRT
14 activities and the CPRT activities, communications flow and
15 teamwork.

16 Those two meetings, I think, were very well received
17 on site. We intend to hold future meetings of the same group
18 to assure that everybody knows exactly what's happening, where
19 we're at, what our status is among our supervisory people
20 down through all the workers at the plant site. I do have
21 notes of my presentation on that meeting if NRC should want
22 them at any time.

23 MR. BECK: If there are no questions, we'll move into
24 the status of the HVAC supports at the site.

25 Bill?

1 MR. COUNCIL: On the heating, ventilating and air
2 conditioning on Unit No. 1, we had notified NRC of a
3 potential 50.55(E) report and discrepancies on the cable
4 tray supports. We have been doing an investigation now
5 since just prior to Christmas on both Unit 1 and Unit 2
6 construction practices on HVAC.

7 What I'm giving you now is preliminary, and I don't have
8 the final report. I put John Streeter on the investigation
9 of HVAC, being supported by other members of the staff on
10 site. We have also done a sampling of those supports that
11 are in the Document Center presently in Unit No. 2 to find
12 out if, in fact, we have problems on Unit No. 2. The program
13 is satisfactory. There are not problems at all.

14 Unit No. 1's supports have been closed out since approxi-
15 mately 1984, about mid-1984 were complete. We have not looked
16 at that since that period of time. We were receiving as-built
17 drawings from Bahnson, the prime contractor, subcontractor,
18 to us on the supports. Cross-checking those supports against
19 the stress analysis for the seismicity on the heating,
20 ventilating and air-conditioning system showed some dis-
21 crepancies between the stress packages and those as-built
22 drawings that were received.

23 That started our investigation. To date what we have
24 found is that there are some discrepancies on the support
25 systems on the heating, ventilating and air-conditioning

1 system. We have not found numerous discrepancies on the
2 investigation to date, but one area does present concern
3 to us, and that is there are approximately 4,000 supports
4 on all systems of heating, ventilating and air conditioning
5 in Unit No. 1. About 15 percent of those supports, or some
6 600, are supposed to be attached, physically attached, either
7 welded and/or bolted, to the ventilating system itself. We
8 have found discrepancies. I don't have a number with me yet,
9 the number of inspections where they were not attached.
10 Consequently, we will initiate an inspection of those
11 supports that are supposed to be bolted or physically welded
12 to the heating, ventilating and air-conditioning systems,
13 100 percent of those that are supposed to be attached.

14 We are still developing, however, the remainder of the
15 program to see where it might lead us in determining the
16 stress packages are, in fact, acceptable.

17 Tentatively, I have scheduled the diesel generating
18 rooms for a hundred percent reinspection and the control
19 room ventilating systems for 100 percent reinspection because
20 both of those ventilating systems are safety related. We
21 will do 100 percent of those in addition to all the bolting
22 supports or welding, and determine where that program should
23 take us after that inspection. That package is just now
24 being put together. I expect reinspection to start in two
25 weeks. It will take probably that long before I can review

1 the package.

2 So that's the preliminary on HVAC Unit No. 1.

3 MS. VIETTI-COOK: So it's two weeks before you start
4 inspecting?

5 MR. COUNCIL: It will be at least that. I checked on
6 the procedures and so forth yesterday, and that procedures
7 package is almost developed. It has not come to me for review
8 yet. I don't have the final report from John either on his
9 evaluation.

10 MS. VIETTI-COOK: But you're through with Unit 2, is
11 that --

12 MR. COUNCIL: We have done the Sampling Program on
13 Unit 2. Unit 2's systems are not complete at all. We did
14 go through the total QA audit on procedures, and also they're
15 in process, how they're going through and doing the as-builts,
16 pulling the stress packages on Unit No. 2. We physically
17 reinspected 60 packages ourselves. Any deviations were
18 minor and would not affect the stress reconciliation as
19 being done on those systems. We believe at this point the
20 balance of the program on Unit 2 is satisfactory in their
21 proceedings.

22 MR. MARTIN: Bob Martin. Is this being done under
23 the Project, Project Control -- Are these inspections and
24 work packages being done under the Project or under
25 responsibility?

1 MR. COUNCIL: It's being done under the Project.

2 (Mr. and Mrs. Ellis joined the
3 proceedings.)

4 MR. WESTERMAN: What has been done on Unit 2?

5 MR. COUNCIL: There is only about 16 percent -- that's
6 a rough number, 16 percent -- of the supports in Unit 2
7 in the vault presently. That work is still ongoing. There's
8 still a lot of work going on in the ventilation systems in
9 Unit 2.

10 Are there any other questions on heating, ventilating
11 and air conditioning?

12 I thought I'd also present you with an update since our
13 last meeting on December 18 and 19 about cable tray hangers
14 and where we've gone since that report.

15 We have reorganized the Ebasco effort on Unit 1 for
16 the as-built cable tray hangers. We have also redone all
17 the procedures that are associated with that reinspection
18 program. Those procedures are presently being tested in
19 the field. They're not final at this point in time. When
20 they are finalized, though, they will not only receive
21 Ebasco's approval of their program, but they're also being
22 signed off by our quality assurance organization as acceptable
23 for the reinspection process.

24 As of January 13, as I indicated before, I told you we
25 would go back with the quality engineering functions, during

1 the first inspection red-lining the drawings for all as-
2 built cable tray hangers on Unit 1. Those, then, would be
3 processed through the CAD System, Computer-Aided Design
4 System, and we could get a final drawing ready then for
5 QC inspection. Finally, the quality control teams would go
6 out and -- as-built -- to make sure that those supports are,
7 in fact, CAD drawings, are right through the reinspection
8 effort of all supports.

9 As of January 13, we had nine teams trained and we
10 were at that point in time not conducting reinspections,
11 but ensuring ourselves that the procedures worked in the
12 field, with the teams going out into the field seeing that
13 things worked.

14 Currently, we have 18 teams trained. By the end of
15 February, we expect to have 31 teams trained to the proce-
16 dures and the procedures signed off. We expect fully that
17 the procedures will be complete, signed off, approved by
18 quality assurance, teams trained and reinspections will
19 recommence of all supports on the cable trays on Unit 1 as
20 of February 24th.

21 As I described the process to you of going out and
22 red-lining drawings in the Computer-Aided Design System
23 for a final as-built drawing and then a QC verification
24 of that drawing, that takes time. Consequently, for your
25 reinspection, Tom, in particular, I would expect by the third

1 week in March you ought to be able to start rechecking as-
2 built drawings on the Unit 1 Cable Tray As-Built Program.

3 MR. BECK: I'd like to have Mr. Ron Klause from Stone
4 and Webster Engineering Corporation provide an update on the
5 piping and pipe support work that Stone and Webster is doing.

6 MR. KLAUSE: Ron Klause from Stone and Webster.

7 The pipe supports and pipe stress requalification efforts
8 continue for both units. The work that is being completed
9 today still continued to be marked "Confirmation Required"
10 pending resolution and finalization of the technical issues,
11 the design criteria and the Project reanalysis procedures.

12 Currently, over 260 stress problems are in progress.
13 Approximately one-half of those have reached the stage of
14 complete with confirmation required.

15 The completed stress analysis packages represent about
16 3,000 supports, of which 25 percent of those have been re-
17 analyzed and completed to the confirmation-required stage.

