September 25, 1995

MEMORANDUM	TO:	William D. Beckner,	Director
		Project Directorate	IV-1
		Division of Reactor	Projects III/IV

FROM:

José A. Calvo, Chief (Original signed by J. Calvo) Electrical Engineering Branch Division of Engineering

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWUP TO THE REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING GENERIC LETTER 92-08 (TAC NOS. M85606 AND M85607)

Plant:	South Texas Project, Units 1 and 2	
Licensee:	Houston Lighting & Power Company	
Review Status:	Open	

We have reviewed Houston Lighting & Power Company's responses of December 19, 1994; March 28, 1995; and April 24, 1995; to the requests for additional information (RAI) of September 19, 1994; December 29, 1994; and March 1, 1995; respectively, regarding Generic Letter 92-08, "Thermo-Lag 330-1 Fire Barriers." The licensee was required, pursuant to Section 182A of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and 10 CFR 50.54(f), to submit written reports, under oath of affirmation, that provided the information specified in the RAIs. On the basis of our review, we have determined that the licensee's responses to the RAIs are incomplete. The specific areas where we found the licensee's responses to be incomplete are discussed in the attachment. Please transmit this information to the licensee and request that it submit a revised response. We recommend that the licensee be given 60 days to submit its revised response.

Docket Nos	:	50-498 50-499
Attachment	:	As stated
CONTACT:		Jenkins, NRR/DE 5-2985

DISTRIBUTION: Central Files PDR EELB R/F BWSheron GCLainas SPLB TSI File

TAlexion MGamberoni EConnell KSWest


NIRG FILE CENTER COPY

DISK/DOCUMENT NAME: G:\SHARED\SOTX.RAI

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy w/o attachment, "E" = Copy w/attachment, "N" = No copy

OFC	her 10	, SC:EELB:DE	C:EELB:DE		
NAME	RVJenkins:jc	ASGIII ASY	JACalvo		
DATE	9 120/95	9125195	9 125/95 955	11	11

COMPARED TO A DESIGNATION OF THE	the contract or three one have the	ACCURATE A DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER WATCHING.	
OPP T	P 7 8 1	nrconn	ronv
11221	101	RELUMIT	LUPY
	LIML.	RECORD	0011





UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D.C. 20565-0001

September 25, 1995

MEMORANDUM TO:

William D. Beckner, Director Project Directorate IV-1 Division of Reactor Projects III/IV

FROM:

Electrical Engineering Branch Jose G. Calor Division of Engineering Branch Jose G. Division of Engineering

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO THE FOLLOWUP TO THE REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING GENERIC LETTER 92-08 (TAC NOS. M85606 AND M85607)

Plant:	South Texas Project, Units 1 and	2
Licensee:	Houston Lighting & Power Company	
Review Status:	Open	

We have reviewed Houston Lighting & Power Company's responses of December 19. 1994; March 28, 1995; and April 24, 1995; to the requests for additional information (RAI) of September 19, 1994; December 29, 1994; and March 1, 1995; respectively, regarding Generic Letter 92-08, "Thermo-Lag 330-1 Fire Barriers." The licensee was required, pursuant to Section 182A of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, and 10 CFR 50.54(f), to submit written reports, under oath of affirmation, that provided the information specified in the RAIs. On the basis of our review, we have determined that the license's responses to the RAIs are incomplete. The specific areas where we found licensee's responses to be incomplete are discussed in the attachment. P._ase transmit this information to the licensee and request that it submit a revised response. We recommend that the licensee be given 50 days to submit its revised response.

Docket Nos.: 50-498 50-499

Attachment: As stated

CONTACT: R. Jenkins, NRR/DE 415-2985

ATTACHMENT

SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT, UNITS 1 AND 2 DOCKET NOS. 50-498 AND 50-499 FOLLOWUP REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING GENERIC LETTER 92-08 "THERMO-LAG 330-1 FIRE BARRIERS"

1.0 REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (RAI) OF SEPTEMBER 19, 1994

In the RAI of September 19, 1994, the NRC staff requested information regarding important barrier parameters, Thermo-Lag barriers outside the scope of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) program, ampacity derating, alternatives, and schedules.

