

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

March 6, 1990

Docket No. 50-390

9003190076 900306 PDR ADOCK 05000390

PTIC

LICENSEE: Tennessee Valley Authority

FACILITY: Watts Bar Nuclear Plant, Unit 1

SUBJECT: MEETING SUMMARY OF FEBRUARY 15-16, 1990 MEETING ON CABLE DAMAGE RESOLUTION PLAN

See Reports

memol4

On February 15 and 16, 1990, a meeting was held between the NRC staff and TVA's representatives at the Watts Bar site in Spring City, Tennessee. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss TVA's plans to resolve the issue of damaged electrical cable in conduits at Watts Bar, Unit 1. Enclosure 1 is the list of individuals attending the meeting. Enclosure 2 contains the meeting agenda and the handouts provided at the meeting.

The NRC staff opened the meeting by stating that a preliminary assessment of the TVA's submittal of December 20, 1989 has been completed. Based on this review, the staff has several questions/concerns regarding TVA's approach towards resolution of the issue. The meeting agenda contains the list of staff questions/concerns (this list was provided to TVA earlier). These questions/concerns provided the basis for the meeting discussions.

The majority of the discussion involved TVA's rationale for the development of the conduit screening methodology which results in the classification of conduit as high-risk, moderate-risk, or low-risk with regard to pullby susceptability.

NRC staff commented that TVA's methodology delineated by the Watts Bar Cable Damage Resolution Plan for the resolution of this problem raises many questions and implementation of this methodology alone would not alleviate the staff's concern of potential cable damage in low-risk category conduits. The proposed plan does not provide any threshold values above which the damage starts.

The NRC staff further stated that an alternate approach consisting of a test program for the low-risk category similar to that proposed for Browns Ferry would address the NRC concerns. Specifically:

- 1. As proposed, categorize the conduits as high-risk, moderate-risk, or low-risk.
- 2. Replace the cables in those conduits that are in the high or moderate risk category.

- 3. All low-risk category conduits will fall under the test program. "Worst case" conduits should be identified, and 20 conduits of V1/V2, and 20 conduits of V3/V4 category should be "high-potential" tested. The test program should be similar to that proposed by TVA for Browns Ferry Unit 2.
- 4. Evaluate the root cause of any failure from the testing and develop corrective actions.

TVA stated that they will re-evaluate their program and will inform NRC of TVA management's decision. The NRC staff concluded the meeting by stating that if the staff and TVA cannot come to a mutually acceptable test program, the staff will review in detail TVA's responses to the NRC questions.

TVA Projects Division Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:

- 1. Attendance List
- 2. Meeting Agenda
- 3. Handout

cc w/enclosures: See next page

OFC :NRR:TVA/PM	:NRR: TVA; ROB	/BC TVA:AD/P :			: :
NAME PAULuckyas	:EMarinos	SB act W	·		
DATE :3/5/90	3/5/90	:31/ /90	:	• * ·	
OFFICIAL RECORD C	OPY				

Document Name: FEB. 15/16 MTG. SUMMARY

cc: General Counsel Tennessee Valley Authority 400 West Summit Hill Drive ET 11B 33H Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Mr. F. L. Moreadith Vice President, Nuclear Engineering Tennessee Valley Authority 400 West Summit Hill Drive WT 12A 12A Knoxville, Tennessee 37902

Dr. Mark O. Medford Vice President and Nuclear Technical Director Tennessee Valley Authority 6N 38A Lookout Place Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

Manager, Nuclear Licensing and Regulatory Affairs Tennessee Valley Authority 5N 157B Lookout Place Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

Mr. Dan Douthit, Program Manager Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Tennessee Valley Authority P. O. Box 800 Spring City, Tennessee 37381

Mr. R. J. Stevens Site Licensing Manager Watts Bar Nuclear Plant Tennessee Valley Authority P. O. Box 800 Spring City, Tennessee 37381

Mr. Richard F. Wilson Vice President, New Projects Tennessee Valley Authority 6N 38A Lookout Place Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

Honorable Robert Aikman County Judge Rhea County Courthouse Dayton, Tennessee 37321 Honorable Johnny Powell County Judge Meigs County Courthouse Route 2 Decatur, Tennessee 37322 Mr. Michael H. Mobley, Director Division of Radiological Health T.E.R.R.A. Building, 6th Floor 150 9th Avenue North Nashville, Tennessee 37219-5404 Regional Administrator, Region II U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 101 Marietta Street, N.W. Atlanta, Georgia 30323 Senior Resident Inspector Watts Bar Nuclear Plant U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Route 2, Box 700 Spring City, Tennessee 37381 Dr. Henry Myers, Science Advisor Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs U.S. House of Representatives Washington, D.C. 20515 Tennessee Valley Authority Rockville Office 11921 Rockville Pike Suite 402 Rockville, Maryland 20852 Mr. Oliver D. Kingsley, Jr. Senior Vice President, Nuclear Power Tennessee Valley Authority 6N 38A Lookout Place 1101 Market Street

Chattanooga, Tennessee 37402-2801

-3-

Meeting Summary, Memoranda for Trip Reports or Site Visits**

Docket File NRC PDR Local PDR WBN Reading ADSP Reading J. Sniezek D. Crutchfield T. Quay B. D. Liaw S. Black R. Pierson LA R. Auluck P. Cortland B. Wilson, Region II OGC E. Marinos H. Garg ACRS (10) GPA/CÀ (M. Callahan) (3) E. Jordan B. Grimes J. Scarborough G. Marcus L. Norrholm C. Ader J. Gray R. Borchardt

