

SEP 16 1987

Docket Nos.: 50-445/446

Mr. W. G. Council
Executive Vice President
Texas Utilities Electric Company
400 North Olive Street, L.B. 81
Dallas, Texas 75201

Dear Mr. Council:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON ISAP RESULTS
REPORT

As a result of our ongoing review of the TU Electric Results
Report for ISAP V.a. we have determined that additional
information is needed to complete our evaluation of this
report. The requested additional information is listed in
the Enclosure. We request that you provide the additional
information within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Original signed by

Christopher I. Grimes, Director
Comanche Peak Project Division
Office of Special Projects

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
Information

cc: See next page

RAIVa

OFC: OSP:CPPD:RIS
NAME: Lellershaw:sam
DATE: 9/16/87

CPPD *RB*
IBarnes
9/16/87

AD *RW*
RFWarnick
9/16/87

DD *RLO for*
CGrimes
9/16/87

8709240424 870916
PDR ADDCK 05000446
A PDR

ENCLOSURE

ISAP V.a (Revision 2), Inspection For Certain Types of Skewed Welds in NF Supports:

1. How does the applicant propose to resolve incorrect data presented in the Tables attached to the ISAP V.a. Results Report, Revision 1, as discussed with Messrs. J. Miller and R. K. Sanan on March 24, 1987?

What impact does the errors that were identified have on text of the Results Report and evaluation of conclusions?

2. Paragraph 4.1.2 of ISAP V.a. states, in part, "The physical significance of any procedural changes will be evaluated by a third party...".

Please provide the conclusions and the engineering basis for those conclusions which resulted from the evaluation performed by the third party of procedural changes.

3. Paragraph 4.1.3 of ISAP V.a., Revision 2, states in part, "...If it is determined that all undersized welds meet code allowable stress levels, on evaluation of the need for additional inspection will be performed based on the observed trends in the weld inspection data...".

The Results Report defines an adverse trend as an identified pattern or commonality that is likely to have resulted in the occurrence of an undetected deficiency in the affected area, population or stratum. The Results Report identifies that about 10% of type 2 skewed welds were smaller than required by design by as much as 25%. What evaluations were performed to assure that the worst case undersize condition, when applied to all other supports in the population, would not constitute a deficiency. The Results Report does not identify the need to perform additional inspections to resolve the differences between actual field conditions and the design drawings. Please provide the basis for not reconciling design drawing data with the as-built conditions with respect to the SWEC Stress Requalification Program.

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket Files (50-445/446) NRC PDR

Local PDR

CPPD Reading (HQ)

*Site Reading

*CPRT Group

*SRI-OPS

*SRI-CONST

*MIS System

*RSTS Operator

RPB

RIV File

*DWeiss, RM/ALF

JKeppler/JAxelrad

CIGrimes

PFMcKee

HSchierling

JLyons

LChandler, OGC

CPPD-LA, OSP

*w/766