18 It's anticipated that with the revision of the Project
19 procedures, CPPP7, which is the design criteria for the
20 requalification effort, that most of these calculations
21 that have reached the confirmation-required stage can be
22 issued as final.

23 Now, the Project activities under way outside this
24 production effort as far as the reanalysis is concerned
25 include conducting the CPPP5 walkdown, and that walkdown is

1 the walkdown for determining whether or not the as-built
2 documentation is adequate for initiation of the small bore
3 slow engine piping system. The reason that we're walking the
4 small bore package down at this time is they were not part
5 of the original TUGCO As-Built Program, so we needed to do
6 this to complete that review.

7 Now, this walkdown began on January 13 and is continuing.
8 We anticipate completing that walkdown and preparing the
9 report sometime in early March.

10 Also, the Project continues to evaluate the observations
11 made during the experienced engineers' walkdown that was
12 conducted back in November. We are reviewing those obser-
13 vations to determine what action is required by the Project
14 and TUGCO.

15 As I stated in my last month's meeting, we have identified
16 instances where our procedures are required to be modified
17 to give the engineers more specific instructions in their
18 reanalysis efforts, but I'd like to stress that there has
19 been no new technical issue found.

20 The Project is also well along in the assessment of
21 fluid systems for potential fluid transients. So far, we
22 have identified seven systems that have been determined to
23 require evaluation of operating and postulated transient
24 effects on piping and supports. This effort is scheduled
25 to be completed around the 1st of March.

1 Also, work has been initiated for the reanalysis of the
2 Class 1 supports. This includes 1,000 supports, and 100
3 percent of the supports will be looked at, approximately
4 500 small bore supports and 500 large bore supports in this
5 classification.

6 The Project has also tentatively resolved all major
7 generic technical issues, and we anticipate that a Project
8 Report will be issued containing our understanding of the
9 issue, the resolution methodology for the issue and where
10 the methodology is implemented in our Project procedures
11 and design criteria.

12 Any questions?

13 Thank you.

14 MR. BECK: If there are no questions in that area, I'll
15 move on into the CPRT report this morning. I'd like to
16 open with some general remarks with regard to our program,
17 in particular, in some organizational changes that we have
18 made. We have a new Review Team leader in the testing area,
19 Mr. John Rushwick. Mr. Rushwick is replacing Montie Wise.
20 The reason for this replacement is a determination by the SRT
21 that we wanted to get a completely fresh look at the testing
22 area insofar as Third-Party aspects are concerned. If you'll
23 recall, our original thrust over a year ago -- and testing
24 was one of the initial issues -- was preparation of an Issue
25 Specific Action Plan, in that instance, primarily by Project

1 personnel.

2 Our policy has evolved since then to require a very
3 strong Third-Party piece. As that particular discipline was
4 explored over the past year, SRT has determined that we
5 simply did not have a strong enough Third-Party flavor.
6 The cleanest way to do that was to have a new set of eyes
7 and a new mind to evaluate all the area associated with
8 testing, and Mr. Rushwick has been about that task over the
9 past almost month now. We anticipate that he will be
10 finished with his review of the Action Plans and any changes
11 that may be incorporated as a result of that review should
12 be ready for submittal to the Staff and available to the
13 public by the 1st of March. If there is any change in that,
14 we'll let you know as soon as it's clear. I don't anticipate
15 that there will be changes of a substantive nature, although
16 I wouldn't rule it out until Mr. Rushwick has finished with
17 his evaluation and the SRT has reviewed the results of that
18 evaluation.

19 The second change -- and Mr. Ron Hansel will speak to
20 it in more detail later on in our presentation this morning --
21 is the addition of a senior level manager in the safety
22 significance evaluation area within the Quality of Construction
23 Program. We have a number of engineers, as you're aware,
24 who have been actively involved in the Safety Significance
25 Evaluation Group, and it became clear that strictly from a

1 managerial standpoint we needed more and higher level
2 constant attention in that regard. Mr. Hansel has added
3 Mr. Ed Brabazon of Stone and Webster, an engineer with some
4 20 years technical and managerial experience in the nuclear
5 business, to his staff as a Deputy Director in the QOC
6 Program to handle that.

7 Without further adieu, Terry Tyler will address Revision
8 3 which we distributed last week.

9 MR. TYLER: Thank you, John.

10 Terry Tyler, Texas Utilities. As John said, we submitted
11 Revision 3 to the Program Plan on January the 27th. As
12 noted in the cover letter that transmitted the Plan, it was
13 missing Appendices D,E and the testing ISAPs. Appendix D
14 and our response to the Board's memo and statistics were
15 submitted on January the 31st. Appendix E will be approved
16 today by the Senior Review Team after this meeting and will
17 be submitted to the NRC tomorrow by Federal Express so that
18 you'll have it in your hands on Monday. As John said, we
19 anticipate the testing Issue Specific Action Plans will also
20 be in the Staff's hands by March the 1st. These submittals
21 have been and are consistent with our commitment that we
22 made at the last meeting and the transmittal letter.

23 I want to emphasize another aspect of the transmittal
24 memo dealing with review and approval of changes to the
25 Program Plan as we move forward from this date. All changes

1 to Issue Specific Action Plans will be reviewed and approved
2 by the Senior Review Team. If it's a substantive change,
3 it requires Senior Review Team approval prior to any implemen-
4 tation in the field. If it is a minor change, it requires
5 approval of the Program Director and subsequent, later after-
6 the-fact approval by the Senior Review Team. There will be
7 a log kept in the Program Director's office of all these
8 changes, and we will submit these changes to the Staff as
9 they take place.

10 I'm sure that all of your first reactions to the revised
11 Plan were that it was a major rewrite due to the number of
12 change bars that you saw in the Program. I want to emphasize
13 that most of those changes were due to incorporation of our
14 responses to the NRC questions that were submitted back in
15 November. We have reviewed our responses versus Revision 3
16 and have not identified any inconsistencies with those
17 responses to date. I will point out that we have used
18 different words in several places, but the substance of what's
19 there is consistent with our original responses.

20 In addition, I want to point out that there will be
21 an additional Issue Specific Action Plan, VII.A9, that
22 deals with release for shipment or receipt inspection where
23 release for shipment inspections were not made that will come
24 out of Mr. Hansel's area.

25 MS. VIETTI-COOK: What is that on? I didn't catch that.

1 MR. TYLER: It's dealing with vendor inspections performed
2 by the Vendor Surveillance Group out of TUGCO, either the
3 release for shipment that's required prior to shipping to the
4 jobsite. In cases it is acceptable by procedure to waive
5 that release for shipment inspection. In those cases where
6 that takes place, we're required to do an on-site receipt
7 inspection when the hardware comes in. It's dealing with
8 the vendor inspection, vendor fabricating material.

9 I'll be presenting the status on the TRT Issue Specific
10 Action Plans. Mr. Hansel will be presenting the status on
11 the quality of construction reinspection effort, and Mr.
12 Levin will be presenting the status on the Design Adequacy
13 Program. I'm going to walk you through Action Plan by Action
14 Plan and give you a brief status as to where we are with
15 those. I don't anticipate this will take very long.

16 We'll start with the Electrical Action Plan. First is
17 Action Plan 1.A1 dealing with heat shrinkable cable install-
18 ation sleeves. Third-Party inspection and review of documen-
19 tation associated with this Action Plan is complete. The
20 results evaluations are approximately 40 percent complete,
21 and we anticipate a Results Report to the Senior Review Team
22 in the near future.