In its submittal of December 19, 1994, the licensee indicated that sitespecific ampacity derating tests had been conducted by the Underwriters Laboratories (UL) Inc. for the South Texas Project. The licensee considered the subject test results directly applicable to the plant design. In addition, the licensee stated that they would respond in further detail when the technical issues with respect to ampacity derating factors have been resolved.

During a public meeting on March 14, 1995, with the licensees for the four lead plants for the resolution of Thermo-Lag issues, the staff responded to the question, "Will the resolution of the ampacity derating concern be deferred until agreement is reached on the appropriate testing protocol (i.e., IEEE P848)?" The staff reiterated its position, which was previously stated in the September 1994 RAI, that the ampacity derating concern could be resolved independently of the fire endurance concerns. After a review of the tests performed under the draft Institute of Electrical and Electronic Engineers (IEEE) Standard P848, the staff transmitted comments that were designed to ensure the repeatability of test results to the IEEE working group responsible for the test procedure.

On May 18, 1995, members of the NRC staff held a telephone conference call with NEI representatives concerning ampacity derating issues for Thermo-Lag fire barriers. The staff indicated that the latest IEEE P848 draft procedure can be used by licensees or NEI as the basis for an ampacity derating test program. NEI agreed to review the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Unit 2 Safety Evaluation (SE) in order to develop a generic test program. The memorandum dated May 22, 1995, which documents the subject telephone conference meeting, is attached for your information. In addition, a copy of the subject SE dated June 14, 1995, was sent to those licensees who rely on Thermo-Lag installations.

2.0 REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OF DECEMBER 29, 1994

In the RAI of December 29, 1994, the staff requested information describing the examinations and inspections that will be performed to

obtain the important barrier parameters for the Thermo-Lag configurations installed at the South Texas Project. In its response of March 28, 1995, the licensee did not provide any further information in the ampacity derating area.

3.0 REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OF MARCH 1, 1995

In the RAI of March 1, 1995, the staff requested that the licensee submit the applicable UL test reports being used to demonstrate the validity of the existing ampacity derating parameters as well as any other documents which support these determinations.

In its submittal of April 24, 1995, the licensee provided the subject test report. After a review of the subject UL report identified as Project 86NK23826, File R6802, entitled "Special Services Investigation of Ampacity Ratings For Power Cables in Steel Conduits and In Open-Ladder Cable trays With Field Applied Enclosures," the licensee is requested to address the following concerns and questions regarding the applicability of those test results for the South Texas Project (STP), Units 1 and 2:

1. In Attachment 1 of the subject licensee submittal entitled "Ampacity Testing in UL," Bechtel Log No. 14926-C042-00017-B3M, there are comments (pages 8 and 9 of Attachment 1) on the deviations from the specification requirements that were noted in the subject UL report. Specifically, Comment 6 reads "Spec. Para 5.4.3 - Linear regression analysis is not used for conductor temperature measurements as specified because of the close tolerances achieved in maintaining the steady state temperature of conductor at 90°C." This statement appears to be inconsistent with the stated purpose of the ampacity test (i.e., maintain a steady state temperature while measuring the current).

The linear regression method allows several thermocouple readings to be averaged over time in order to determine the slope or rate of temperature change. A small slope value (for example, IEEE P848 specifies) denotes the desired thermal equilibrium condition for the current measurement.

- The subject UL report provides an ampacity value (i.e. 34.8 amperes) for the conduit with the ½-inch Thermo-Lag fire barrier which is higher than the ampacity value reported for the baseline conduit (i.e. 34.1 amperes). Please provide a technical basis for this discrepancy.
- 3. Please identify any deviations in the construction of Thermo-Lag installations at STP with respect to the tested UL configurations. An evaluation should analyze any deviations of the installed configuration with respect to the test configuration for potential impact on the applicability of the subject test results.

- 4. During the course of the investigation into Thermal Sciences Inc. (TSI) Thermo-Lag fire barrier issues, the staff received a UL letter dated December 30, 1986 to TSI, which put into question the validity of the test results associated with the subject UL report. The subject UL test report documents an ampacity test conducted on October 11, 1986. The subject UL letter described a duplicate ampacity test completed on October 25, 1986, which was conducted by UL personnel independent of the Bechtel and TSI representatives. Another difference between the two tests were the longer time period (15 minutes versus 4 hours) used to establish thermal equilibrium in the October 25, 1986, test. Please comment on the following technical issues raised in the attached December 30, 1986, UL letter to TSI:
 - (a) The observation made by the UL Senior Engineering Associate that the TSI panels provided for both tests were uncured and the test specimens were not representative of installed field conditions.
 - (b) The adequacy of the stabilization time (i.e. 15 minutes) used by Bechtel and TSI personnel as documented in UL Report Project 86NK23826, File R6802.

