

191

RELATED CORRESPONDENCE

CASE

1426 S. Polk
Docketed
Dallas, Texas 75224

(CITIZENS ASSN. FOR SOUND ENERGY)

214/946-9446

*84 MAY 16 A10:27

May 14, 1984 OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

TO: Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
and all parties in Docket 50-445-1 and 50-446-1

Subject: In the Matter of
Application of Texas Utilities
Generating Company, et al. for
An Operating License for
Comanche Peak Steam Electric
Station Units #1 and #2 (CPSES)
Docket Nos. 50-445-1 and 50-446-1

Revision of Page 9 of CASE'S ANSWER TO
APPLICANTS' MOTION FOR SUMMARY
DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN CASE ALLEGATIONS
REGARDING AWS AND ASME CODE PROVISIONS
RELATED TO WELDING ISSUES
(and to Affidavit of Jack Doyle)

After the attached subject pleading had already been typed, printed, and collated, Mr. Doyle telephoned and requested that one additional reference be added which had been inadvertently omitted. The only change is the addition of the reference which is single-spaced at the end of the next-to-the-last paragraph on the page.

Please substitute the attached page 9 for the page 9 included in the attached subject pleading.

Thank you.

Respectfully submitted,

CASE (Citizens Association for Sound
Energy)

Juanita Ellis
(Mrs.) Juanita Ellis
President

cc: Service List

B405160445 B40514
PDR ADOCK 05000445
G PDR

DS03

- (1) At tr. 10071/9-19, Mr. Baker states that if a downhill weld is ground out and is visually O.K., then that weld is O.K., although it is in violation of procedures. This statement indicates that if one can circumvent the code and pass a visual inspection, then no problem existed.
- (2) At tr. 11344, at lines 2-9, Mr. Brandt states that bead width is not controlled by AWS. However, the fact is that the bead width for flat, horizontal, overhead, vertical and root passes are controlled by AWS 4.10.6 et seq. and these criteria are less than the four core wire diameter allowed in weave bead welding, with the exception of the vertical weld. (See NRC Staff Witness Collins, Tr. 12,215/7-25 and 12,216/1-5.) The purpose of this restriction is to prevent weld cracking. (See NRC Staff Witness Smith, Tr. 12,216/7-21.) This purpose for a code restriction on bead width is of more concern with weave welding than it is for stringer bead welding due to the higher heat input. But Applicants' experts appear to be unaware of this problem since they are convinced that any fillet bead width is O.K. so long as it does not exceed four core wire diameters. (Among others, see Applicants' Witness Brandt, Tr. 11,227/9-16, 11,235/7-11 and 16-25, 11,245/17 through 11,246/1, and 11,250/3-10 and 24. See also Q. and A. 4 by Brandt, and Q. and A. 6 by Brandt and Baker from Applicants' prefiled rebuttal testimony, referenced in footnote 2 on page 7 of this pleading.)

However, in all cases for fillet and groove welds (which are the vast majority of welds for supports at Comanche Peak), the code allowable is less than the 8 core wire diameter industry practice mentioned by Mr. Baker in the last sentence on page 17 of his affidavit.