23 Action Plan 1.A2 dealing with the inspection report on
24 butt splices, Phases 1 and 2 are complete where we did the
25 physical reinspections in the plant of the Control Room and

1 Cable Spreading Room panels. Phase 3 is in progress.
2 Phase 3 deals with the identification and inspection of
3 all other Class 1E circuits where AMP butt splices may have
4 been utilized in the plant. The evaluation results of
5 Phases 1 and 2 are complete, and we anticipate Phase 3 will
6 be complete within the next six to eight weeks.

7 Action Plan I.A3, Butt Splice Qualification. Inspections
8 are complete on this Action Plan. The evaluation results
9 are nearing 60 percent completion.

10 Action Plan I.A4, Agreement Between Drawings and Field
11 Terminations. Third-Party inspection of those terminations
12 is complete. Results evaluation is nearing 75 percent
13 completion.

14 I.A5, Disposition of Non-Conformance Reports on vendor-
15 installed AMP terminal lugs. All those dispositions have
16 been reviewed on NRCs that were identified prior to 1984.
17 We have in process a search of other non-conformances for
18 Unit 2 and from 1984 on in Unit 1, dealing with the same
19 type of vent terminal lugs. That evaluation will be complete
20 within the next 10 days. We hope to have a Results Report
21 on this Action Plan to the Senior Review Team in early March.

22 Action Plan I.B1, Flexible Conduit-Flexible Conduit
23 Separation. The Control Room inspections are complete for
24 the use of flexible conduit in those. We have embarked upon
25 identification and inspection of other control panels in

1 the plant, wherein there are two divisions of cable and
2 the servic air flexible conduit was used. That examination
3 or physical inspection is just starting. We have no results
4 to report on that. The final review of separation criteria
5 by the Third Party should be complete within the next three
6 weeks.

7 Action Plan I.B2, Flexible Conduit Cable Separation.
8 Both this Action Plan and I.B1 worked in parallel since they
9 both deal with separations criteria for the flexible conduit.
10 The status on I.B2 is the same as for I.B1.

11 Conduit to Cable Tray Separation. The analysis sub-
12 stantiating the conduit to cable tray separation criteria
13 utilized in the plant is under evaluation by the Third Party
14 at this point in time. That overall evaluation process is
15 approximately 20 percent complete. We don't anticipate
16 a Results Report on this item until late March, early April.

17 Action Plan I.B4 dealing with Separations Barrier Material
18 Removal. Non-conformance reports have been issued on this
19 item. They have been issued for almost a year now. Procedures
20 have been revised controlling the removal of barrier material
21 and we anticipate a Results Report on this Action Plan within
22 this March time frame.

23 Moving on to Action Plans I.D1, I.D2, I.D3, dealing
24 with QC Inspector Qualifications. Action Plan I.D1 on the
25 QC Inspector Qualifications, Phase 1 of that review is

1 complete. Phase 2 dealing with the review of the certifica-
2 tion records for the all electrical, all currents and all
3 ASME inspectors is complete, and the summaries of the findings
4 on that have been transmitted to the Project for review and
5 disposition. Phase 3, which deals with the physical rein-
6 spection of questionable inspectors' work is being completed
7 as those inspectors are identified in Phase 2.

8 Do you have an overall completion on that?

9 MR. HANSEL: We anticipate, again, feedback from the
10 Project, but I would suspect that we'd complete that in March.

11 MR. TYLER: Action Plan I.D2, Guidelines for Administra-
12 tion of QC Inspector Test. A draft Results Report on this
13 Action Plan is in preparation. We anticipate it also to
14 the Senior Review Team sometime in March.

15 Action Plan I.D3, which was a new Action Plan included
16 in Revision 3 to the Program Plan, is entitled Craft
17 Personnel Training. The review of Craft Personnel Training
18 is approximately 75 percent complete.

19 Moving over to the civil-structural TRT issues, starting
20 with Action Plan I.C, Electrical Conduit Supports. The
21 investigation phase, the analysis of random and engineering
22 samples, is approximately 90 percent complete. The corrective
23 action phase of the walkdown of the trained C conduit cited
24 at Category 1 areas is expected to start in March. Overall,
25 the investigation phase is nearing 75 percent completion,

1 and the corrective action phase will start approximately
2 one month after -- will be complete approximately one month
3 after completion of the physical walkdowns of the plant.

4 Action Plan II.A, dealing with reinforcing steel in the
5 reactor cavity. The initial investigation phase and
6 evaluation of results is approximately 95 percent complete.
7 There has been a new task added to this Action Plan dealing
8 with as-building inspection of exposed rebar areas in the
9 plant. We are about five percent complete with the investi-
10 gation of that. That task involves looking at block-outs
11 in areas where we tested the concrete, physically mapping the
12 rebar that is exposed there.

13 Action Plan II.B, Concrete Compressive Strength. We
14 have a draft Results Report on this Action Plan and anticipate
15 it will go to the Senior Review Team for review within the
16 next week to 10 days.

17 Action Plan II.C, Maintenance of the Air Gap Between
18 Concrete Structures. The investigatory phase is approximately
19 75 percent complete. We have a draft Results Report
20 formulated. It does have some holes in it, depending upon
21 the completion of the physical removal of the debris that's
22 in the gap currently and the opening of the gap wherein the
23 gap does not meet the minimum requirements of the specifi-
24 cation. Until that's complete, it's difficult to anticipate
25 when we'll have a Results Report on that Action Plan.

1 Action Plan II.D, Seismic Design of the Control Room
2 Ceiling Elements. The new ceiling installation review is
3 approximately 40 percent complete. The Damage Study-Related
4 Modification Review is approximately 50 percent complete.
5 I don't have an anticipated completion date on the overall
6 Action Plan as far as submittal of the Results Report at
7 this time.

8 Action Plan II.E, Rebar in the Fuel Handling Building,
9 about 25 percent complete, with the overall evaluation of
10 the results and documentation and findings.

11 Moving to the Mechanical Action Plans. Action Plan V.A,
12 Inspection of Certain Types of Skewed Welds NF Supports.
13 The physical reinspection is complete. Approximately 100
14 welds were looked at in the final evaluation phase of those
15 results in the preparation of a Results Report. We anticipate
16 this Action Plan will be closing out in the March-April time
17 frame.

18 Action Plan V.B, dealing with the improper shortening
19 of anchor bolts in the steam generator upper lateral supports.
20 The original inspection in Southwest Research overview is
21 complete. We're in the process of awaiting final resolution
22 of the design of the final connection for the steam generator
23 upper lateral before we proceed with closing this Action Plan
24 out.

25 Action Plan V.C, Design Consideration for Piping Systems

1 Between Seismic Category 1, Non-Seismic Category 1 Buildings.
2 We have a draft Results Report on this Action Plan that we
3 anticipate will go to the Senior Review Team during the
4 month of February.

5 Action Plan V.D, Plug Welds. Investigatory phase is
6 approximately 90 percent complete. The overall evaluation
7 of the results is nearing 70 percent completion.

8 The last Mechanical Action Plan is V.E on the installa-
9 tion of main steam pipes. The investigation phase is
10 complete. We're in the process of finalizing the draft
11 Results Report. We also anticipate submittal of this Action
12 Plan to the Senior Review Team in late February or early
13 March.