NOTE TO- Brian W. Sheron, Director, DE, NRR

FROM: Carl H. Berlinger, Chief, EELB, DE, NRR

SUBJECT: MEMORANDUM OF RECORD

On May 18, 1995, members of the NRC staff (B. Sheron, C. Berlinger, P. Gill, M. Gamberoni and R. Jenkins) held a telephone conference call with Mr. Alex Marion and Mr. Biff Bradley of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) on ampacity derating issues for Thermo-Lag fire barriers. Mr. Marion contacted the staff regarding two topics: (1) Status of the Safety Evaluation (SE) on the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Unit 2 Ampacity Derating Test Program; and (2) Staff Acceptance of the IEEE Standard P848, "Procedure for the Determination of the Ampacity Derating of Fire Protected Cables."

Dr. Berlinger stated that the subject SE for CPSES 2 had been completed and we expected that it will be transmitted to the licensee within the next two weeks. Dr. Berlinger agreed to notify Mr. Marion by phone after the SE had been issued by the staff. Due to potential generic applications the staff will provide a copy of the CPSES, Unit 2 SE to licensees with Thermo-Lag fire barriers.

The staff has been interfacing with the IEEE Task Force responsible for IEEE P848 over the last 2 years to improve the subject procedure. This effort has resulted in recent revisions to the subject procedure which addressed the majority of the concerns raised by EELB (reference: Letter dated 10/13/94 from C. Berlinger to A. K. Gwal). Although not all of the concerns were addressed by the IEEE Task Force Dr. Berlinger indicated that the latest IEEE P848 draft procedure can be used by licensees or NEI as the basis for an ampacity derating test program. The latest procedure revision (Draft 16) addresses the major test concerns regarding inductive heating and conduit surface emissivities effects.

The staff emphasized that licensees should submit the actual test procedures or plans to the staff for comment. After discussion of the various options to develop a generic test program NEI agreed to review the CPSES 2 SE and then contact the staff as necessary for further discussions or questions on this matter.

cc: Alex Marion, MEI

CONTACT: Ronaldo Jenkins, FELB/DE 415-2985

DISTRIBUTION

AThadani, NRR
MGamberon1, NRR SPLB TSI File

Document Name: G:\SHARED\FY95NEI.NOT

P	o receive a cray of this document	indicate in the box C=Cos	y w/o attachment/enclosure	E=Copy with a	ttachment/enclosure N = No co	
π.		PERSONAL AVAILABLE INCOMENDATION AND AND AND AVAILABLE AVAILAB	WALTER AND THE ADDRESS OF THE OWNER ADDRESS OF THE	s-supy with a	ILLECTIONIC/ BACLOBULE N . NO CO	YOK .

OFFICE	EELB:DE:NRR C	SC/EELB:DE:NRR	C	C/EEL3:DE:NRR	C
NAME		PGIII Any		CHBerlinger H	5
DATE	05/19/95	05/19/95		05/22/95	
		OFFICIAL	RECO	ORD COPY	TAXABLE PARTY

450914000B 1p.

cc: File NFF - Writer (3)

December 30, 1986

Thermal Science Inc. Mr. Rubin Feldman 2200 Cassens Dr. St. Louis, MO 63026

Our Reference: 86NK23826, R6802

Subject: "Baseline" Ampacity For Cable Tray Configuration Used In Special Services Investigation

Dear Mr. Feldman:

This is to confirm my telephone conversations with you and Mr. Jim Rippe concerning the above subject.

On October 11, 1986, an ampacity test was conducted on the cable tray configuration with a corrugated steel cover secured to the top surface of the cable tray with stainless steel banding straps. The test was supervised by Mr. Mohan Bali of Bechtel Power Corp. and Mr. Jim Rippe of your company. The electrical current required to attain a steady-state tomperature of 90°C on the hottest cable conductor at the center of the cable tray configuration was 24.9 A with the ambient temperature at 40.2°C. For this test, the time period allowed for attainment of the steady-state condition was approximately 5 h. & 15 min time period was allowed to elapse between the final current adjustment tray configuration.