H. Garg

*cc: Licensee/Applicant & Service List

ENCLOSURE 1

ENCLOSURE 1

OVER ->

ATTENDANCE ROSTER

MEETING TOPIC: <u>WATTS</u> ASSES	S BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN) SSMENT AND RESOLUTION PLA	- ELECTRICAL CABLE N	DAMAGE
DATE: Febru	uary 15, 1990		
NAME	Title	Organization	Telephone
Jin Young	Nuclear Fuge	WBN TUA	8761
Jim Altson	Chrief E.E.	NE	<u>x2441-1</u> C
WS RAUGHLOY	ENGR MGR - Newly	NE-WB	0 (E) BU
RJ Stevens	Manager - Site Licensing	WBN TVA	<u> 3650 -</u>
WAThue	Consultant		407 692-2268
ANSELO MARINOS	NRC	NRC	<u> 301- 492-076</u> 8
HUKAM GARG	Elec Engo	1180	301. 492 4000
R. Auluck	Proj. Manager	NRG	301-492-0759
CP. ZAAR	CERTING TRE	K) (
XENT 2) FROWN	SEFERENCER	Mar Maria	05.032-4010
TH KALEG	SFN EVIS CORCALINE	- A- Gara	25 12 - 76 .
ALLAN GENTRY	ASST SITE REP	TVA - ECP	<u>365-3507</u>
K.E. LEWS	GA MEMBER	WBPT	365-3374
CF Willson	TYD-YP-Maria	· .	
NB Garaner	Consultant THE		
A.K. GWAL	Elect, IE, C Member	WBPT-TVA	365-3729
E. W. WhitaKer	Stuff Spec, - Sr V P Nuclear	<i>TVA</i>	751- 8095
G. A. Walton	Res. Insp.	NBC	8676
PG Humphrey	Res Ensp	1/12C	8676
F.E. LAURENT	ant sqM	NQA-WI3N	8675
SAMW. CZOWE	SOM	NQA-WBN	8667
R.L. COLLINS	ELEC.INST. SPEC.	NE/EE	× <u>5211-5QN</u>

2877G

,

÷

1

~

.

MEETING TOPIC: <u>WATTS</u> ASSES	BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN SSMENT AND RESOLUTION PLA) <u>– ELECTRICAL CABLE D</u> AN	AMAGE -
DATE:Febru	lary 15, 1990		
NAME	Title	Organization	<u>Telephone</u> 6/0-
FLIIOREADITH	<u>VP</u>	NUCLETAR ENGR	<u>632 - 20</u> 21
H. Hemmati-Asam	Const Elect Field Eng	Nucleur Const	365-3349
HUCK MSFALL	MOVELT LOUTEOL ENGE	PC \$ FS - WBLI	<u> 3452 - WB</u> N
			<u>= _</u>
	<u> </u>		
· ·			
			· · ·
		- <u>i</u>	
	·		

2877G

2/15/90 Brian Reagan R. Luthe-NE-EE Engg. Spec. 632-7073 (203) 223 - 3491 Consultant, TUA 365-1419 T. G. HUGHES ENG SPEC NE-EE SPECIAL PROJECTS PA P. Re.illy 365-3658 suec/turg

-

MEETING TOPIC:

WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN) - ELECTRICAL CABLE DAMAGE -ASSESSMENT AND RESOLUTION PLAN

DATE:

February 16, 1990

NAME Youn 1m 500 12 ANBELO MARINOS HLYAN GLUC Auluck P Forner R.L. COLLINS G.A. Walton 12 tum hrey HUCK MEFALL PAUL REILLY TIM MIRIES TOM HUGHES R. Luther L.E. Brock W.S. Ranghl Hennati-Arass H,

Title	Organization	Telephone
Nucl Engr	WBN Site Lic	(615)-365-8761
	NE	x2447-1K
LEAD ELET ANER	NE WSEP	x 1416-
Consultant	to NRC	-07 692-2268
Nec.	NRC	3 <u>01-492-</u> 0768
the second s		
- Daged Ngr	NRC	301-492-0759
to NRC	Lett.	<u>.53 393 </u> 2779
ELEC.INST. SPEC.	NE/EE	615-843-5211
Res. Insp.	NBC	8676
SZETION, CHEF		4 <u>04-331-039</u> 93
Res Insp	NRC	<u>X-8676</u>
PROJECT LOUTEUL EULE	REAFS - WBL	3452 - WBN
SPECIAL AROJECTS	sweetra	655-365-3658
ENG SPECIALIST	-974 	729 516
ENG SPECIALIST	NE-EE WON	615-365-1419
TVA Conjultant		(203)223-3491
TVA, QA EUGR	NQA	8368
ENGR MGR-Nalm	j NE-WB	×1390
Const Elect Field	Eng NC	365-3349

2877G

MEETING TOPIC:	WATTS BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN) ASSESSMENT AND RESOLUTION PLA	- ELECTRICAL CABLE	DAMAGE
DATE:	February 15, 1990		
NAME	Title	Organization	<u>Telephone</u>
Jin Young	Nuclear Engr	WBN TVA	8761
Jim Altson	Chrief E.E.	NE	x2441-1C
WS RAUGHLO	+ ENGR MGR - Newly	NE-WB	0 (E1 Bu)
RJ Stevens	Manager - Site Licensing	WBN TVA	8650
WAThe	Consultant		407 692-2268
ANGELO MARINOT	NRC	NRE	<u> 301- 412-076</u> 8
HUKAM SHR	EKC Engo	NRC	301. 492 4007
R. Auluck	Prej Manager	NRG	301-492-0759
<u> </u>		- NRC	- <u>)</u> <u>-</u> ; <u>-</u> :-
XENT DEC	WN SEFLEPTINE	- M. Commune	015-032 - Mayo
JA CRIEG		-UA- BEN	205 723 -76
ALLAN GENTRY	Assy Site Rep	TVA - ECP	<u>365-3507</u>
K.E. LEW'S	GA MEMBER	WBPT	365-3374
2 P WALLER	TYD-Yi-Maria	Ai	215-3151
NB Garaner	Consultant THE		<u></u>
A.K. GWAL	Elect, It, C Member	WBPT-TVA	365 - 3729
E.W. Whitaker	Staff Spec, - Sr VP Nuclear	TVA	751- 8095
G. A. Walto	n Res. Insp.	NBC	8676
PGHumph	rey Restrop	1/ RC	8676
F.E. LAUREN	T_ ant sqM_	NQA-WI3N	8675
SAMW. C.ZOWE	SQM	NQA-WBN	8667
R.L. COLLINS	ELEC. INST. SPEC.	NE/EE	× <u>5211-50</u> N

OVER ->

2877G

MEETING TOPIC: <u>WATTS</u> <u>ASSES</u>	BAR NUCLEAR PLANT (WBN SMENT AND RESOLUTION PL	<u>) - ELECTRICAL CABLE D</u> AN	AMAGE -
DATE:Febru	ary 15, 1990		
NAME FL MOREADITH H. Hemmoti-Aram	Title VP Const Elect Field Egg	Organization NUCLETAR ENGR Nucleur Const	<u>Telephone</u> 615 - <u>632 - 20</u> 21 <u>365 - 334</u> 9
HUCK MSFALL	PROJECT LOUTEOL ENGE	PC445 - WBLI	<u> 3452 - WB</u> N
·			
		,	
			·
	· ·		
- <u></u>	<u></u>		
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
			<u> </u>

2877G

.