14 Miscellaneous Action Plans starting with Action Plan
15 VI.A, the Gap Between the Reactor Pressure Vessel Reflective
16 Insulation Biological Shield Wall. There were three investi-
17 gation aspects in this Plan. The first was the critical
18 space review to identify critical spaces requiring inspection,
19 95 percent complete. The critical space inspection activities
20 have not started yet. The review of the non-nuclear design
21 change impact on safety-related equipment is approximately
22 40 percent complete. I can't project a Results Report
23 completion on this Action Plan at this time.

24 Action Plan VI.B, dealing with the polar crane shimming.
25 Physical testing of the polar crane has been completed.

1 Investigation of the uplift problem is approximately 60
2 percent complete.

3 Rail motion restraint design is under design considera-
4 tion right now and has not been reviewed by the Third Party.
5 Overall, the investigation and evaluation of results is
6 approximately 25 percent complete.

7 Continuing with the TRT Action Plans, moving to the
8 QA/QC programmatic ones, the first one is Action Plan VII.A1,
9 Material Traceability. The 1981 ASME survey review dealing
10 with this topic has been completed. The procedure review
11 for material traceability control is approximately 80 percent
12 complete.

13 The Action Plan VII.C, Population Inspection Procedures
14 have been reviewed and confirmed to include appropriate
15 attributes for looking for traceability and identification
16 of materials, and until other Action Plan results are avail-
17 able, namely, Action Plan VII.D3 -- I'll give you that
18 title -- Pipe Support Inspections, and VII.C are complete.
19 This Action Plan won't be closed out.

20 Action Plan VII.A2, Non-Conformance and Corrective
21 Action Systems. Non-conformance review is approximately
22 90 percent complete. That's the review by John Hansel's
23 people of programmatic compliance and the handling of non-
24 conformances. There was a step added in the revision of
25 this Action Plan that came in this time, which now includes

1 a review of the technical adequacy of the NCR dispositions
2 that are in Mr. Hansel's sample by Mr. Levin's Design
3 Adequacy Program, so that is an addition to the program.

4 The other aspect of this Action Plan, the review of
5 the corrective action system, including trending, is
6 approximately 50 percent complete; and the review of the
7 non-conformances in other items for reportability under
8 10CFR 50.55(E) is approximately 10 percent complete.

9 Action Plan VII.A3 on document control. The preliminary
10 evaluation of the Action Plan III.3 draft Results Report,
11 which will receive additional review by Mr. Rushwick and
12 is not final by any means, indicates that document control
13 inadequacies did not have an adverse effect on testing
14 programs. That is one input into this Action Plan. The
15 Action Plan will draw the remainder of its input from the
16 problems that are identified in the Issues Specific Action
17 Plan VII.C reinspections with regard to the drawings that
18 were utilized in the field versus the ones that we're re-
19 inspecting with.

20 Action Plan VII.A4, Audit Plan and Auditor Qualifications.
21 The program document review -- and by that, I mean the
22 PSAR/FSAR commitments, TUGCO program commitments, Comanche
23 Peak steam electric station QA plan commitments and imple-
24 menting procedures -- is complete. Records and file review
25 of audits and audit personnel qualifications is also complete.

1 We're in the process of formulating the Results Report on
2 this Action Plan. We do not have a target date for submittal
3 to the Senior Review Team at this time.

4 Action Plan VII.A5 -- have we changed the title of this
5 one? Management Assessment was what it was called in
6 Revision 2 of the Plan. We have obtained outside source
7 material from INPO and are getting ready to initiate the
8 review of the management assessment of the effectiveness
9 of the QA Program.

10 Action Plan VII.A6, Exit Interviews. Review activities
11 with the Ombudsmen have been completed. Industry examples of
12 exit interview programs have been obtained, the preliminary
13 familiarization complete. The review of the Safe Team and
14 implementing procedures is in process, and we anticipate
15 being able to report the status on this Action Plan in more
16 detail at the next meeting.

17 MS. VIETTI-COOK: I'd like to ask you a question about
18 that. Are you looking at the files that were used by
19 Ombudsmen, the files that the Ombudsmen were using, or are
20 you just looking at it programmatically?

21 MR. HANSEL: We looked at the files of the Ombudsmen
22 and the transfer of that information to the Safe Team. We
23 have covered that flow of material and analysis.

24 MS. VIETTI-COOK: My understanding was the Safe Team
25 did not pick up the Ombudsmen file. Has that changed?

1 MR. HANSEL: They did pick up some open files that were
2 remaining at the time when the Ombudsmen left.

3 MR. COUNCIL: The Safe Team has all of the Ombudsmen
4 files. Any investigations not completed, they are in the
5 process of completing. The closed files I asked the Safe Team
6 Director to go back through those files and review all files
7 for any kind of generic-type implications and so forth on
8 the closed files. I was told by the Safe Team leader late
9 last week that he has completed that review and he wants to
10 talk to me. I have not had time yet, Tom, to come to the
11 site to talk to him.

12 MR. TYLER: Action Plan VII.A7 dealing with Housekeeping
13 and System Cleanliness. The specific issue cited by the
14 NRC was reactor vessel cleanliness. That review is complete,
15 and the procedures review for housekeeping and cleanliness
16 is complete. This Action Plan depends upon the results of
17 two other Action Plans for it to be closed out, and until
18 those are finished, the work in this Action Plan is basically
19 on hold.

20 Action Plan VII.A8, Fuel Pool Liner Documentation. The
21 Results Report preparation has started, and we anticipate
22 submittal of the Results Report on this Plan to the Senior
23 Review Team in early March.

24 Action Plan VII.B1, On-Site Fabrication. The review of
25 shop records to identify the population and to select samples

1 has been completed. The physical sample review is -- how
2 far along?

3 MR. HANSEL: We've been monitoring that for about 60
4 days. I'd say we're very close to wrapping that one up,
5 within the month.

6 MR. TYLER: Action Plan VII.B2, Valve Disassembly. The
7 Results Report is in the final stages of preparation. We
8 anticipate submittal of this Action Plan to the Senior Review
9 Team late February to early March.

10 MR. MARTIN: You mean Results Reports?

11 MR. TYLER: Yes, Results Reports, I'm sorry.

12 VII.B3, Pipe Support Inspections. This was on Room 77N.
13 The reinspections for the TRT issue populations in Room 77N
14 are essentially complete. VII.C Reinspection on Pipe
15 Support is nearly 90 percent complete. We anticipate a
16 Results Report on this Action Plan within the next month
17 or two.

18 Action Plan VII.B4, Hilti Anchor Bolt Installation.
19 The procedure and sampling technique for torque verification
20 has been finalized, and a torque check on a sample of hiltis
21 in the plant has just started. The inspection of the remainder
22 of hilti bolt installation attributes covered under the
23 Reinspection Program, Action Plan VII.C, is nearing 85 percent
24 completion. That covers many different populations of hard-
25 ware.

1 The last TRT Action Plan is VII.B5, Electrical Raceway
2 Support Inspections. Due to the corrective Action Plan that's
3 ongoing with the Unit 1 cable tray supports, this Action Plan
4 only is looking at conduit support inspections, and those
5 inspections are approximately 66 percent complete.

6 That completes my part of the status.

7 MR. BECK: Before you move on, I'd like to cover a
8 pause that we instituted in the QOC Program before John gets
9 started in his report of details.