On October 17, 1986, we conditioned the ampacity test on the cable tray configuration with a flat No. 16 gauge galvanized steel plate cover secured to the top surface of the cable tray with carbon steel banding straps. The electrical current required to attain a steady-state temperature of 90°C on the hottest cable conductor at the center of the cable tray configuration was 27.35 A with the ambient temperature at 40.1°C. For this test, the time period to attain the steady-state condition was approximately 48 h. A 4 h time period was allowed to elapse between the final current adjustment and initiation of the 1 h scan of temperatures within the cable tray configuration.

Since it seemed illogical that the cable tray configuration with the flat steel cover would have a higher ampacity than the cable tray configuration with the corrugated (vented) steel cover, we (UL) decided to rerun the test on the cable tray with the corrugated steel cover to verify the October 11, 1986 test data. R6802 Page 2 December 30, 1986

The duplicate ampacity test on the cable tray with the corrugated steel cover was completed on Saturday, October 25, 1986. In this test, the electrical current required to attain a steady-state temperature of 90°C on the hottest cable conductor at the center of the cable tray configuration was 28.8 A with the ambient temperature at 39.6°C. For this test, the time period to attain the steady-state condition was approximately 48 h. A 4 h time period was allowed to elapse between the final current adjustment and initiation of the 1 h scan of temperatures within the cable

The only significant difference between the two ampacity tests conducted on the cable tray configuration with the corrugated steel cover was the time allowed for stabilization following the final current adjustment (15 min vs 4 h). Based on the disparity between the currents required to obtain steady state conditions in the two tests (24.9A vs 28.8A), it is plausible that the time period required to ensure steady-state conditions within the cable tray may be considerably greater than the time which had been allowed during the October 11, 1986 test.

The cable tray "baseline" ampacity test was conducted on September 30, 1986. The electrical current required to attain a steady-state temperature of 90°C on the hottest cable conductor at the center of the cable tray configuration was 32.1A with the ambient temperature at 40.3°C. For this test, the time period allowed for attainment of the steady-state condition was approximately 5 h. A 15 min time period was allowed to elapse between the final current adjustment and initiation of the 1 h scan of temperatures within the cable tray configuration.

In light of the findings from the duplicate ampacity test on the cable tray configuration with the corrugated steel cover, we (UL) decided that we would rerun the cable tray baseline test to verify that the 15 min time period between the final current adjustment and initiation of the 1 h scan of temperatures had been sufficient time for stabilization. Accordingly, immediately following the duplicate ampacity test on the cable tray configuration with the corrugated steel cover, the cover was removed and the current loading on the cables on the cable tray was adjusted to 32.1 A. The current loading was left on the cable tray over the weekend. On checking the cable tray sample on the morning of Monday, October 27, it was noted that the maximum cable conductor temperature at the center of the cable tray configuration was 82.5°C although the current had remained steady at 32.1 A. Accordingly, the electrical current was increased to attain the desired cable conductor temperature of 90". The current adjustments were main over a 30 h period. A 4 h time period was allowed to elapse between the final current

R6802 Page 3 December 30, 1986

adjustment and initiation of the 1 h scan of temperatures within the cable tray configuration. The results of the ampacity test indicated that a current of 36.15 A was required to attain a steady-state temperature of 90.0°C (Thermocouple No. 16) at an ambient temperature of 40.2°C.

The ampacity investigation was conducted for you under an application for Special Services. In our application, we agreed to conduct the ampacity tests in accordance with the test method ; outlined by Bechtel Power Corp. with the understanding that the information developed in the investigation would be submitted only to Bechtel Power Corp. for their consideration as to the acceptability of the various field-applied coverings on redundant safety trains at the South Texas Project nuclear power plant. Representatives from Bechtel Power Corp. and Houston Lighting and Power Co. were present for the initial cable tray baseline ampacity test, the initial corrugated steel cover test and each test which employed your company's panels. It should be noted that the representative of Bechtel Power Corp. made the determination as to when the steady-state condition was reached in each of the above-mentioned ampacity test configuration on the cable tray system.

