CYGNA
ENERGY SERVICES
101 California Street, Suite 1000, San Francisco, CA 94111-5894 415-397-5600

October 11, 1984
83090.019

Mrs. Juanita Ellis
President, CASE
1426 S. Polk
Dallas, Texas 75224

Subject: Communications Report Transmittal #5
Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station
Independent Assessment Program - Phases 1 and 2
Texas Utilities Generating Company
Job. No. 83090

Dear Mrs. Ellis:

Enclosed please find communications reports associated with Phases 1 and 2 of the Independent Assessment Program.

If you have any questions or desire to discuss any of these documents, please do not hesitate to call.

Very truly yours,

D Oldag

D. Oldag
Administrative Assistant

NHW/do
Attachments

cc: Mr. D. Wade (TUGCO) w/attachments
Mr. S. Treby (USNRC) w/attachments
Ms. J. Van Amerongen (TUGCO/EBASCO) w/attachments
Mr. D. Pigott (Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe) w/c attachments
Mr. S. Burwell (USNRC) w/attachments

2222- Per S. Burwell
1/1 See Attached

Communications Report

Company: Texas Utilities ☐ Telecon ☐ Conference Report

Project: Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Independent Assessment Program - Phase 2

Job No: 83090

Date: 7/26/84

Subject: Factor Use in Equivalent Static Load Method

Time: 10:00 a.m.

Place: Gibbs & Hill Site

Participants:	of
J. Pier, C. M. Jain (Part-time)	Gibbs & Hill
E. Bezkor (Part-time), P. Huang (Part-time)	Gibbs & Hill
G. Bjorkman	Cygna

Item	Comments	Required Action By
	The purpose of the meeting was to obtain additional information regarding the analyses that were performed to justify the use of a factor of 1.0 times peak acceleration in the equivalent static load method used in the design of cable tray supports. The items discussed included the geometry and stiffness characteristics of the dynamic models, modeling assumptions and justification for the assumptions, analysis output, and the methodology for computing the combined factor.	

Signed: T. H. Williams

Page 1 of 1

/dmm

Distribution: N. Williams, D. Wade, J. Van Amerongen, G. Bjorkman, S. Treby, J. Ellis, S. Burwell, Project File

1020.01a

CYGNA

Communications Report

Company: Texas Utilities ☐ Telecon x☐ Conference Report

Project: Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station
Independent Assessment Program - Phase 1 and 2

Job No: 83090

Date: 6/13/84

Subject: DCTG Review

Time: 9:00 AM

Place: CPSES

Participants		of
	Bibo, Williams, Smedley	Cygna
	Strange, Redding, McBay, Wade, Grace	TUGCO
	Hatley	CASE
	Walker	BLCP&R

Item	Comments	Required Action By
	N. Williams opened the meeting by asking Mike Strange (TNE) to explain the validation process by which the DCTG data base was updated. Mike began with a brief history of the DCTG function. He explained that the validation process (described in the 10/24/83 Cygna Communication Report between Williams & Strange) was for the most part complete. The validation effort did not include piping and pipe location drawings (i.e., BRP, BRHL). Although the design changes associated with the piping and pipe location drawings are accounted for on this DCTG numerical design change listing, they were not part of the DCTG data base update. Mike McMay explained how these drawings were being updated. Mike Strange explained that for DCA's, a comparison of the contents of the G&H and DCTG computer listings was made to ensure that all DCA's were accounted for. If there were any missing numbers, or discrepancies, the DCA and associated Change Verification Checklist (CVC) was pulled and reviewed to determine and resolve the problem. The database was then updated. Mike also explained that the DCTG validation process for CMC's was basically completed. This process was accomplished by reviewing the CVC for each CMC and updating the database. In addition, a reviewer of all drawing (except piping and structural) was performed to determine if the DCA/CMC had been incorporated and if so, the database was updated.	