10 As you all are aware, due to some internal concerns
11 and some discrepancies or differences between NRC overview
12 inspection results performed under their audit of the QOC
13 Program, the SRT issued a stop work or a pause or a suspension
14 of work in the physical reinspection effort under the QOC
15 Program in early January. We established a subcommittee
16 of the SRT, consisting of myself, John French, Jack Buck,
17 Warren Nyer and Terry Tyler to substantively investigate and
18 interview all the circumstances on the QOC Program. In the
19 process of that investigation, we specifically interviewed
20 17 individuals, ranging from quality inspectors up to the
21 senior management of the QOC effort. The thrust of our
22 interview was to determine the facts surrounding differences
23 that might exist from not only the NRC overview audit
24 inspections and those of the QOC investigations themselves
25 but as well as differences that existed between internal

1 overview surveillance efforts, what the cause of those
2 differences was and what corrective mid-course fine tuning
3 might be required to reduce the number of differences. It
4 turns out that the discrepancy rate was less than one percent
5 in both the internal overview surveillance and those validated
6 NRC findings and the original QOC inspection results.

7 There were a couple of areas where one percent or
8 specific disciplines was exceeded. We focused our attention
9 there, although we looked very carefully at all areas of
10 investigation, or population, if you will.

11 We discovered a very strong professional attitude
12 throughout the organization as we talked to the individuals,
13 and we were quite impressed with their desire to do a good
14 job and with, in fact, their feelings that this pause was
15 going to be a good thing to go back and look in particular
16 at some of the quality instructions which served as a source,
17 perhaps, of some of the differences in interpretation, and
18 thus the findings, as the inspectors went out into the field.
19 There was a strong sense of support for the retraining -- or
20 not the retraining, but the hand-in-hand exercise of walkdown
21 of QIs prior to their initial implementation. That served
22 as a real strong basis for understanding between the engineers
23 who devised the quality instructions and the inspectors who
24 executed them in the field.

25 Our determination at the end of the investigation and

1 prior to issuing a restart to the QOC Program consisted of
2 three primary recommendations: To revise or review all
3 quality instructions and revise as necessary. That review
4 process was to include not only the engineers associated with
5 authoring the QIs, but the inspectors who were involved in
6 executing them.

7 To retrain and exercise dual walkdown prior to implemen-
8 tation of any revision in the QI and to increase the internal
9 overview inspection rate and, in particular, emphasize those
10 areas that had exhibited problems or discrepancies in excess
11 of a one-percent agreement rate.

12 We also emphasized very strongly that the highest
13 priority of this program is accuracy and completeness. While
14 schedule is obviously important to us, it's secondary to
15 the quality of the effort.

16 The program was restarted, and Mr. Hansel will give us
17 some details as to status.

18 MS. VIETTI-COOK: When did the program restart?

19 MR. BECK: Two weeks ago --

20 MR. HANSEL: Two weeks ago tomorrow.

21 MR. MARTIN: John, before you begin the next phase, in
22 the summary that Terry gave on the ISAP activity, you have
23 just submitted Revision 3. If Revision 3 is approved as
24 written, will that impact the status that you just gave in
25 the sense that are there commitments in Revision 3 that the

1 current program as it's been implemented, that some of those
2 ISAPs in the past, prior to Revision 3, were not conducted
3 in accordance with Revision 3 as it stands? That is, the
4 backfit. Will there be a backfit activity if Revision 3
5 is approved as written, quite apart from any impact of further
6 changes to the program?

7 MR. TYLER: In some cases there will be some backfit.
8 The backfit is mainly in the area of how you categorize
9 findings that come out of the program and how you go through
10 and do evaluations for root cause generic implications, and
11 also the overview of corrective actions by the CPRT, which
12 was added under Appendix H. Those are additional steps to
13 the Action Plan that really don't impact the status as we
14 see it today. We took that into account in the status as
15 we gave it to you today.

16 MR. BECK: They're primarily expansion rather than
17 go back and do something different or do it over again.

18 MR. HANSEL: Covering the quality of construction effort,
19 as John indicated earlier, we have added Mr. Ed Brabazon
20 from Stone and Webster as a deputy to myself, and he will
21 handle all engineering aspects of the quality of construction
22 effort. He's on board. He's well entrenched and doing very
23 well. When you go to the site, if you get an opportunity
24 to, try to stop by and meet him. So he will handle all
25 engineering aspects associated with the population, engineers

1 and the safety significance evaluation. John Christianson
2 is also a deputy, and John will look after all external
3 source issues for me and the management of those.

4 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Is he going to be looking back at
5 the safety significance evaluations that were done previous
6 to --

7 MR. HANSEL: We've already started that process, yes.

8 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Is it going to be a 100-percent review?

9 MR. HANSEL: We don't know yet. We've done an audit
10 over the past 20 days. I just got the results of that audit
11 yesterday. We will be talking to the Senior Review Team
12 this afternoon about a proposed Action Plan, and we will be
13 going back and doing considerable review of past evaluations.
14 I don't know if it will be 100 percent. I suspect it will
15 be very close to that. Again, I have to discuss that with
16 the SRT this afternoon.

17 Following up on John's discussion on the pause or to
18 stop work, that was a very healthy effort. We did a complete
19 review of all quality instructions with any inspector who
20 would have an opportunity to work to that quality instruction
21 and the engineers, and also the engineers who would do the
22 evaluation of the DRs, Deviation Reports. We ended up with
23 changes to most of the QIs, a very high percentage. The
24 majority of those now have been through finalization; I have
25 signed off on the majority of them. The reinspection effort

1 has started. That was a very good exercise.

2 To bring you up to date on the program in general, since
3 we met last, we have completed all of our documentation on
4 the homogeneity of the work process effort, as a follow-up
5 to the efforts with Jose Calvo and others. That work is
6 completed. We have, again as I say, revised the QIs. As
7 a result of the homogeneity review, we added ~~one~~ additional
8 population since we met last, and that's on HIS cable
9 termination. That brings us now to a total of 31 populations.

10 In terms of the package preparation for inspections,
11 82.7 percent of all packages required have been released.
12 Now, some of those will have to be recycled and looked at
13 again based upon the recent review of the QI. So I don't
14 have an exact number, but it won't be a major impact.

15 Fifty-four point four percent of all inspections have
16 been completed. That's inspections and documentation reviews,
17 and of the deviation reports that have been determined to be
18 valid and put into the Safety Significance Evaluation Group,
19 41 percent of those have been reviewed. There is approximately
20 1,000 of those, so we will be backing up and looking at that.

21 We also have, as John had indicated, our overinspection
22 effort going. We now have nine inspectors conducting over-
23 inspections, trying to assure ourselves that we get the very
24 best out of that effort. Our results to date indicate that
25 we're well below one percent. In other words, we're agreeing

1 between the second inspector and the first inspector in
2 excess of 99 percent of the cases. This will help us to
3 evaluate each inspector, the type of inspectors, be it
4 electrical, civil, mechanical or structural. We'll also be
5 able to identify any additional attributes that appear to be
6 troublesome. It's going to give us good insight as to the
7 accuracy of the inspections.

8 That's about the status of the quality construction
9 effort to date.

10 MR. MARTIN: John, the overview inspectors: Are they
11 inspectors that have been involved in the prior efforts and
12 have been reassigned different duties, or are those different
13 individuals --

14 MR. HANSEL: They're all new.

15 MR. MARTIN: All new staff or new to the site or --

16 MR. HANSEL: All new staff and new to the site. And
17 we have a supervisor on board now that oversees that effort,
18 and it's going very well. We have completed 66 inspections
19 and have looked in that population of 66. We've looked at 36
20 inspectors, and out of the 36 we had 15 where we had some
21 minor disagreement, minor problem, so we're starting to
22 gather good data.