The duplicate test on the cable tray system with the corrugated steel cover and the duplicate cable tray baseline test were not requested by you and were conducted at our expense using a longer stabilization period following the final current adjustment than that which had been deemed adequate by the representative of Bechtel Power Corp. The duplicate tests were conducted in the interest of providing supplemental test data when it was noted that the accelerated conduct of the ampacity test investigation may have an impact on the test results. We are available to discuss these results and methodology with you or representatives of Bechtel Power Corporation if you so desire.

.

Very truly yours,

Reviewed by:

C. J. JOHNSON Senior Engineering Associate Fire Protection Department

R. M. Berhinig Associate Managing Engineer Fire Protection Department

CJJ/KDR:mjw LTR5

.2	
ARY	
V	
2	•
···· 6	
SUMA	
SUMM	
1	
	-
2	and the second s
ò	and the second se
È	
Q.	Contraction
6	
F	1
S	
E	ļ
INVESTIGATI	
~	
2	Ì
174	Contraction
PACI	
2	
2	
AM	
-	No. of Concession, name
751	
E	
1	ļ

SAFELANE (ALD PATE A TEM, T No. TEME to be each Pole 33 (19) 39, 19 40.0 32.3 SAFELANE (ALD EACL) 9-25-8L 22.0 90.1 39 (19) 40.2 32.3 MSELANE (ALD EACL) 9-25-8L 22.0 90.1 39 (19) 40.2 32.3 MSELANE (ALD EACL) 9-25-8L 22.0 90.1 39 (19) 40.2 32.3 MSELANE (ALD EACL) 9-30-86 32.1 90.2 18 40.2 31.2 33.3 MSELANE (ALD EACL) 9-30-86 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 33.3 33.4 40.0 33.6 10.3 10.3 10.3 10.3 10.3 10.3 10.1 1			CURPENT,		1.C.	RMB.	20 %	% DERATING
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	CONFIGURATION	DATE	R	72 MB 21	No	2 IN 2	BOGUS	REAL
9-25-84 22.0 90.1 39(19) 40.2 32.3 9-25-84 22.0 90.1 39(19) 40.2 32.3 9-25-84 22.1 90.0 16 40.2 32.3 9-20-86 32.1 69.9 17 40.2 32.3 9-20-86 32.1 90.0 16 40.2 31.2 9-30-86 23.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 3 9-30-86 23.1 90.3 17 40.3 31.2 3 3 9-1-86 19.5 90.3 17 40.1 32.4 3	CABLE TRAY , BASELINE (OLD ENCL).	9-23-86	32.5	1.06		59.9	1	
9-25-84 21.0 90.1 $39(19)$ 40.0 32.3 $9-30-86$ 32.1 69.9 17 40.3 31.2 $9-29-86$ 32.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 $9-29-86$ 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 $9-29-86$ 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 $9-29-86$ 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 32.8 $10-11-86$ 21.7 90.3 17 40.2 39.3 31.2 $10-11-86$ 21.7 90.3 17 40.2 32.8 32.4 $10-12-86$ 28.5 90.3 17 40.2 33.3 32.4 $10-2.2-84$ 17.5 40.1 11.2 40.2 32.4 32.6 40.1 11.2 $10-15-84$ 99.2 17 40.2 39.3 40.1 11.2 21.2 40.1 11.2 40.2 21.6 40.1 10.2 31.2 40.1 <	CABLE TRAY - 1" REG. DEN. PNLS.	9-24-86	22.0	2.06	S	40.2	32.3	1
KL 9-30-86 32.1 69.9 17 40.3 31.2 9-29-86 34.15 90.2 16 40.3 31.2 3 9-29-86 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 3 3 9-29-86 23.1 90.2 18 40.0 28.0 3	2 2 2 1 .	9-25-86	22.0	90.1	100	40.0	32.3	1
k(L) $9-30-86$ 32.1 69.9 17 40.3 31.2 3 $9-29-86$ 28.15 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 3 $9-29-86$ 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 3 $9-29-86$ 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 28.0 31.2 3 $10-11-86$ 23.1 90.3 17 40.2 22.4 30.3 31.2 33.3 31.2 <								•
10-20-86 36.15 90.0 16 40.2 31.2 3 9-29-86 23.1 90.0 18 40.0 28.0 3	CABLE TRAY BASELINE (NEW ENCL)	9-30 -86	32.1	89.9	1	40.3		
9-29-86 22.1 90.2 18 40.0 31.2 3 9-30-86 23.1 90.0 18 40.0 28.0 3 </td <td></td> <td>10-28-86</td> <td>36.15</td> <td>90.0</td> <td>16</td> <td>40.2</td> <td>1</td> <td> </td>		10-28-86	36.15	90.0	16	40.2	1	
