



300 Madison Avenue
Toledo, OH 43652-0001
419-249-2300

John P. Stetz
Vice President - Nuclear
Davis-Besse

Docket Number 50-346

License Number NPF-3

Serial Number 1-1075

June 13, 1995

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

Subject: Response to Inspection Report 50-346/95004

Gentlemen:

Toledo Edison (TE) received Inspection Report 95004 (Log Number 1-3580) on May 23, 1995. The response to the Notice of Deviation contained in this inspection report is provided in the attachment to this letter.

Should you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Mr. William T. O'Connor, Manager - Regulatory Affairs, at (419) 249-2366.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read 'J. P. Stetz', written over the typed name.

NKP/eld

Attachment

cc: L. L. Gundrum, NRC Project Manager
J. B. Martin, Regional Administrator, NRC Region III
S. Stasek, DB-1 NRC Senior Resident Inspector
Utility Radiological Safety Board

9506190457 950613
PDR ADOCK 05000346
Q PDR

Operating Companies:
Cleveland Electric Illuminating
Toledo Edison

TEO
11

Reply to a Notice of Deviation (95004-02(DRS))

Alleged Deviation

Toledo Edison's response to NRC Bulletin 90-01, Supplement 1, was provided in a March 5, 1993, letter from Mr. D. C. Shelton to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission. The portion of the response related to low pressure transmitters stated, in part, that "Weekly computer point trending will continue for all transmitters listed in Table 4 to maintain a high degree of confidence for detecting transmitter failures.." NRC Bulletin 90-01, Supplement 1, requires the licensee to document how they will maintain a high degree of confidence for detecting transmitter failures.

Contrary to the above, from March 1993 until April 1995, the licensee did not trend 12 of the 15 transmitters listed in Table 4.

TE Response

1. The twelve transmitters mentioned in the deviation are currently not trended because they have no inputs to the plant computer (FT6426, FT6427, PT4588, PT4694, PT4695, PT5898, AND PT5899); do not provide an output signal to the plant computer during normal plant operation (FT4630, FT4631, FT6425, and FT6435); or do not provide useful trending information as they are wide range transmitters and normally operate at the low end of their range (FTMU31). This action is consistent with the information provided in Toledo Edison's (TE's) response to Request Action 4 of NRC Bulletin 90-01 (Serial 1821) dated July 19, 1990.

In TE's response to Requested Action 1.f. of NRC Bulletin 90-01, Supplement 1 (Serial 1-1005) dated March 5, 1993, TE stated that weekly computer point trending would continue for affected transmitters that have a normal operations pressure less than or equal to 500 psi. However, during the inspection conducted in April 1995, it was noted that such trending was not being performed for the twelve transmitters described above.

At the time of TE's response to NRC Bulletin 90-01, Supplement 1 in 1993, it was TE's intent to continue the trending program established for these transmitters as was described in the response to NRC Bulletin 90-01. The error in the response to NRC Bulletin 90-01, Supplement 1 was due to an oversight, as it was thought that this response would supplement the response to NRC Bulletin 90-01.

Toledo Edison plans to continue to monitor the affected transmitters in the manner described in its response to NRC Bulletin 90-01 in the future. This matter was discussed with the inspectors during the April 1995 inspection and no concerns with the resolution were noted.

Docket Number 50-346
License Number NPP-3
Serial Number 1-1075
Attachment
Page 2

2. Corrective Steps That Have Been Taken and the Results Achieved

As stated above, TE plans to continue to monitor the affected transmitters as is described in its response to NRC Bulletin 90-01. Toledo Edison also conducted a review of other commitments for monitoring Rosemount Transmitters and found no other instances where the transmitters were not monitored in accordance with docketed commitments. This is considered an isolated occurrence.

3. Corrective Steps That Will Be Taken To Avoid Further Deviations

Since this deviation was determined to be an isolated occurrence, no further corrective actions are warranted.

4. Date When Corrective Actions Will Be Completed

All corrective actions have been completed.