1

, **4**

-

2/15/90 Brion Reagan R. Luther NE-EE Engg. Spec. 632-7073 (203) 223-3491 Consultant TUA T. G. HUGHES 365-1419 ENG SPEC NE-EE P. Re. Ily SPECIAL PROJECTS PA 365-3658 suection

ENCLOSURE 2

AGENDA

Watts Bar Cable Damage Assessment

February 15, 1990

The staff and its consultants have performed the preliminary assessment of the TVA submittal dated December 20, 1989. Based on this review, the following is a preliminary list of staff questions and concerns.

- 1. TVA should demonstrate that SWBP calculations directly relate to potential pullby damage. Explain the process used for calculating the SBWP for the conduits which were removed from the WBN.
- 2. Provide and explain all key overlays of the conduit isometrics that confirm their theory of damage mechanisms.
- 3. How is TVA reconciling probable differences in pulling practices used in the past to assumed practices in calculations? How is the use or non-use of mid run pull points determined?
- 4. What are the differences in the criteria which were used to determine the worst case pullbys during the Sequoyah review to the ones used in the Browns Ferry review (new)? Explain how the 28 conduits were selected for removal from Watts Bar.
- 5. What is the justification for increasing SWBP values allowed in G-38? How does TVA reconcile the issues raised in the staff's TER regarding the May 1986 SWBP test report?
- 6. Provide the details of pull tension calculations for the conduits removed at Watts Bar to allow NRC's evaluation of assumptions and methodology used by TVA.
- Describe actual work practices used to place pull lines used for pullbys.
- 8. What are the sources of non-pullby damages discussed in the UCONN report? How is this damage mechanism being addressed by TVA?
- 9. Describe why the concern for the jacket integrity of coax cable is not applicable to other instrumentation cables? Provide copy of CAQR 890492.
- 10. Describe that dry hi-pot tests are an adequate damage assessment criteria for MV cables and for LV cables.
- 11. PLG report Page 3-1 states that cables pulled with 2000 lb/ft or more could be damaged by pull forces alone. However, Page 1 of Enclosure 1 of the submittal says high risk cables will only be replaced if evidence of pullbys is demonstrated. What about damage based on excess SWBP?
- 12. Describe any electrical testing done on cables prior to their removal.
- 13. Provide copies of the references listed on Page 11 of their December 20, 1989 submittal.

14. Explain all basic assumptions used in the PLG Backup study, e.g., damage with pull rope will occur at much lower SWBP compared to pull wire, coefficient of friction will be higher than 0.75 in case of pull rope compared to pull wire, etc.

* QUESTION;

A) "TVA SHOULD DEMONSTRATE THAT SWBP CALCULATIONS DIRECTLY RELATE TO POTENTIAL PULLBY DAMAGE."

* ANSWER;

A) OVERLAYS OF THE CABLE DAMAGE ON THE CONDUIT ISOMETRICS DEMONSTRATED A DIRECT CORRELATION BETWEEN SWBP AND DAMAGE FOR ALL OF THE UNIT 2 PULLBY DAMAGE LOCATIONS. SWBP ALSO IS A MEASURE OF THE CABLE-TO-CABLE FORCES AND AN INDICATOR OF THE DIFFICULTY OF A PULL AND THE LIKELIHOOD FOR A PULL ROPE TO SPIRAL WITH ITS CABLES.

* QUESTION;

- B) "EXPLAIN THE PROCESS USED FOR CALCULATING THE SWBP FOR THE CONDUITS WHICH WERE REMOVED FROM THE WBN."
- * ANSWER;
 - B) SWBP CALCULATIONS WERE PERFORMED ON THE CABLES REMOVED FROM WBN FOR SCOPE ASSESSMENT USING THE METHODOLOGY DEFINED IN G-38. THESE EQUATIONS FOLLOW INDUSTRY STANDARD PRACTICES AND ARE ENCODED IN THE TVA QA PROGRAM 'CBLPUL'. CONDUITS WERE FIRST WALKED DOWN TO DETERMINE LENGTHS AND ANGLES. THEN RECORDS WERE REVIEWED TO DETERMINE PULL GROUPINGS. THIS DATA WAS THEN INPUT TO THE PROGRAM.

QUESTION:

 "PROVIDE AND EXPLAIN ALL KEY OVERLAYS OF THE CONDUIT ISOMETRICS THAT CONFIRM THEIR THEORY OF DAMAGE MECHANISMS."

ANSWER:

٠

- KEY OVERLAYS OF THE CONDUIT ISOMETRICS ARE BEING PROVIDED.
- SIDEWALL BEARING PRESSURE AND PULL TENSION CALCULATIONS INDICATE VALUES IN EXCESS OF G-38 LIMITS IN THE SECTIONS OF THE U-2 CONDUITS WHERE THE MOST SEVERE DAMAGE OCCURED.

THE MOST SEVERELY DAMAGED CABLES (CONDUCTOR EXPOSED) WERE INSTALLED IN THE CONDUITS PRIOR TO THE PULLBY WITH HIGHEST SIDEWALL BEARING PRESSURE.

* QUESTION;

A) HOW IS TVA RECONCILING PROBABLE DIFFERENCES IN PULLING PRACTICES USED IN THE PAST TO ASSUMED PRACTICES IN CALCULATIONS?

* ANSWER;

- A) THE CALCULATIONS FOR THE REMOVED CABLES ARE BASED ON WALKDOWN DATA AND PULL CARD DATA. IT IS ASSUMED THAT PULLBYS WERE PRACTICED RATHER THAN PULLBACK AND REPULL.
- * QUESTION;
 - B) HOW IS THE USE OR NON-USE OF MID RUN PULL POINTS DETERMINED?

* ANSWER;

B) IN THE RIGOROUS CALCULATIONS PERFORMED BY TVA ON THE CABLES REMOVED, EACH PULL POINT IS ASSUMED TO HAVE BEEN USED. NO DATA TO THE CONTRARY EXISTS. EVIDENCE FROM THE CABLE REMOVAL INDICATES THAT ALL PULL POINTS WERE USED. NONE OF THE OBSERVED PULLBY DAMAGE WAS LOCATED AT A PULL POINT. GIVEN THE SMALL RADIUS OF CONDULETS DAMAGE WOULD HAVE OCCURRED IF THESE WERE BY-PASSED GIVEN THE SEVERITY OF THE PULLBYS.

• QUESTION;

A) WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCES IN THE CRITERIA WHICH WERE USED TO DETERMINE THE WORST CASE PULLBYS DURING THE SQN REVIEW TO THE ONES USED IN THE BFN REVIEW (NEW)?

