

POR

ORIGINAL

ORIGINAL

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

In the Matter of:

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

COMMANCHE PEAK

50-445/446

Location: 7735 Old Georgetown Rd. Pages: 1-42
Room 10117
Bethesda, Maryland

Date: Monday, June 11, 1984

8601080414 840611
PDR ADCK 05000445
T PDR

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE

Nuclear Regulatory Commission
7735 Old Georgetown Road
Room 10117
Bethesda, Maryland

Monday, June 11, 1984

The Commission met, pursuant to notice.

PARTICIPANTS:

- SCOFFWORD BURWELL (NRC)
- GEARY MIZUNO (NRC)
- JUANITA ELLIS (CASE)
- JOHN FINNERAN (TU)
- WILLIAM A. HORIN (TU COUNSEL)
- DAVID WADE (TU)
- DAVID TERAQ (NRC)
- JOHN F/IR (NRC)
- ROBERT IOTTI
- MARK WALSH

1 MR. MIZUNO: This is Geary Mizuno, Counsel for
2 NRC Staff, and this is a telephone conference call
3 primarily for the benefit of CASE, so that they may ask
4 the applicants questions that they may have regarding
5 various motions for summary disposition regarding Pipe
6 Support Design matters, which were raised by CASE. With
7 me in Bethesda is Spoffword Burwell, who is the Project
8 Manager for NRC. On the telephone, also listening in,
9 is Dave Terao and John Fair. Will the other parties
10 identify themselves for the record.

11 MR. HORIN: This is Bill Horin, Counsel for
12 Texas Utilities. Also on the line for Texas Utilities
13 are David Wade, John Finneran and Dr. Robert Iotti.

14 MRS. ELLIS: This is Juanita Ellis, President
15 of Case, the intervener in the hearing, and with me is
16 Mark Walsh.

17 MR. MIZUNO: O.K., I guess we should start by
18 Mrs. Ellis and Mark Walsh, start to ask questions on, I
19 believe there are two remaining motions for summary
20 disposition that we need to cover. One is involving
21 U-Bolts and the other one is involving safety factors, I
22 think.

23 MRS. ELLIS: Let's see, I think we got through
24 the safety factors. (inaudible) Oh, we didn't?

25 MR. HORIN: No, Juanita, no, we didn't do the

1 safety factors.

2 MRS. ELLIS: O.K., what about the generic
3 differences?

4 MR. HORIN: We finished that at the last --

5 MRS. ELLIS: We got through with that one --
6 O.K.

7 MR. HORIN: Were those the ones on your list,
8 Mark?

9 MR. WALSH: Yes, I agree with Mr. Mizuno.

10 MRS. ELLIS: The Richmond inserts, as I
11 understand it Mark hasn't finished going through that
12 yet, so we don't what we might want to ask about that.
13 I'd like to mention, too, that we've received a couple
14 of letters from the staff, and one dated June the 4th
15 and June the 7th addressed to Mr. Phipps, and I think
16 we'd like to have, you know, the same information that
17 they requested in those also.

18 MR. MIZUNO: Can you repeat that, again, Mrs.
19 Ellis?

20 MRS. ELLIS: We got copies of June 4th and
21 June 7th letters from the staff to the applicant and we
22 asked some questions and asked for some documents; and I
23 just want to be sure that we would be getting those
24 documents and that information also.

25 MR. HORIN: Was that related to the meeting

1 last Friday?

2 MR. MIZUNO: Yes.

3 MR. HORIN: A follow-up to the meeting or
4 prior to?

5 MRS. ELLIS: Prior to. We haven't received
6 anything, yet, about what when on at the meeting; and
7 there may be some other things, you know, that we'll be
8 interested in when --

9 MR. HORIN: Juanita, on those I think the most
10 efficient thing to do is to -- because we didn't receive
11 those until immediately prior to the hearing of the
12 meeting. I think all that we provided in advance or at
13 the hearing was a couple of items, which if I understand
14 correctly, Geary was going to have included as
15 attachments to the transcript?

16 MR. MIZUNO: Yes.

17 MRS. ELLIS: That's right -- very good.

18 MR. HORIN: And you'll be able to see in the
19 transcript itself what other information might be
20 provided.

21 MRS. ELLIS: Great. That will be real
22 helpful.

23 MR. MIZUNO: It's my understanding that there
24 was one set of documents which we requested which the
25 applicants were supposed to have sent to us as part of -

1 MR. HORIN: Is this the OBESSE?

2 MR. MIZUNO: Right --

3 MR. HORIN: We may have those on Friday.

4 MR. MIZUNO: Right -- and we received those,
5 so --

6 MR. HORIN: O.K.

7 MR. MIZUNO: Mrs. Ellis, that's one of the
8 things that they are committed to sending to us, again,
9 since we lost it, somehow, and so you should have a copy
10 of that particular set of documents.