9-30-86 23.1 90.0 18 40.0 28.0 39.3 10-11-86 19.5 90.3 17 40.1 32.4 4 10-11-86 21.7 90.3 17 40.1 32.4 4 10-11-86 24.9 90.3 17 40.1 32.4 4 10-11-86 24.9 90.3 17 40.1 32.4 3 3 10-25-84 28.5 90.3 17 40.1 12.2 2 3 4 3 3 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 4 3 3 4 4 3 3 4 4 3	CABLE TRAY - 1" REG. DEN. PNLS.	9-29-86	1.22	90.2	18	40.0	31.2	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		9-30-86	23.1	90.0	00	40.0	28.0	36.1
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		10-11-86	19.5	90.3	61	40.3	39.8	44.1
10-11-86 24.9 90.3 17 40.2 22.4 3 10-25-86 28.5 90.1 17 39.6 10.2 10-25-86 28.5 90.3 17 40.1 11.2 2 10-17-86 28.5 90.3 18 40.1 11.2 2 10-17-86 27.35 90.0 17 40.1 11.2 2 10-17-86 27.35 90.2 18 40.1 11.2 2 10-15-86 19.9 90.2 18 40.2 38.0 44.2 10-15-86 19.5 90.2 18 40.2 38.0 44.2 10-15-86 19.5 90.2 18 40.2 38.0 44.2 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 18 40.2 38.0 44.2 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 18 40.2 39.3 44.2 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 24 40.1 24.2 24.1 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 2 <t< td=""><td></td><td>10-2-86</td><td>21.7</td><td>90.3</td><td>17</td><td>40.1</td><td>32.4</td><td>1400</td></t<>		10-2-86	21.7	90.3	17	40.1	32.4	1400
10-25-86 28.8 90.1 17 39.6 10.3 21 10-17-86 28.5 90.3 18 40.1 11.2 2 10-17-86 27.355 90.0 17 40.1 14.8 2 10-17-86 27.355 90.0 17 40.1 14.8 2 10-17-86 19.9 90.2 18 40.2 38.0 45 10-15-86 19.5 90.1 18 40.2 38.0 45 10-15-86 78.1 90.1 18 40.2 39.3 40 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 18 40.2 39.3 40 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 14.8 2 10-15-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 2 10-15-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 2 2 10-16-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 2 2 40.1 2 2		10-11-86	24.9	90.3	17	40.2	22.4	
10-23-86 28.5 90.3 18 40.1 11.2 2 10-17-86 27.35 90.0 17 40.1 14.8 2 10-17-86 27.35 90.0 18 40.1 14.8 2 10-17-86 27.35 90.0 18 40.2 38.0 45 10-15-86 19.5 90.1 18 40.2 39.3 40 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 18 40.2 39.3 40 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 14.8 2 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.2 33.3 40 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.2 33.3 40 10-16-816 34.8 90.1 2 40.2 2.1 9.4 51 APPERTED 'UNCURED'E, APPERTIDE CONDUCTORED'E, AUCT'CONDUCT'E, AUCT'CONDUCT'	,	10-25-86	28.8	90.1	17	39.6	10.3	20.2
10-17-86 27.35 90.0 17 40.1 14.8 24 10-12-86 19.9 90.2 18 40.2 38.0 45 10-15-86 19.5 90.1 18 40.2 38.0 45 10-15-86 19.5 90.1 18 40.2 39.3 46 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 94.2 39.3 46 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 94.2 39.3 46 10-16-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 94.2 31.3 46 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 40.1 9.4 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 10-8.86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 10-8.86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4	CABLE TEAY- FLAT STL. BOTTOM PLT.	10-23-86	28.5	90.3	18	40.1	11.2	212