Signed: N. D. Williams /ss

Distribution: N. Williams, D. Wade, G. Grace, S. Bibo, D. Smedley, S. Treby, J. Ellis, Project File, S. Burwell

1020.01a

Item	Comments	Required Action By
	S. Bibo asked Mike if he would walk us through the validation process and show us the documentation he used to record this process. Mike agreed to this and N. Williams asked the CASE representative if she would want to witness this. Mrs. Hatley (CASE) said that she had other things to do but may want to talk to Nancy later. N. Williams gave Mrs. Hatley the on-site Cygna extension where she could be reached. N. Williams, D. Smedley, S. Bibo and M. Strange proceeded to the DCTG area and were given a tour of the DCTG file and computer terminal areas. Mike showed us some design change files which were filed by discipline and grouped by design change number blocks (i.e., CMC 600 through 700). He pulled a typical folder and explained the notes/markings on the log that was filed in front of each folder. One in particular showed that during the DCTG validation process, a CVC was determined to be missing. There was a notation on the log that a copy was requested and received from Gibbs & Hill. The entire log entry for the DCA was then "highlighted" in blue which, as Mike explained, meant the file was completed. We returned to Mike's office and continued a general discussion of the validation process. Mike explained in a little more detail the merging of the G&H and DCTG databases. Mike said that if a DCA/CMC was listed against an affected document on the G&H printout, but the document should not have been, DCTG changed the status to "NI" (Not to be Incorporated) but left the DCA/CMC on the printout for historical purposes. S. Bibo then requested Mike to pull the file of a DCA (the number was chosen at random by S. Bibo), and the computer listing of affected drawings relative to the DCA selected. Mike pulled the DCA and explained that we would have to give the computer a drawing number, to determine the DCA/CMC associated with it. We asked the computer for the drawing number which was referenced on the DCA. A printout for that drawing revealed that in fact the DCA requested was listed against the drawing. The DCA indicated that it was to be incorporated into the referenced drawing, but the printout indicated "NI". S. Bibo questioned Mike on this and he showed the CVC (attached to the DCA) which indicated that the DCA was not to be incorporated. S. Bibo then asked Mike if it was true that one function of the CVC was to change the incorporation requirement of the DCA. Mike said that was correct. S. Bibo and Mike Strange held further discussions on the actual percent complete of the DCTG validation effort. Mike stated that from the standpoint of merging the G&H and DCTG databases, the effort was 100% complete, however, Mike felt that he was about 3	

Item	Comments	Required Action By
	months away from what he considered to be a "completed product". S. Bibo and Mike Strange continued this dialogue (relative to percent complete) with N. Williams, D. Smedley, D. Wade, and G. Grace. After the discussion, all parties agreed that the DCTG validation process was basically complete and could be verified.	

CYGNA

Communications Report

Company:	Texas Utilities	☐ Telecon	☒ Conference Report
Project:	Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station Independent Assessment Program, Phase 2	Job No.	83090
		Date:	March 15, 1984
Subject:	Fire Protection for Electrical Cable Trays	Time:	1:50 pm
		Place:	CPSES (site)
Participants:	Jeff Spiegleman	of	TUGCO
	John Russ		Cygna

Item	Comments	Required Action By
	Ref.: Conference Report of 15 March 1984, 1:30 p.m., "Fire Protection and Hardware Weights for Cable Trays," D. Hunt, D. Nandi and J. Russ participating. I spoke to Jeff, who is in the hazards evaluation area, about the cable trays which require fire protection. Jeff, who is responsible for developing the list of protected trays, gave me a copy of his CPPA Log, which is attached. The CPPA's are memoranda which are used to transmit the lists of trays which require protection. Jeff stated that the list is approximately 98% complete. Additional segment lists and revisions are provided by additional CPPA's.	

Signed: Nancy Williams /pm

Distribution: D. Wade, N. Williams, R. Hess, J. Russ, G. Grace, S. Treby, J. Ellis, Project File

1020.01a

TO: DOCUMENT CONTROL

FROM: S. B. Burwell x 27563

SUBJECT: Cygna Review (Phase 1 & 2) Comanche Peak

Attached is the following document:

October 11, 1984 83090.019
Communications Report Transmittal #5
Cygna (Oldag) to CASE (Ellis)