11 MRS. ELLIS: O.K., so we'll be getting that in
12 -- O.K.

13 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bill, did we send that
14 to Mrs. Ellis?

15 MR. HORIN: No, somehow the staff didn't have
16 it. It would have already been sent to Juanita.

17 MRS. ELLIS: It would have --

18 MR. HORIN: Whereas, Mark, perhaps you recall
19 it was about a ten page document regarding the OBESSE
20 affidavit with a typed discussion on the first page of
21 where to look in the attached computer printout to
22 identify where one or two percent had been used, and
23 where two and four percent damping had been used. Do
24 you recall that?

25 MR. WALSH: I don't remember a particular

1 page, but I do remember a discussion of the affidavit.

2 MRS. ELLIS: Is it a sheet that starts off,
3 explanation of attachment.

4 MR. HORIN: Right.

5 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. Yeah, we've got that.

6 MR. HORIN: O.K.

7 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. -- O.K., I guess that's all
8 I have. Fire away, Mark.

9 MR. WALSH: The first item in regards to
10 safety factors, that will be the applicant's Statement
11 of Material Facts.

12 MR. MIZUNO: Hello --

13 MR. WALSH: And to expedite everything,
14 there's only one request for discovery. That request is
15 a copy of all the references that are utilized for this
16 job. Discussion of how they came up with their factory
17 statement (inaudible).

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Bill, I can obtain all
19 copies of the references.

20 MR. HORIN: Well, good.

21 MR. WALSH: Bill.

22 MR. HORIN: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: It will take us some
24 time to put them altogether (inaudible). It is my
25 understanding that Mr. Walsh has requested all

1 references to the safety factor's affidavit, right?

2 MR. WALSH: Yes.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: O.K. That's no
4 problem. (Inaudible)

5 MR. WALSH: It's a very large volume of
6 documents. Very large.

7 MR. MIZUNO: Dr. Iotti.

8 DR. IOTTI: Yes.

9 MR. MIZUNO: You're going to have to shout,
10 because I can barely hear you.

11 DR. IOTTI: (inaudible) Can you hear me now?

12 MR. MIZUNO: You sound like you're in a cavern
13 -- very far away.

14 DR. IOTTI: Bill Horin.

15 MR. HORIN: Hear, --

16 DR. IOTTI: Why don't you just translate for
17 us. We haven't said anything very technical, yet.

18 MR. HORIN: Does that mean I can't translate
19 technical, also.

20 DR. IOTTI: No, it means it's just hard for
21 you to remember it.

22 MR. HORIN: Give me a break.

23 DR. IOTTI: (inaudible) We have all of the
24 references. It will be sometime to pull them together,
25 get them duplicated and sent, but you can have them all.

1 MRS. ELLIS: I think we heard that.

2 MR. HORIN: Did you get that, Geary?

3 MR. MIZUNO: I hope the reporter caught it.

4 MR. HORIN: What he said was that they were
5 going to get the references and supply them to Mark.
6 There are quite a few, so it may take a little bit, but
7 we'll get on it.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I think there's over 40
9 references in that document, so it will take time to put
10 it together.

11 MR. HORIN: That is correct.

12 MR. MIZUNO: O.K. The reporter tells me that
13 you will have to identify yourself before speaking.

14 MR. WALSH: O.K. Well, this is Mark Walsh,
15 again, and the next area, the last one left on the list,
16 and that's the U-Bolts.

17 MR. HORIN: That was it on safety?

18 MR. WALSH: That's it, that's it on safety --
19 factors.

20 MR. HORIN: I don't like this progress. Bob,
21 can you hear Mark.

22 DR. IOTTI: Mark, this is Bob Iotti. I can
23 hear everybody very well, but apparently you cannot hear
24 me.

25 MR. HORIN: Oh, good.

1 MR. WALSH: All right. Under this item of
2 cinched up U-Bolts --

3 MR. WADE: Excuse me, Mark, this is David
4 Wade. Are we talking U-Bolts that are cinched or is it
5 two-way restraint? These are two different issues as we
6 classify them.