23 MR. MARTIN: Those inspections are a quality effort
24 to ensure the quality of the activity that's going on. They
25 are not, in fact, an inherent part of the quality of

1 construction effort as such.

2 MR. HANSEL: It's a secondary quality check on the first
3 inspection.

4 MR. MARTIN: I know Tom is aware of that activity
5 going on. Is that just being maintained within your organi-
6 zation as inspection reports or results --

7 MR. HANSEL: It's within my organization, and the data
8 is available. We can share that with Tom and his people at
9 any time. Certainly, results will go to the Senior Review
10 Team. We can also share that with Tom.

11 MR. LEVIN: My name is Howard Levin. I'm the Review
12 Team leader for the Design Adequacy Program. I'll be
13 discussing items in four areas, the first being a status on
14 the HDA or scope validation process, our self-initiated
15 review, our evaluation of external source issues and lastly,
16 our overview of various project corrective action programs;
17 those being Piping and Supports Program and Cable Tray
18 and Conduit Support Program.

19 In the area of homogeneous design activity validation,
20 just recapping items from the last meeting, there were two
21 activities involved after our initial Phase 3 evaluation,
22 those being the identification of HDA constituents where we
23 develop a correlation with an entire population of design
24 documentation. That effort is complete. The second area
25 being a correlation of various project procedures, criteria

1 prescriptive to methodology, computerized calcs and unique
2 methodologies in an effort to identify the similarity and
3 methodology internally to the HDAs. That effort is complete.

4 The scanning of populations, calculation populations,
5 our procedure, DAP 21, is essentially complete, with a few
6 minor exceptions in the electrical area. That effort will
7 be complete in approximately a week. What's happening now
8 is some minor supplementation of this checklist to make the
9 descriptions on there more complete and auditable. Our
10 review of the outside contractor is not included in that
11 estimate. That will be -- and what I'm referring to is
12 outside design contractors other than Gibbs and Hill -- that
13 will be completed in process, and we're currently looking
14 at the logistics for obtaining that documentation for
15 evaluation.

16 The Phase 3 Engineering Evaluation Reports, the original
17 ones, will be updated, and we expect that update will be
18 completed in approximately two weeks; and shortly thereafter
19 we'll have an overview engineering evaluation which will
20 include not only the discipline reports but also inconsistency
21 of Gibbs and Hill procedures over time that govern the control
22 of design and evaluation of unique vendors. The program is
23 approximately 45 percent complete, and that includes all
24 efforts.

25 Going into our self-initiated review, as you recall,

1 there was an initial scope. We termed it Phase 2. I
2 characterize that as being approximately 50 percent complete.
3 That led to the implementation of approximately 100 checklists,
4 which have been completed. We anticipate being at what we've
5 characterized with I&E Staff the one-third completion point --
6 and I'll get back to the definition of that in a moment --
7 in approximately six weeks. And what I mean by that is not
8 completion from the standpoint of total effort, but the point
9 at which one-third of the topical areas will have been fully
10 consummated throughout the process, and that process being
11 one where the criteria, design criteria, have been evaluated
12 and documented on what we've called Type A checklists. The
13 design verification has been implemented, and all these
14 Type C checklists have been completed. The topic has been
15 fully summarized on a Type E checklist, and the engineering
16 evaluation for that topical area is complete; so at that
17 point that area is completed, and we're managing the program
18 such that we're staging topical areas in approximately three
19 groups. The staging is not in series, so therefore all three
20 groups of topics have been initiated. However, we have a
21 lead group over the next two groups that will provide two
22 benefits. One, it provides the I&E people an opportunity
23 to perform the audit as they desire at approximately that
24 point in time, with being able to get a fuller review of the
25 package that evaluates a topical area. Secondly, it gives

1 us a feeling for what it takes to fully consummate a topical
2 area and give us some feedback into completion of the rest of
3 the program. So consequently, the third point is really much
4 further along in terms of total resources to be expended,
5 but it's the point at which we would feel comfortable in
6 saying we're finished with those topical areas and want to
7 subject them to an audit.

8 MR. NORBIN: May I ask a question? Don Norbin with NRC.
9 You're distinguishing between completion of the Type C
10 checklists which may come earlier than six weeks --

11 MR. LEVIN: That's correct.

12 MR. NORBIN: -- and the actual documenting of the
13 Results Evaluation Reports.

14 MR. LEVIN: Yes, that's correct.

15 MR. NORBIN: You say either you feel comfortable with
16 I&E inspection when the evaluation reports were not --

17 MR. LEVIN: We consider all the things I mentioned to
18 be the package of information that needs to be looked at
19 collectively to give you a picture, and ourselves a picture,
20 of what we've learned, and the Type C checklists are but one
21 item as part of the package, and I don't think it gives a
22 complete picture.

23 MR. NORBIN: As long as you're bringing this up, we
24 talked about a schedule, accounting-type schedule, which
25 enables us planning. We expect that, based on our internal

1 discussions, by next week. Can you make a firm commitment
2 to have it next week?

3 MR. LEVIN: Yes. This information is consistent with
4 what's coming out of that.

5 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Howard, on the self-initiated review,
6 I know that you're looking at aux feed water and electrical
7 power systems, plus a little bit more, and on that more list
8 is HVAC. How are you interfacing with what Texas Utilities
9 is doing on the HVAC?

10 MR. LEVIN: Okay. There are two elements to the HVAC
11 review. There's a systems evaluation, and that's one area
12 where we have selected an additional vertical slice, if you
13 will, and we have selected the control HVAC system and are
14 simply looking at its performance requirements. But in
15 addition -- and this has always been a part of the program --
16 we're looking at the hardware from anchorage and support
17 as a commodity in the plant through our civil-structural
18 evaluation where we're looking at the support design, dust
19 design and things like that, so there are two aspects. The
20 HVAC system evaluation flows out of the scope validation
21 process. The review of those support designs was always
22 a part of the initial program, and that support review has
23 been in process for some time.

24 MS. VIETTI-COOK: So you're doing more than an overview
25 of what Texas Utilities is doing? That's what you're telling

1 us?

2 MR. LEVIN: That's correct. There's an independent --
3 or let's put it this way -- a self-initiated effort to look
4 at the support designs in the HVAC area.

5 Just to give you a feeling of the very top overview of
6 the items Don Norkin was referring to for the entire self-
7 initiated effort in terms of keeping track of the production
8 rates, we're talking about approximately 30 criteria lists,
9 which together represent the design basis of the plant. We
10 will have approximately 200 checklists, boiler-plated items,
11 that we pull off the shelf to conduct design reviews. We'll
12 be implementing them approximately 1,000 times, leading
13 to 75 engineering evaluations in these topical areas; and
14 as I mentioned previously, approximately 100 are complete
15 to date.