102-86 19.5 90.2 18 40.2 38.0 49.1 10-15-86 19.5 90.1 18 40.2 39.3 40.1 10-15-86 38.3 89.2 99.1 18 40.2 39.3 40.1 10-15-86 38.3 89.2 9 9 10 40.2 39.3 40.1 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 2 40.1 9 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (UNCURED) \$, IN THE OPINION OF THE PROV 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (UNCURED) \$, IN THE OPINION OF THE PROV 40.1 9.4 0.4 60 THAT SAMPLES WERE COL 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WERE COL 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEAREED WERE COL 40.1 2 40.1 9.4	1.8	10-17-86	27.35	90.0	17	40.1	14.8	143
10-20-86 19.5 90.1 18 40.2 39.3 40 10-15-86 78.3 89.2 9 40.2 39.3 40 10-15-86 78.3 89.2 9 40.2 39.3 40 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 2 40.1 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 2 40.1 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (UNCURED) & NTHE OPINION OF THE PROV 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (DNCURED) & NTHE OPINION OF THE PROV 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (DNCURED) & NTHE OPINION OF THE PROV 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (DNCURED) & NTHE OPINION OF THE PROV 40.1 9.4 0.1 51 APPEARED WET" (DNCURED NOT OF N		10 2-86	6.61	90.2	18	40.2	38.0	45.0
10-15-86 78.3 89.2 9 40.2 40.1 10-15-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 2 10-9-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 2 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 2 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (UNICURED) & MATHE OPINION OF THE PROVING 746 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (UNICURED) & MATHE OPINION OF THE PROVING 746 9.4 51 APPEARED "WET" (UNICURED FIELD COMPLYINGS 8604 US BECAUSE OF (1) UNICURES SECONSE OF (1) UNICURES SECONSE OF (1) UNICURES SECONSE OF (1) UNICURES SECONSE OF (1) UNICURED FIELD FIELD FIELD COMPLICE FIELD COMPLICE SECONSE OF (2) UNICURE OF (2) UNICURE SECONSE OF (2) UNICURE SECONSE OF (2) UNICURE SECONSE OF (2) UNICURE SECONSE OF (2) UNICURED FIELD FIE	2	10-20-86	19.5	90.1	18	40.2	39.3	46.1
10-9-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 - 10-10-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 - 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 - 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-10-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-10-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-10-81 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED 'WET'(UNCURED) &, IN THE OPINION OF THE PROVIDES oF 40.1 9.4 52 40.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED 'WE TELE RIELD CONDURES (A TEST OF MERICED IN THE OPINION OF THE PROVIDES OF 10, IN COLED IN THE TSI PROPS. LUCK OF 10, UNCURED IN THE TSI PROPS. LUCK OF 10, UNCURED IN THE TSI PROPS. LUCK OF 10, UNCURED IN THE TSI PROPS. LUCK OF 25.56 & 9.20.56. DELAN 61.1/16 7.4 75.55 & 0.0 9.25.56 & 9.20.56. DELAN 7.1/16 7.1 7.1 7.1 7.1 D.1 7.1/16 7.5 7.1	Allow the second second	10-15-86	N Qe	80 2	ø			
10-9-86 34.1 90.2 2 40.1 2 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 10-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED "UET" (UNCURED) & IN THE OFINION OF THE PROV 9.4 51 APPEARED "UET" (UNCURED) & IN THE OFINION OF THE PROV 9.4 51 APPEARED "UET" (UNCURED) & IN THE OFINION OF THE PROV 9.4 51 APPEARED "UET" (UNCURED) & IN THE OFINION OF THE PROV 9.4 51 APPEARED "UET" (UNCURED) & IN THE OFINION OF THE PROV 9.4 51 APPEARED "UET" (UNCURED FREID CONDITIONS. REPRESENTATIVES FROM 9.4 52 APPEARES WITH THE TSI PROPS. LONG'S BECAUSE OF (I) UNCURED FROM 9.4 62 THAT SAMPLES WERE OF FREE BOGUS BECAUSE OF (I) UNCURED FROM 9.4 62 THAT SAMPLES WERE OF FREE BOGUS BECAUSE OF (I) UNCURED FROM 9.4 62 JOGUS BASELINE TESTS ON 9-23-36.4 9.4 9.4 7.4 THE TSI PROPS. LOOP BETARE THE TSI PROPS. LOOP BETARE THEN THE 9.4 9.4	Sincle LADLE IN FREE AIL	90 000	0.0	07.6		40.2	1	1