• ANSWER:

A) NOT APPLICABLE TO WBN

• QUESTION;

B) EXPLAIN HOW THE 28 CONDUITS WERE SELECTED FOR REMOVAL FROM WATTS BAR.

• ANSWER;

- B) * 14 CONDUITS WERE CHOSEN FROM UNIT 1 WHICH WERE EQUIVALENT TO THE UNIT 2 RUN IN WHICH THE DAMAGE WAS IDENTIFIED
 - * 4 CONDUITS WERE SELECTED FROM THE WBN WORST CASE PULLBY CALCULATION
 - * 10 CONDUITS WERE CHOSEN BASED ON A REVIEW OF THE CCRS FOR LENGTH AND FILL AND A CONFIRMATION OF PULLBY ACTIVITY
- V2 >25 FEET AND >50% ALLOWABLE FILL
 - V3 >25 FEET AND >100% ALLOWABLE FILL
 - V4 MINIMUM 4 CABLES >25 FEET AND >50% ALLOWABLE FILL

QUESTION:

 "WHAT IS THE JUSTIFICATION FOR INCREASING SWBP VALUES ALLOWED IN G-38? HOW DOES TVA RECONCILE THE ISSUES RAISED IN THE STAFFS TER REGARDING THE MAY 1986 SWBP TEST REPORT?"

ANSWER:

- THE ORIGINAL VALUES WERE BASED ON STANDARDS AND INFORMATION SUPPLIED BY CABLE VENDORS.
- NEW VALUES ARE BASED ON TVA AND EPRI TEST RESULTS.
- THE TEST OBJECTIVE WAS TO IDENTIFY PERMISSIBLE SWBPs.

QUESTION:

 "PROVIDE THE DETAILS OF PULL TENSION CALCULATIONS FOR THE CONDUITS REMOVED AT WATTS BAR TO ALLOW NRC'S EVALUATION OF ASSUMPTIONS AND METHODOLOGY USED BY TVA."

ANSWER:

- WALKDOWNS WERE PERFORMED TO DETERMINE CONDUIT CONFIGURATION (I.E. LENGTH AND DEGREES OF BENDS).
- INSTALLATION RECORDS WERE REVIEWED TO DETERMINE CABLE GROUPINGS AND PULL DATES.
- A BASIC COEFFICIENT OF FRICTION OF 0.3 ON INITIAL PULLS AND 0.75 ON PULLBYS WAS USED.
- PULL TENSIONS WERE CALCULATED USING THE FOLLOWING BASIC EQUATION;

T = L * W * K * EXP(K*A)

WHERE:

.

L=CONDUIT SEGMENT LENGTH W=WEIGHT OF CABLES IN PULLBY K=COEFFICIENT OF FRICTION A=ANGLE IN RADIANS

SWBP WAS CALCULATED USING THE FOLLOWING BASIC EQUATION:

SWBP = T / R

WHERE:

 $T = CALCULATED PULL TENSION, \cdot POUNDS$

R = RADIUS OF BEND, FEET

QUESTION:

 "DESCRIBE ACTUAL WORK PRACTICES USED TO PLACE PULL LINES USED FOR PULLBYS."

ANSWER:

- OLD PRACTICE
 - PULL ROPES OR PULL WIRES WERE SOMETIMES INSTALLED WITH THE CABLES DURING THE CABLE PULL.
 - THOSE PULL ROPES OR PULL WIRES WERE THEN USED TO PERFORM A CABLE PULLBY.
- NEW PRACTICE
 - EXISTING PULL ROPES OR WIRES ARE NOT USED SINCE APRIL 10, 1989.
 - NO PULL ROPES OR WIRES ARE INSTALLED WITH NEW CABLE PULLS.

- QUESTION;
 - A) WHAT ARE THE SOURCES OF NON-PULLBY DAMAGES DISCUSSED IN THE UCONN REPORT?
- ANSWER;
 - A) VARIOUS NICKS AND SCRAPES TO JACKETS WERE NOTED WHICH ARE CONSIDERED TO BE TYPICAL OF THE RIGORS OF INSTALLATION.
- QUESTION;
 - B) HOW IS THIS MECHANISM BEING ADDRESSED BY TVA?
- ANSWER;
 - B) * ALL COAXIAL CABLES REQUIRED FOR 10CFR50.49 OR REG GUIDE 1.97 SERVICE ARE BEING REPLACED WITH CABLES OF DOUBLE JACKET CONSTRUCTION
 - * SUCH DAMAGE IS NON-SIGNIFICANT TO OTHER CABLE TYPES AND THEREFORE NO ACTION IS PLANNED

• QUESTION;

"DESCRIBE WHY THE CONCERN FOR THE JACKET INTEGRITY OF COAX CABLE IS NOT APPLICABLE TO OTHER INSTRUMENTATION CABLES?"

• ANSWER;

THE CONCERN FOR COAX IS FOR MOISTURE GETTING UNDER THE JACKET AND BEING 'WICKED UP' BY THE BRAID TO THE CONNECTORS. BULK MOISTURE AT THE CONNECTORS MAY UNACCEPTABLY DEGRADE SIGNALS. OTHER INSTRUMENTATION CABLES ARE TWISTED SHIELDED PAIRS (NOT COAXIAL) AND DO NOT HAVE THE BRAIDED SHIELD. WHERE THE END DEVICE IS MOISTURE SENSITIVE CONDUIT SEALS ARE PROVIDED.

- QUESTION;
- "DESCRIBE THAT DRY HI-POT TESTS ARE AN ADEQUATE DAMAGE ASSESSMENT FOR MV CABLES AND LV CABLES"

• ANSWER;

- DRY HI-POT TESTS ARE STANDARD FOR SHIELDED MV CABLES (REFERENCE IEEE 400 AND ICEA TESTS)
- NO HI-POT TESTING IS PROPOSED FOR LV CABLES AT WBN

• QUESTION;

PLG REPORT PAGE 3-1 STATES THAT CABLES PULLED WITH 2000 LB/ FT OR MORE COULD BE DAMAGED BY PULL FORCES ALONE. HOWEVER, PAGE 1 OF ENCLOSURE 1 OF THE SUBMITTAL SAYS HIGH RISK CABLES WILL ONLY BE REPLACED IF EVIDENCE OF PULLBYS IS DEMONSTRATED. WHAT ABOUT DAMAGE BASED ON EXCESS SWBP?

