



Log # TXX-92011
File # 10110
903.3
Ref. # 10CFR50.55(e)

TU ELECTRIC

January 14, 1991

William J. Cahill, Jr.
Group Vice President

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attn: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

SUBJECT: COMANCHE PEAK STEAM ELECTRIC STATION (CPSES) - UNIT 2
DOCKET NO. 50-446
DESIGN BASIS TORNADO ANALYSIS FOR SAFETY-RELATED EQUIPMENT
SDAR CP-87-64 (FINAL REPORT)

Gentlemen:

On August 24, 1987, TU Electric orally notified the NRC of a potentially reportable item involving the pressure relieving capacity of the tornado venting devices on Units 1 and 2. Specifically, the existing Design Basis Tornado (DBT) analysis did not include sufficient documentation to show conclusively that safety-related equipment was qualified for the negative pressure transient expected during a DBT. The last report on this item was logged TXX-89751 dated November 15, 1989, which stated that Unit 2 corrective actions would be assessed upon resumption of the balance of Unit 2 engineering activities.

The corrective actions completed on Unit 1 were two-fold:

- 1) Validate the existing tornado venting analysis to assure that the differential pressures to which safety-related equipment would be subjected in the event of a DBT are correct, and
- 2) Validate the component adequacy or operability of affected safety-related equipment using the validated differential pressures.

The corrective actions in Unit 2 are the same. Calculations have now validated the tornado venting analysis for Unit 2 and the results are comparable to the validated Unit 1 results. Validation of Unit 2 component adequacy or operability of affected safety-related equipment will be completed using the validated Unit 2 DBT differential pressures in accordance with approved project procedures. This activity will be complete prior to Unit 2 fuel load.

IE27
1/0

9201210206 910114
PDR ADDCK 05000446
S PDR

TX-89751 also stated that appropriate actions were being taken to ensure that affected equipment or components procured since January 20, 1988, were adequate to withstand the effects of a DBT and that future procurement activities will properly consider the DBT design criteria. These procurement activities apply to Unit 2 as well as to Unit 1.

Sincerely,


William J. Cahill, Jr.

CBC/JTC/fds

cc: R. D. Martin, Region IV
Regional Inspectors, CPSES (2)
M. B. Fields, NRR