16 I'd like to move on to our review of external source
17 issues, if there are no other questions there.

18 MR. NORKIN: Excuse me. You said a hundred. A hundred
19 what? Checklists?

20 MR. LEVIN: One hundred Type C checklists have been
21 completed to date. Approximately.

22 MR. NORKIN: But they are not ready for our audit until
23 the evaluations are complete.

24 MR. LEVIN: That's correct, the engineering evaluations.
25 We have completed the review of all external source

1 documents that exist today, and that number is 214. That
2 review led to the identification of just over 1,000 design-
3 related issues. As I indicated previously, some of those are
4 duplicative in that some sources have identified the same
5 issue. We're in the process of identifying that and putting
6 these into hoppers. For example, in the piping and supports
7 area, the review generated approximately 800 issues, so you
8 can see that the vast majority are in that discipline.

9 We have put these issues into 36 categories. These
10 categories break down into 29 that correspond directly to
11 the ones that Stone and Webster have previously identified
12 and seven additional ones that I would say are minor that
13 are being covered in large part by Stone and Webster's
14 standard procedures, so we will be transmitting a final
15 record of all these issues to them this week for their
16 insertion into the select program. They're previously
17 received issues as they've been generated in the past.

18 In terms of our review of the Stone and Webster program,
19 we've been through, I guess, what I'd say is our first round
20 review of their major technical procedures, with the one
21 exception of the approach that they're going to take in
22 selecting small bore designs, which Stone and Webster, I
23 understand, is still developing. Within a week we should
24 be able to send out our checklists to them indicating what
25 our comments are.

1 We've identified a few items, just in the way of
2 summary, that are not currently addressed by the procedures,
3 and I understand that there are plans that those things will
4 be developed in later revisions and we'll have to continue
5 our review at that time. In addition, we plan to do some
6 additional work in reviewing these procedures for process
7 control and also aspects of the walkdown.

8 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Let me ask a question real quick.
9 When you were talking about confirmation required, are you
10 talking about Howard Levin's operation?

11 MR. KLAUSE: Part of that, yes, will be review of the
12 procedures and the resolution and methodology.

13 MR. LEVIN: And the resolutions, we've initiated those
14 reviews in the last two weeks with the availability of the
15 documentation and supports in those technical studies. We
16 expect a flow is starting to develop where this information
17 is flowing to the Third Party for review, and we expect by
18 the beginning of April most of that information will have
19 been to us, and shortly thereafter we will be able to complete
20 our review of those technical resolutions. I'd say at this
21 point that we're roughly 25 percent of the way through this,
22 and based on account of, I guess, just the complexity and
23 the significance of the issues as opposed to strict account
24 on the issues themselves.

25 I'd like to say that based on what we've seen so far

1 in that 25-percent review, the select resolutions appear to
2 be technically sound. We have not found any areas of major
3 disagreement.

4 In terms of our review of their implementation, we
5 originally plan to review approximately 20 stress analysis
6 problems as a sample of their effort, including all the
7 supports which are, for our purposes here, let's say, about
8 25 per problem to be able to cover all our checklist items.
9 We may supplement this with a few more problems to be able
10 to get full coverage of the work that's being done in their
11 five offices.

12 We intend to use one checklist per analysis and one for
13 each of the 25 supports. This would produce 60 checklists
14 and cover 750 supports. We're hoping to be at that point
15 by April 1, but it's dependent upon the flow of the infor-
16 mation from them, but we understand we can meet that schedule.

17 In the cable tray area, if I can move on, in terms of
18 the external source issues, the Comanche Peak Project is
19 well aware of the issues via the CYGNA RILs; however, given
20 that we've completed our external source issues review, we'll
21 also be formally sending them our issue records from the
22 DAP system very shortly.

23 In terms of our review of Project's procedures in this
24 area, we have reviewed the original as-built procedures,
25 and what we were looking for -- and this is some time back --

1 to be sure that the attributes important to design are fully
2 covered in those procedures. Our conclusions at that time --
3 and we'll be reviewing some later revisions -- were that
4 they did, but in view of some of the recent problems in that
5 area, we have suggested, and SRT has approved, our expanding
6 that effort because of the importance of the as-built
7 information and the overall design verification by Ebasco
8 and IMPELL to include a monitoring of TUGCO's own overview
9 and surveillance efforts of the new as-built program.

10 In addition to the men that are out there doing the
11 walkdowns and the normal QA/QC, they have a team of people
12 that are providing an additional overview of that. We want
13 to take a look at that special program, including monitoring
14 these individuals in the field to give us the confidence that
15 the design information we're evaluating is predicated upon
16 accurate field information.

17 We have looked at the Ebasco procedures from the stand-
18 point of the technical aspects and found them to also look
19 reasonable; however, we have not had complete -- we don't have
20 a complete package of all the backup studies that support
21 these, and we currently have to complete our review of those.
22 We expect that very shortly. We received the IMPELL proce-
23 dures for the first time in mid-January, and we have just
24 initiated these reviews.

25 MR. MARTIN: Did you say you just received the INPO

1 procedures?

2 MR. LEVIN: IMPELL. I'm sorry.

3 In terms of the review of the cable tray analyses, we
4 have not reviewed the implementation of those to date,
5 largely because no final design verification really exists,
6 given the reconciliation process that's going on now with
7 the as-built. Until that occurs and the packages are recon-
8 firmed, we won't initiate that effort.

9 We have been monitoring the testing program and following
10 that very closely. That's the program by ANCO.

11 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Howard, I'm not sure. Are you going
12 to be following up on the as-built drawings, the inspections,
13 that are being done by Ebasco? Are you following up on
14 those as-built drawings? Do you have people that are going
15 to be verifying what Ebasco has done as far as as-built
16 drawings and using them in the reanalysis?

17 MR. LEVIN: Our method of doing that, the objective,
18 is exactly that, to verify the adequacy of that information
19 for use in the design verification by both IMPELL and Ebasco.
20 The way we're approaching that is to take a look at the
21 various programs that have already been put in place by
22 TUGCO to overview that effort themselves. We want to take
23 a look at that program and monitor that very closely,
24 including participating with those people in the field and
25 observing just what is happening. That's the approach that

1 we've selected as opposed to adding yet another group of
2 people to go out there with yardsticks and measuring the
3 same thing. I think that will give us the insight we need,
4 at least as a first step, because there have been layers
5 as part of the corrective action that have already been
6 initiated.

7 Our review of the conduit area parallels my discussion in
8 the cable tray area very closely. We're currently revealing
9 their as-built procedures, and the only thing that I can say in
10 this review, as well as the Project's effort, is somewhat
11 staged behind the cable tray effort, but there are analogous
12 pieces and we're following hand in hand with that effort, just
13 as with cable trays. Essentially, the same steps are involved.
14 We expect, however, that the first analysis in our initial re-
15 view will be available in approximately two or three weeks and
16 will give you a feel for how that's progressing.

17 That's all that I have unless there are any questions.

18 MR. BECK: If there are no questions of Howard, I'd like
19 to look toward future milestones for a brief minute.

20 Since Revision 3 has been submitted, our emphasis has
21 shifted toward implementation of the program. As Terry
22 indicated to you earlier, we're going to see a stream of
23 Results Reports commencing later this month and in the month
24 of March, and that stream will continue throughout the spring.
25 Our goal is to have the investigatory phase of CPRT complete

1 no later than May of this year. We anticipate, consistent
2 with that goal, completion of Action Plan Results Reports
3 in the June-July time frame of this year. The SRT review
4 process is a necessary part of that completion, and we'll
5 obviously follow the submittal of the Results Reports to the
6 SRT.