• ANSWER;

SCREENING CALCULATIONS USED TO CATEGORIZE CONDUITS WERE BASED ON THE ASSUMPTION THAT PULLBYS HAD OCCURRED IN EVERY CONDUIT. ASSUMED PULLBYS WERE LARGE AND COEFFICIENT OF FRICTIONS WERE 0.75, 0.85 OR 1.0 DEPENDENT ON CONDUIT FILL. IF NO PULLBY ACTUALLY OCCURRED THE C.O.F. WOULD HAVE BEEN SIGNIFICANTLY LOWER AND THE SWBP WOULD HAVE BEEN CORRESPONDINGLY LOWER.

QUESTION:

• "DESCRIBE ANY ELECTRICAL TESTING DONE ON CABLES PRIOR TO THEIR REMOVAL."

ANSWER:

• IMMEDIATELY PRIOR TO THEIR REMOVAL, NO TESTING WAS PERFORMED.

Ŧ

QUESTION:

٠

"PROVIDE COPIES OF THE REFERENCES LISTED ON PAGE 11 OF THEIR DECEMBER 20, 1989 SUBMITTAL."

ANSWER:

• COPIES OF REFERENCES ARE BEING PROVIDED.

QUESTION;

EXPLAIN ALL BASIC ASSUMPTIONS USED IN THE PLG BACKUP STUDY, e.g., DAMAGE WITH PULL ROPE WILL OCCUR AT MUCH LOWER SWBP COMPARED TO PULL WIRE, COEFFICIENT OF FRICTION WILL BE HIGHER THAN 0.75 IN THE CASE OF PULL ROPE COMPARED TO PULL WIRE, etc.

ANSWER;

PULLCHARTS USED IN THE PLG STUDY WERE DEVELOPED AS FOLLOWS;

. SEPARATE CHARTS WERE DEVELOPED FOR V1/V2, V3 AND V4

. SEPARATE CHARTS WERE DEVELOPED FOR SIX FILL CATEGORIES

THE FOLLOWING ASSUMPTIONS WERE APPLIED;

. PULLBYS OCCURED IN EVERY CONDUIT

. PULLBYS WERE LARGE

- . MORE THAN 360 DEGREES EXISTED BETWEEN PULL POINTS
- . NO INTERMEDIATE PULL POINTS EXISTED
- . CONDUIT WAS THE MAXIMUM LENGTH IN ITS RANGE
- . FOR THE 10-40% FILL CATEGORIES 0.75 C.O.F. WAS USED IN THE 50% FILL CATEGORY A 0.85 C.O.F. WAS USED IN THE 60% FILL CATEGORY A 1.0 C.O.F. WAS USED



Attachment 5

·q × 80

COMPUTED WIT DATE 8-8-QIR LEE WEN E9004 CALCULATION OF PULL TENSIONS CHECKED RED DATES/23/

> WATTS BAR CALCULATION PACKAGE NUMBER 2PM6470D-9A PAGE 2

		.] . –	FORWARD P	ULL	FROM JE 14 LL AT PI	144 TO JUL POINT E
SEG NUM	SEGMENT TYPE	LENGTH IN FT	ANGLE FROM HORIZ	BEND ANGLE	PULLING TENSION IN LBS	SIDEWALL PRESSURE IN LBS
1 2	HORIZONTAL H BEND	4.63 0.00	0.00	0.00 20.00 0.00	3.03 4.37 23.04	3.22
3 4 5	BEND, H-V DN	·0.00 4.25	0.00 0.00 25.00	14.00	29.93 31.33	22.05
67	BEND, V DN-H HORIZONTAL	0.00 26.33	0.00	14.00 0.00	40.30 57.53	29.70
89	H BEND HORIZONTAL	0.00 2.79	0.00	15.00 0.00	75.73 77.55	55.80
10	H BEND HORIZONTAL	0.00 6.35	0.00	15.00 0.00 30.00	102.09 106.24	105.22
	H BEND HORIZONTAL DEND H-V DN	7.42	0.00	0.00	188.95 983.97	. 725:03
ر د 16	INCLINED DN BEND, V DN-H	1.00	90.00 0.00	0.00	983.35 1270.77	936.36
17 18 19	INCLINED DN BEND, H-V DN INCLINED DN	1.71 0.00 1.29	76.00 0.00 90.00	0.00 14.00 0.00	1270.01 1641.61 1640.81	1209.61
TOTAL	OF BEND ANGLES IN	PULL: 226.	00 DEGREI	ES	SEGMEN	s sub- It only
MAXIMU MAXIMU MAXIMU	M EXPECTED PULLIN M EXPECTED SIDEWA M EXPECTED TENSIO	G TENSION (T LL PRESSURE N FOR FIGURI	exp): 164 (SWPexp) NG SIDEW)	41.61 LBS/ 1209.61 ALL PRESSU	FT LBS/FT RE: 1641.61	LES
				APPROX LOCATI	IMATE DAMAGE	-

Attachment 5

29× 81

COMPUTED 1111 DATE 5-8-5 QIR LEE WEN 89004 CALCULATION OF PULL TENSIONSHECKED READ DATE AND SIDE WALL PRESSURES

> WATTS BAR CALCULATION PACKAGE NUMBER 2PM6470D-9A PAGE 3

	;	REVERSE PULL
SEG NUM	TENSION IN LBS	PRESSURE (B) TO BOX 1444 IN LES
19 18	0.80	0.91
17 16 15	2.54 3.12 3.75	2.30
14 13	22.55	16.61 - FIPPROX MATE
12	47.48 51.64	34.99 DAMAGE LOCHINON
b 9	67.97 69.80	50.08
8	91.88 109.10	67.70
د. بر ا	140.86 144.50	103.79
4 3	186.96 205.63	137.76
· 2 1	296.66	218.59

MAXIMUM PULLING TENSION ON REVERSE PULL (Texp): 299.69.LES/FT (TENSION OF 1641.61 LBS FOR FORWARD PULL)

MAXIMUM SIDEWALL PRESSURE ON REVERSE PULL (SWPexp): 218.59 LES/FT (SIDEWALL PRESSURE OF 1209.61 LES FOR FORWARD PULL) MAXIMUM TENSION FOR SIDEWALL PRESSURE ON REVERSE PULL: 296.56 LES



WHN INSTRUCTION WORK CONTROL

WBN-GCI-8.1.05-01 C	
Rev. U	
Page 37 of 50	
Diail Staria 17-20-8	9
Frank Dagry VERIGNATION / DATS	
Secure MATY USE FILSTON / DATE	

Ω.

