

JUL - 5 1989

In Reply Refer To:
Dockets: 50-445/89-26
50-446/89-26

Mr. W. J. Cahill
Executive Vice President
TU Electric
400 North Olive Street, Lock Box 81
Dallas, Texas 75201

Gentlemen:

Thank you for your letter dated June 15, 1989, in response to our letter dated May 16, 1989. Concerning Violation A (445/8926-V-01), we find your assertion that the subject nonconformance report (NCR) was properly closed out partially defensible, in that at the time of the QC inspection the welds appeared to be fully coated. Two problems with the overall process remain: (1) the fact that the raw exposed edges on the internal portion of one duct were not referenced on the NCR and (2) that the QC inspection was conducted before the coatings had dried. The failure to include the raw exposed edges in the NCR appeared to be due to an inadvertent missed communication among your personnel. The fact that the inspection was conducted prior to the coatings drying is considered more significant. It would seem that some controls should have been in place to preclude inspection under wet conditions. However, we understand that HVAC coatings have been reclassified as nonsafety-related. For other coatings that retain safety significance, we understand that you have conducted training to ensure that inspection will take place only after adequate drying has taken place. We also recommend any necessary procedural changes to ensure that this policy is implemented.

Concerning Violation B (445/8926-V-02), we take exception to your classification of the identified platform discrepancies as being isolated. The number of problems found per inspection time suggests a broader problem. We will review the results of your reinspection program and consider further inspections on our part to gauge the extent of the problem.

NR
IP:CPPD:NRR
MRunyan
7/3 /89

IP:CPPD:NRR
HLivermore *HL*
7/3 /89

AD:IP:CPPD:NRR
RWarnick *RFW*
7/3 /89

8907110414 890705
PDR ADOCK 05000445
Q PDC

IEO1
1/1



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

JUL - 5 1989

In Reply Refer To:

Dockets: 50-445/89-26
50-446/89-26

Mr. W. J. Cahill
Executive Vice President
TU Electric
400 North Olive Street, Lock Box 81
Dallas, Texas 75201

Gentlemen:

Thank you for your letter dated June 15, 1989, in response to our letter dated May 16, 1989. Concerning Violation A (445/8926-V-01), we find your assertion that the subject nonconformance report (NCR) was properly closed out partially defensible, in that at the time of the QC inspection the welds appeared to be fully coated. Two problems with the overall process remain: (1) the fact that the raw exposed edges on the internal portion of one duct were not referenced on the NCR and (2) that the QC inspection was conducted before the coatings had dried. The failure to include the raw exposed edges in the NCR appeared to be due to an inadvertent missed communication among your personnel. The fact that the inspection was conducted prior to the coatings drying is considered more significant. It would seem that some controls should have been in place to preclude inspection under wet conditions. However, we understand that HVAC coatings have been reclassified as nonsafety-related. For other coatings that retain safety significance, we understand that you have conducted training to ensure that inspection will take place only after adequate drying has taken place. We also recommend any necessary procedural changes to ensure that this policy is implemented.

Concerning Violation B (445/8926-V-02), we take exception to your classification of the identified platform discrepancies as being isolated. The number of problems found per inspection time suggests a broader problem. We will review the results of your reinspection program and consider further inspections on our part to gauge the extent of the problem.

W. J. Cahill

2

JUL - 5 1967

We have no further questions concerning your response to Violation C (445/8926-V-03).

Sincerely,

R F Warnick

R. F. Warnick, Assistant Director
for Inspection Programs
Comanche Peak Project Division
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc:
(see attached)

W. J. Cahill

cc:

Roger D. Walker
Manager, Nuclear Licensing
TU Electric
Skyway Tower
400 North Olive Street, L.B. 81
Dallas, TX 75201

Juanita Ellis
President - CASE
1426 South Polk Street
Dallas, TX 75224

Susan M. Theisen
Assistant Attorney General
Environmental Protection Division
P.O. Box 12548, Capitol Station
Austin, TX 78711-1548

GDS Associates, Inc.
1850 Parkway Place, Suite 720
Marietta, GA 30067-8237

Lanny A. Sinkin
Christic Institute
1324 N. Capitol Street
Washington, DC 20002

Ms. Billie Pirner Garde, Esq.
Garde Law Office
104 East Wisconsin Avenue
Appleton, WI 54911

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

William A. Burchette, Esq.
Counsel for Tex-La Electric
Cooperative of Texas
Heron, Burchette, Ruckert & Rothwell
1025 Thomas Jefferson St., NW
Washington, DC 20007

TU Electric
c/o Bethesda Licensing
3 Metro Center, Suite 610
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

E. F. Ottney
P. O. Box 1777
Glen Rose, Texas 76043

Joseph F. Fulbright
Fulbright & Jaworski
1301 McKinney Street
Houston, Texas 77010

George A. Parker, Chairman
Public Utility Committee
Senior Citizens Alliance of
Tarrant County, Inc.
6048 Wonder Drive
Fort Worth, Texas 76133

Jack R. Newman, Esq.
Newman & Holtzinger, P.C.
Suite 1000
1615 L. Street N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036