10-10-86 34.8 90.1 2 40.2 (2.1) 10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 51 APPEARED WET" (UNCURED) & IN THE OPINION OF THE PROJ ENTATIVE OF MISTALLED FIELD CONDITIONS, REPRESENTATIVES OF UED THAT SAMPLES WERE OF 6 TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OP JEED THAT SAMPLES WERE OF 6 TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OP THAT SAMPLES WERE OF 6 TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OP THE 4 (3) BOGUS BASCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 6-9-30-66, DERAT GLINE TEST ON 10-28-56 ARE DEEMED MARE REALISTIC, ALTHOUSD		10-9-86	34.1	30.2	2	40.1	1	
10-8-86 30.9 90.1 2 40.1 9.4 SI APPEARED WET" (UNCURED) &, IN THE DPINION OF THE PROJ ENTATIVE OF MUSTALLED FIELD CONDITIONS, REPRESENTATIVES OF DED THAT SAMPLES WERE OK & TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OP JESTS W/THE TSI PROPS. WERE BOGUS BECAUSE OF (1) UNCURED THAE 4 (3) BOGUS BASCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & DERAT GLINE TEST ON 10-28-86 ARE DEEMED MARE REALISTIC, ALTHOUSD	CONDUTT - 2"REG. DEN. PECTREM. PALS.	10-10-86	34.8	90.1	N	40.2	(2.1)	
(UNCURED) &, IN THE DRINION OF THE PROJ ED FIELD CONDITIONS, REPRESENTATIVES OF WERE OK & TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OP COPS. WERE BOGUS BECNUSE OF (1) UNCURED SCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-56, DERAT SCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-56, DERAT SCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-56, DERAT SCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-56, DERAT	CONDUIT - 1"REG. DEN. PREFORM. PALS.	10-8-86	30.9	90.1	2	40.1	4.6	1
(UNCURED) & IN THE DRINION OF THE PROJ ED FIELD CONDITIONS, REPRESENTATIVES OF WERE OK & TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OF COPS. WERE BOGUS BECAUSE OF (1) UNCURED SCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-56. DERAT- 56 ARE DEEMED MARE REALISTIC, ALTHOU OPE THE TSI PRODS. LOOK BETTER THAN THE								
ED FIELD CONDITIONS, REPRESENTATIVES OF WERE OK & TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OF LOPS. WERE OK & TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OF SCUME TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-56. DERAT 56 ARE DECMED MARE REALISTIC, ALTHOU OPE THE TSI PRODS. LOOK BETTER THAN THE		APPERCEN "	int" Chart					
WERE OK & TEST COMMENCED, IN THE OF LODS. WERE BOGUS BECAUSE OF (1) UNCULED SCLINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-86. DERAT -86 ARE DEEMED MARE REALISTIC, ALTHOU ADE THE TSI PRODS. LOOK BETTER THAN THE		TIVE OF M	USTALLED		ANDITIDAS	· ·	OF THE !	2
COPS. WERE BOGUS BECAUSE OF (1) UNCURED BELINE TESTS ON 9-23-86 & 9-30-56. DERAT- SE ARE DEEMED MARE REALISTIC, ALTHOU ADE THE TSI PRODS. LOOK BETTER THAN THE	BECNTEL POWER CORP. DETERMINED	THAT SAM		E QK	6 7257 CI		2	1.
1 NAPE THE TO PRODS. LOOK BETTER THAN THE	(2)INSUFFICIENT STABILIZATION TIME	4 (3) BOGU	S BASELIA	LE TEST	2000	CAUSE 01	4.8	EED PROPS.
PROBABLY NADE THE TSI PRODS. LOOK BETTER THAN THE	DERIVED PROM CASLE TRAY BASELIN	E TEST ON	2	ARE DEL	4ED	E REAL		CRATINGS
	THE WET CONDITION OF THE PANEL		NADE	THE 731	PRODS.	OK BETT	ER THAN	TUPV ARE

attend 8