Attachment H	
LOP	Ja
DESCRIPTION OF WORK	Sey
Workplan No. FADODAZ Rev. No.	1

Page _ of

F19 HOLD STEP DISTANCE FROM POINT NQ 21. 2-JB-292-1656-0 <u>Sequaxe #</u> 2Pm 791 D-H 2PM 7910-1 TYPE DAMAGE 30'-9" TORN JACKET 6474 270'-9'' (424 2PM791D-2 . PINCH IN JACKET . • . . . Material verification required prior to fitup. I YES I NO























TRUITS NO 1242 BU VILL SCIES ISOMETRIC















AZ 2 1600 5.0.3 T'6" ADIUS-KEY PLAN ~2-JB-293-1675-D EL 2 768-0" PULL POINT "B" 2PM 6420D ΊŻ•Η AZ = 190, 0° EL = 161.0° 1'-9" 10:84 30°H PULL POINT"A 2-JB-293-1673-D 2PM-6398 CONDUNT # 2PM63990



TID LEE WORK I

PHachment 6

Page 46

PROGRAM CELPUL. SOFTWARE ID 262352 VERSION 2 COMPUTED UN DATE 8-8-89

> CHECKED <u>PSO</u> DATE<u>5</u> CALCULATION OF PULL TENSIONS AND SIDE WALL PRESSURES

WATTS BAR CALCULATION PACKAGE NUMBER 2PM6473D-9 PAGE 1

INPUT SUMMARY

CABLE(S) UNID	MARK NUMBER	MARK NUMBER DESCRIPTION	(NC)	- OUTER DIAM	WEIGHT PER/FT	CIRC M. ARE:
2PM591D 2PM1314D 2PM1454D 2PM1536D 2PM1573D 2PM1656D 2PM1694D	WVC WVA WVA WVA WVA WVA WVA	#16 AWG 4/C #16 AWG 2/C #16 AWG 2/C #16 AWG 2/C #16 AWG 2/C #16 AWG 2/C #16 AWG 2/C #16 AWG 2/C	4 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	0.447 0.396 0.396 0.396 0.396 0.396 0.396 0.396	0.113 0.085 0.085 0.085 0.085 0.085 0.085	

PULL POINTS: FROM <u>A</u> TO <u>2-TB-292-1444-D</u> 21 POINT UNID: 2PM6473D NOMINAL DIAMETER: 3 INCHES AUM ALLOWABLE BEND RADIUS: .95 FEET

EXPECTED PULLING TENSION AND EXPECTED SIDEWALL PRESSURE CALCULATIONS WILL BE PERFORMED FOR EXISTING CABLE --- 'PULL-BY' CABLE FUNCTION: MEDIUM-LEVEL / LOW-LEVEL SIGNAL CABLE PULLING METHOD: CONNECTION TO CONDUCTOR

NUMBER OF CABLES IN PULL: 7 WEIGHT CORRECTION FACTOR: 1.4 TOTAL CABLE WEIGHT: .623 LBS/FT INPUT COEFFICIENT OF FRICTION: .75 COEFFICIENT OF PULLING FRICTION: 1.05

æ.,



YIKLES WOIL 27007

LUMPUIEU MALLUNIERE

E;

Attachment 6. ____ Page 47 war CALCULATION OF PULL TENSIONS AND SIDE WALL PRESSURES CHECKED DATES

WATTS BAR CALCULATION PACKAGE NUMBER 2PM6473D-9 PAGE 2

FORWARD PULL FROM JB 55 TO JE

SEG	SEGMENT TYPE	LENGTH IN FT	ANGLE FROM HORIZ	BEND ANGLE	PULLING TENSION IN LES	SIDEWALL PRESSURE IN LES
	HORIZONTAL	1.50	0.00	0.00	0.98	
2	BEND. H-V UP	0.00	0.00	90.00	4.36 ◀	3.22
3	INCLINED UP	14.75	90.00	0.00	13.50	23 50
4	BEND. V UP-H	0.00		45.00	33 81	
5	INCLINED UP	2.13	43.00	45 00	76.57	56.49
C 7	INCLINED UP	14.75	90.00	0.00	85.85	
8	HEND V UP-H	0.00	0.00	90.00	449.80	331.43
9	HORIZONTAL	3.21	0.00	0.00	451.90	
10	H BEND	0.00	0.00	35.00	858.24	632.38
1	HORIZONTAL	1.96	0.00	0.00	859.52	633.70
12	H BEND	0.00	0.00	15.00	1131.40	033.70
13	HORIZONTAL	4.31	0.00	- 0.00	1104.20	
					۱.	
TAL	OF BEND ANGLES IN	PULL: 320.	.00 DEGRE	ES		
MAXIM	UM EXPECTED PULLIN	G TENSION (7	[exp): 11	34.28 LBS/I	T	
MAXIM	UM EXPECTED SIDEWA	LL PRESSURE	(SWPexp)	: 833.70 I	LBS/FT	
MIYIM	IM EXPECTED TENSIO	N FOR FIGUR	ING SIDEW	ALL PRESSUR	KE: 1131.40	

APPROXIMATE DAMAGE LOCATION

Attachment 6	CALCULATION OF PULL TENSIONS AND SIDE WALL PRESSURES CHECKED PSO DATE
Page 48	WATTS BAR CALCULATION PACKAGE NUMBER LEMATION-1

REVERSE PULL

HROM UB 1444 TO UB 55

	· • •		
SEG NUM	TENSION IN LBS	PRESSURE IN LES	· · ·
13 12	2.82 3.71	2.73	•
11 10	9.48	6.99	
8	61.02 51.83	44.96	
6	117.25	86.40	
4	268.03	197.50	FIPPROX IMATE
2	1343.85× 1344.83	990.21	DAMPAGE LOCATIO
		•	

MUM PULLING TENSION ON REVERSE PULL (Texp): 1344.83 LBS/FT (TENSION OF 1134.28 LBS FOR FORWARD PULL)

MAXIMUM SIDEWALL PRESSURE ON REVERSE PULL (SWPexp): 990.21 LES/FT (SIDEWALL PRESSURE OF 833.70 LES FOR FORWARD PULL) MAXIMUM TENSION FOR SIDEWALL PRESSURE ON REVERSE PULL: 1343.85 LES