7 We're open to any questions you may have.

8 MR. NORKIN: I have a general question. Just looking
9 at the way we're conducting business, having the status
10 meetings, from my perspective of focusing on the Design
11 Adequacy Program, I'd feel a lot more comfortable if I had
12 two things first, which I have neither right now. One is
13 a long-term schedule as to where you're going, which I've
14 been trying to get from Howard and which I alluded to before;
15 and the other is a monthly list of where you are, which we'd
16 have to come here to get. And I notice that the tempo of
17 this meeting, 95 percent of the status was given at this
18 meeting. We all just listened to it, and nobody really had
19 much dialog. It just seems so much more useful to put out
20 a monthly status report, rather than having so many people
21 get together and just listen to a status report being read.
22 I don't see an awful lot of dialog, questions and answers,
23 about the status that is being given. Most people are just
24 reading. We're all just listening. Reflecting on experience
25 with other programs that I've been involved in, I think this

1 is kind of unique. These two elements I'm asking about,
2 I've seen in every other program I've been involved in.

3 MR. BECK: Don, we're certainly amenable to providing
4 updates and status in whatever form all the parties to this
5 activity desire, and that's a suggestion that's certainly --

6 MR. NORKIN: From my own standpoint, I can digest it
7 a lot easier when I can have a report that I can read rather
8 than have to get it verbally and try to write a lot of notes
9 down. Even if we had a meeting, I could react, I could ask
10 more incisive questions if I know ahead of time what we're
11 talking about.

12 MS. VIETTI-COOK: That's something we can consider.
13 I'll talk to Vince about it, and that might be something
14 worthwhile doing.

15 MR. TERAQ: I have one question. I suppose I should ask
16 John Beck this question. I'm David Terao. In the Stone
17 and Webster effort, we're aware that they completed certain
18 phases of their work. For example, in the CPP-5 initial
19 walkdown, they pretty much finished the large bore piping
20 aspect of that, and they issued --

21 MS. ELLIS: We can't hear you down here.

22 MR. TERAQ: First of all, I have to apologize because I
23 have a cold today. But in their CPP-5 as-built walkdown,
24 they have completed the large bore portion of it and have
25 issued a report back in October of 1985, but the Staff hasn't

1 seen this report yet. I just wondered how the Staff can
2 get hold of these reports. As you know, we have been following
3 and auditing the Stone and Webster work, but for some reason
4 we don't get the final reports when they're issued.

5 MR. BECK: Have you issued any final reports?

6 MR. KLAUSE: Yes, I've issued that. A copy was to you
7 and to the site. This was for the CPP-5 report. That was
8 the large bore walkdown. That was last December time frame.

9 MR. BECK: We'll certainly make that available in the
10 file.

11 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Does anyone else from the Staff have
12 any questions?

13 Juanita, do you have any comments that you'd like to
14 make?

15 MS. ELLIS: I don't think so. I would like to just
16 mention that I somewhat share the gentleman's concerns with
17 the NRC, the way that the meetings are being handled.
18 Certainly when we started out, we had anticipated there would
19 be more dialog. We're disappointed that that hasn't developed
20 to that point; however, we will keep following and we'll keep
21 being here and keep asking. We will ask questions on
22 interrogatories and so forth, but we will keep our comments
23 to a minimum, I think, at these meetings. We are very much
24 interested in any kind of final reports that have been
25 completed by Stone and Webster. I would like to inquire one

1 thing: Are there any other final reports, other than this
2 one, which have been completed at this point in time?

3 MR. COUNCIL: No other reports have been issued.

4 MS. ELLIS: We'll reserve our other comments for now.

5 MS. VIETTI-COOK: Just for your information, Juanita,
6 the Staff on inspections and audits at the various offices
7 vary frequently. I know. I keep track of it, so I know
8 that there are Staff members different places every week,
9 and so at that time we are obtaining a lot of information,
10 and this is a public forum for them to give us their status.
11 And it might be better served for us to have them issue a
12 report. This is the way we've been doing it for the last
13 three meetings. I'll discuss it with Vince.

14 MS. ELLIS: It might be when I talk with Billie Garde
15 and Tony Roisman that they might also want to have some
16 input into that. I'll get back to them today on that, and
17 we'll get that to you right away, if we have any suggestions.

18 There is one thing that I would like to clarify for
19 my own benefit with the Staff, if possible, and that is
20 what appears to me to be a Staff position that is developing,
21 or has developed, that the CPRT effort does not have to be
22 conducted under the guidelines of Appendix B and so forth.
23 Am I incorrect on that assumption? This is something that
24 I'm really quite concerned about.

25 MS. VIETTI-COOK: I will bring that back to the Staff

1 and have them look at it.

2 MS. ELLIS: I think that's all the comments right now
3 that we have.

4 MR. MARTIN: I presume at this point, with no further
5 comments, that this meeting is adjourned.

6 (The meeting was adjourned at 10:15 a.m.)
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

This is to certify that the attached proceedings before the Nuclear Regulatory Commission and Texas Utilities Generating Company

In the Matter of: Texas Utilities Status on Activities on the Implementation of the Comanche Peak Program Plan

Date of Proceedings: February 6, 1986

Place of Proceedings: Arlington, Texas

were held as herein appears, and that this is the original transcript for the file of Texas Utilities Generating Company.

Carmen Gooden
Certified Shorthand Reporter

Carmen Gooden
Certified Shorthand Reporter

Carmen Gooden

4403 STEEPLCHASE COURT
ARLINGTON, TEXAS 78016
METRO (817) 429-5532

PENNSD CO. BAYONNE N.J. 07002 FORM 404

i
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

FEB 25 1986

50-445

Meeting Summary Distribution

Docket or Central File

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

NRC Participants

A. Viett-Cook
T. Westerman
D. Terao
R. D. Martin, RIV
E. H. Johnson, RIV
R. Heishman, IE
D. Norkin, IE
V. Noonan
C. Trammell
C. Early
E. Marinos
L. Shao
G. Mizuno

cc: Licensee and Plant Service
List

FEB 25 1986

-2-

TU provided the results of the Senior Review Team review of the Quality of Construction (QOC) Program. This review resulted in three primary recommendations:

1. To review all quality instructions (QIs) and revise them as necessary. This review was to be conducted by the engineers and inspectors.
2. To retrain and exercise a dual walkdown prior to implementation of any revision to a QI and to increase the internal overview inspection rate, particularly in areas where there had been in excess of one percent discrepancy between ERC results and NRC or TU overview.
3. To emphasize that the highest priority in the program is accuracy and completeness.

ERC provided the status of the QOC program.

Finally, TERA presented the status of the design adequacy review. TU is focusing their efforts on implementation of the Program Plan. They plan to have the investigation phase of the CPRT complete no later than May 1986 and completion of action plan results reports by mid-1986.

Annette Vietti-Cook, Project Manager
PWR Project Directorate #5
Division of PWR Licensing-A

OFC	: PD#5	:	:	:	:	:	:
NAME	: AVietti-Cook	:	:	:	:	:	:
DATE	: 2/26/86	:	:	:	:	:	:

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

FEB 25 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 A. Viett-Cook

OELD

E. Jordan

B. Grimes

ACRS (10)

M. Rushbrook

NRC Participants

A. Viett-Cook

T. Westerman

D. Terao

R. D. Martin, RIV

E. H. Johnson, RIV

R. Heishman, IE

D. Norkin, IE

V. Noonan

C. Trammell

C. Early

E. Marinos

L. Shao

G. Mizuno

cc: Licensee and Plant Service
List