WIR LEEWBNSY00Y Page 85

COMPUTED WIF DATE 8-8-5

Attachment 7 _____ CALCULATION OF PULL TENSIONS AND SIDE WALL PRESSURES CHECKED RSO_ DATE 8/23/

WATTS BAR CALCULATION PACKAGE NUMBER 2PM6474D-98 PAGE 2

FORWARD PULL

SEG NUM	SEGMENT TYPE	LENGTH IN FT	ANGLE FROM HORIZ	BEND ANGLE	PULLING TENSION IN LBS	SIDEWALL PRESSURE IN LES
1 2	INCLINED UP BEND. V UP-H	4.17 0.00	90.00	0.00	2.60 2.91	2.14
3 4	INCLINED UP BEND. H-V UP	0.00	0.00	5.00	3.69	2.72
5 6 7	BEND, V UP-H HORIZONTAL	0.00	0.00	90.00	70.86 85.37	52.22
89	H BEND HORIZONTAL	0.00 6.29	0.00	25.00 0.00	134.98 139.09	99.40
10	BEND, H-V DN INCLINED DN	0.00	0.00 25.00	25.00	220.19 220.71 348 57	
15	BEND, V DN-H HORIZONTAL	3.67	0.00	0.00 30.00	350.97 608.19	448.14
5 16	HORIZONTAL BEND, H-V DN	3.04	0.00	0.00	610.18 3175.81	2340.07
17	INCLINED DN	2.67	90.00	0.00	31/4.15	MELT OILY
TOTAL	OF BEND ANGLES IN	PULL: 295.	00 DEGREE			
MAXIMU MAXIMU MAXIMU	M EXPECTED PULLIN M EXPECTED SIDEWA M EXPECTED TENSIO	G TENSION (T LL PRESSURE N FOR FIGURI	exp): 317 (SWPexp): NG SIDEWA	75.81 LBS/F 2340.07 L ALL PRESSUR	T BS/FT E: 3175.81	LES
						-

APPROXIMATE DAMAGE LOCATION

•	QIR LEE WEN	1340	04					COMPLE		DATE 8-8-
	Attachment	7			ULATIO	N OF F	PULL TENS	IONS	rep Periode	
	Page 86			ANI	D SIDE	WALL	PRESSURE			_DATE <u>C/CS</u>
)		WATTS	BAR	CALCU	LATION PAGE	N PACKAGE 3 [.]	NUMBER	2PM6474D-	-9 B

REVERSE PULL

579.84

PRESSURE TENSION SEG IN LBS IN LBS NUM ___ 1.66 17 8.62 16 11.70 15 14 13 12 13.69 17.48 23.73 26.13 30.24 41.04 11 42.39 67.44 49.69 D 71.55 APPROXIMATE. 8 7 113.13 83.36 🔫 DAMAGE LOCATION 127.63 664.89 489.92 655.55 718.39 529.34

MAXIMUM PULLING TENSION ON REVERSE PULL (Texp): 786.92 LBS/FT (TENSION OF 3175.81 LBS FOR FORWARD PULL)

717.97

786.92 784.32

MAXIMUM SIDEWALL PRESSURE ON REVERSE PULL (SWPexp): 579.84 LBS/FT (SIDEWALL PRESSURE OF 2340.07 LBS FOR FORWARD PULL) MAXIMUM TENSION FOR SIDEWALL PRESSURE ON REVERSE PULL: 786.92 LBS



3

2

1

.

· 👟

DEVELOPMENT OF KEY OVERLAYS

- A walkdown was performed to determine the exact configuration of the conduits and prepare conduit sketches.
- Hand-over-hand inspection was performed to identify types of damage points with a reference point of the conduit bushing on conduit 2PM6474D in junction box 2-JB-292-1636-D.
- Assigned a unique number to identify each cable.
- Prepared a list of symbols to represent categories of damage.
- Using dimensions from sketches and dimensions from handover-hand inspection, overlaid cable damage on sketches.



enter termine cull	CARLE	PULL	l IIG	CAQ
--------------------	-------	------	-------	-----

.

÷

							LAPL	, FOLDING CAY					
	CABLE BO	LVSOARD Cable Dunger	NARK Nark	5118	FROM DEVICE	TO DEVICE 	TO DEVICE 82	PUNCTION	DESIGN [®] LENGTA	CONTRACT	TIPE OF DANAGE	REQD (1/W	I RECORD BUNBER
١	2-22N-1-1314-D	28813130	AAA	1-20116	2-P8L-99-83	2-PENT-293-38-D	2-77-1-34	S.G. 1 STN FLOV CH. 1	622	125152		L	1
2	. 2-2ex-L-1454-D	2PH14530	AAA C	1-20116	2-PUL-99-83	2-PENT-293-34-0	2-82-101	S.G. 2 STH FLOV CH. 1	622	125452		I	2
3	2-2PH-1-1573-D	2ex15720	D AAT	1-20816	2-PSL-99-84	2-PBNT-293-38-8	2-71-1-214	S.G. 3 STN FLOW CN. 1	622	125152		I	3
Ч	2-2PH-1-1694-D	2PH16930	AAA Q	1-20116	2-PHL-39-84	2-PENT-293-38-D	2-71-1-284	S.G. 4 STN FLOV CN. 1	m	125152		ı	4
5	~ 2-2PH-3-1536-D	2PH16350	AAT	1-20116	2-886-99-81	2-PKNT-293-38-D	2-67-3-51	STEAR GEN 7 LEVEL	$\mathbf{m}^{(i)}$	025852		ľ	5
b	2-2PH-3-1656-D	20N16550	AVV O	1-20116	2-PHL-33-81	2-8881-293-38-D	2-Lt-3-93	STEAK GEN 3 LEVEL	m	825852		I	6
7	2-2PH-47-2035-0) NA	WYE	1-20116	2-PUL-99-84	2-PHL-39-LL16	121/505D{F0180	REAC TRIP STAT/STH DHP W	412	824447		1	1
3	2-228-63-4781-0	2P#47800	D WVA	1-20116	2-286-33-84	2-RENT-293-38-0	2-LT-63-180-D	CONTAINANT LVL RNR RECIR	412	824868		ı	1
ł	2-2PH-68-1001-6	22810100	AAT O	1-20116	2-286-33-81	2-PBNT-293-38-D	2-LT-68-339	RCS PRESSURIIER LEVEL	4)7	825852		ı	,
٠ţ	2-2PH-68 506-D	28N505D	WYC	1-10116	2-PHL-99-82	2-PENT-253-38-D	2-18-68-28	RCS LP I BL RTD HAN TEMP	412	824447		I	10
ŧ	2-2PH-68-508-D	2285070	VVC .	1-4CI16	2-886-99-82	2-PKUT-293-30-D	2-18-68-148	RCS LP] BL BTD HAN TENP	462	824447		I	п
) 2-2PN-68-516-0	2285150	WYC	1-10116	2-886-99-82	2-6882-553-38-9	2-16-68-28	RCS LP 1 HL RTD HAN TENP	662	824447		1	12
Ŧ	; 2-2PH-68-518-D	2PN5170	VVC	1-40116	2-PHL-33-82	2-PENT-293-38-D	2-18-68-148	BCS LP I BL BTD NAM TEMP	672	824147		8	Ð
1	:# 2-2PH-68-591-D	22X5980	VYC	1-10116	2-286-39-82	2-2682-293-38-9	2-18-68-1	RCE LOOP 1 TEMP	622	47232		ľ	14
••	\$ 2-2PH-60-606-D	28×6050	V VA	1-20816	2-286-39-81	2-26887-293-38-0	2-11-68-62	RCS LOOP 1 COOLANT FLOW	622	825852		I	15
7	<u> -</u> 2-2PH-68-686-0	28X685D	WYC	1-4011	2-P#L-33-82	2-PERT-293-38-D	2-18-68-24	RCS LOOP 2 TEMP	m	124447		ł	16
1	7 2-2PH-60-696-D	28X6950	AAY	1-20810	2-P8L-39-81	2-PENT-293-38-D	2-11-64-292	RCS LOOP 2 COOLANT FLOW	€12 [:]	#25#52			17
· 	Z-1-228-68-778-0	2ex5340	VYC	1-40116	2-284-33-82	2-PENT-293-30-0	2-15-64-14	RCS LOOP TEMP	m	424447			18
	<u>7</u> 7-201-60-791-0	2rx7900	VYA	1-20116	2-PHL-39-R1	2-2XXT-293-38-0	2-11-61-614	ECE LOOP 3 COOLANT PLOY	622	825852		r	19
٦	: ;•2-2PH-68-871-D	22H6340	WYC	1-10116	2-PHL-33-82	2-22887-293-34-0	2-18-64-61	RCS LOOP TSHP	612	824447		1	28
2	1 2-228-60-881-D	2 2 888800	VYA	1-20116	2-PHL-39-R1	2-PENT-293-38-0	2-11-60-714	RCE LOOP 4 COOLANT FLOW	612	825852		R	11
2	2-2PH-68-958-0	28H949D	VVA	1-20110	2-PHL-33-RL	2-2887-293-38-0	2-PT-64-310	RCS PRESSURFIER PRESSURF	- 622	425452		ŧ	n
7	_{2-2P5-68-282-D	11	¥85-)	1 1-2081	1 2-PHL-202-2/1A	2-30-290-3404-0	2-15-68-343	RCP I UV & UF CONT	361	#25342-2		1	11
•	<12-2PS-61-283-0	H A	V#8-3	1 1-2011	1 2-P#L-202-2/1A	2-J8-290-3404-0	2-85-68-344	RCP & UV & UF CONT	361	025342-2		I	21
1	2-2PS-68-284-D	81	¥#8-3	1 1-2011	1 2-PUL-202-2/14	2-JD-290-3404-D	2-85-68-343	RCP 1 UV 4 UF CONT	341	825342-2		1	25
2	L2-205-61-285-0	84 °	V10-	1 1-2011	1 2·20L-202-2/11	2-38-298-3484-0	2-115-61-344	RCP I UV & UF CONT	361	125312-2		1	26











	WBN CABLE PULLBYS
	DAMAGE TYPES
	CONDUCTOR EXPOSED
0	INSULATION DAMAGED BUT CONDUCTOR NOT EXPOSED
x	SHIELD OR ASSEMBLY WRAP DAMAGED BUT INSULATION NOT DAMAGED
•	JACKET COMPLETELY PENETRATED BUT NO DAMAGE TO ASSEMBLY WRAP, SHIELD, OR INSULATION
Δ	JACKET CUT, SCRAPE, SCUFF, OR NICK THAT DOES NOT COMPLETELY PENETRATE (GOUGE)
ᡇ	INDENTATION
٠	BEND OR KINK
\$	SOFT SPOT
#	BULGE
\otimes	DAMAGE TO OUTER JACKET (CUT, PUNCTURE, ETC.) CONDITION OF SHIELD, DRAIN, AND CONDUCTORS UNKNOWN

,

				х г
17-16	8'·			
JNP/ 7/15	5/11			Poge 8 g
) W	alk i	Wordections .		MR A-631252
STEP NO.	HOLD		DESCRIPTI	<u>on</u>
5 37.		MEASURE A	DO RECORD BEL	ow the Distonce
		Between the	c 2-JB-292-10	136-0 Ero of
		the CABLE OF	nd EACH IDENTI.	FICO DAMAGED
		ALEA. ALSO 1	RECERD the Ge	SEAL TYPE OF
		DAMAGE ine	AUNCTURE, TE	AR, ABRASION,
		etc.		
		NOTE : MEASU	ACMENTS Should	Be IN Fect ond
		IICAS 2	Distruce Re	m Tille DAVILLE
		Sequence #	2-J0-112-46x	BUMP IN TALKET
5 6474		$ars_2 O - D - R$	51'-4"	JACKET SHAVED / BROKEN) OF CN EX POSING CONDUCTORS
		213201-10-2	Unit 7/14/199 RSA 7/19/199	INSULATION SMALLD OFF CONDUCTORS AND CONDUCTOR BENT / TWISTED
702		215284-D-2	188'-5"	CUT IN JACKET
		FIRST PAP	TI YERIFICATION U. TILL	in us Blaring DATE 7/19189
		SZCOND PAR	TY VERIFICATION Rob	et 5 Davis DATE 7/19/89
			<u> </u>	
	i . <u> </u>			

•

€ 13 €

• • • ●					,			
	·						,	
JNP	7-15-8	, 9 79	# 2 ⁴		-	Phills J E.R.ST FARTY Mill L SECOND PAR	Hartsach VETRIEICATION I. Ruila Ty VETRIEICATION Poze 9 e	7-20.89 DATE 1-20-39 1 DATE
)	U ISTEP	HOLD	INSTAUCTION	<u>s</u> :		<u> </u>	MA A-63	<u>~36</u>
(5	NO.	POINT			DISTALE	DESCRIPTION FLOM		
<u>ر</u> کر ر	(interior		2 PS 283 D -	AT	2-JB-292	-1656-0	TUPE DA	THEE T
	X 4	474	2 PS 2 8) D - 1	<u> </u>	30'-9	<u></u>	TEAR PEPETRAT	FS JACKET
	$ \Delta $	701	2PS283D-2		173-5		SMILL CUT 1	J JACKE
	<u></u>		- 					
							· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
6								
			•			•		
		<u> </u>	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
· .	++-					<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
		<u> </u>						
				.				
	-					· · · · ·	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	

• •