7 MR. HORIN: The only affidafit, this is Bill
8 Horin, the only affidafit we've filed so far, Mark, is
9 the regarding U-Bolt is U-Bolts acting as two-way
10 restraints. MR. WALSH: I assume we're
11 talking about that one. We have yet to file, the
12 U-Bolts with cinching.

13 MRS. ELLIS: O.K., so what you're saying is
14 this one isn't really designed to address that issue.

15 DR. IOTTI: Yes, maam. That is correct. That
16 will be forthcoming in another week or so.

17 MR. WALSH: All right. Well, the question
18 that I read -- this is Mark Walsh, again -- include
19 items that would be covered under the cinched up
20 U-Bolts, and (inaudible) should be done, or if you'd
21 like, is that will be covered under that document.

22 MR. WADE: This is David Wade, again. I think
23 items 3, 4, and 5 are planned to cover cinching of
24 U-Bolts, and we have yet to file that one. It will come
25 out in the very near future. The one that we did file,

1 and I've forgotten the plan item number covers the
2 U-Bolt used as two-way restraints.

3 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's item 14.

4 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. Why don't you go ahead and
5 give them the questions that you have, Mark, and then if
6 they are not really applicable to this, then when you
7 file the other affidavit, you'll probably save some time
8 if you've read them in there.

9 MR. WALSH: I think that would be helpful. In
10 the applicant Statement of Material Facts, item number
11 one, the first sentence -- we would request
12 documentation showing why U-Bolts need to be cinched up,
13 and (inaudible) inserted by design programs, but not in
14 the original analysis.

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Did you hear that, Bob?

16 DR. IOTTI: Let me rephrase for you and then

17 --

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Holler, maybe they can
19 hear you.

20 DR. IOTTI: This is Dr. Iotti. I will
21 rephrase the question to make sure that I've understood.
22 Mr. Walsh is asking us to provide documentation as to
23 why U-Bolts need to be cinched up.

24 MR. WALSH: Yes.

25 DR. IOTTI: If this is in relation of the

1 Statement of Material Facts, item number one.

2 MR. WALSH: Yes, all set.

3 DR. IOTTI: Well, that statement specifically
4 says that these do not need to be cinched up.

5 MR. WALSH: Well then, that's the
6 documentation we're looking for.

7 DR. IOTTI: Doesn't the statement tell that
8 there is a 1/16 inch gap already designed into each of
9 these particular U-Bolts.

10 MR. WALSH: Yes, but continuing on with the
11 second paragraph or second sentence, the cinched up
12 U-Bolt does not consider the 1/16 inch gap.

13 DR. IOTTI: Yes, but we are not talking about
14 the same U-Bolt.

15 MR. WALSH: Well, that's apparently, that's
16 what I'm looking for -- the statement stating that this
17 was not considered in the original design.

18 MR. WADE: Mark, I think we're complicating
19 things here, because the question really doesn't relate
20 to this particular affidavit. The question relates to
21 the other affidavit, which we're about to file.

22 DR. IOTTI: I think the question does relate.
23 I think the convusion here arises, that certain U-Bolts
24 were always intended to be cinched up. Certain other
25 U-Bolts were never intended to be cinched up.

1 MR. WADE: Precisely.

2 DR. IOTTI: The U-Bolts that we said we are
3 discussing, under the present affidavit in that
4 particular Statement of Material Facts, were never
5 intended to be cinched up, so there's no correlation to
6 be made. These were simply not intended to be cinched
7 up, as a matter of fact, these were intended to have a
8 gap -- so I don't know what other documentation we can
9 provide, other than telling you that these particular
10 U-Bolts were intended to have a gap, and never intended
11 to be cinched up.

12 MR. WALSH: Well, I guess a way to show
13 documentation is to show that the U-Bolts were
14 intentionally cinched up were considered in the original
15 design to be cinched up, and that these items were also
16 shown in that documentation -- that's why it would be
17 different than what we're looking at now.

18 DR. IOTTI: In regard to your later statement,
19 we will address that in the next affidavit, you've
20 cinched up the Bolts because properly speaking, those
21 that were always intended to be cinched up will be
22 addressed in this affidavit. Here in terms of
23 documentation, the only ones that are pertinent to the
24 documentation which indicate that these U-Bolts are not
25 intended to be cinched up, and are not in fact cinched

1 up. Is that satisfactory?

2 MR. MIZUNO: This is Mr. Mizuno. Now, Mrs.
3 Ellis?

4 MRS. ELLIS: Huh.

5 MR. MIZUNO: Applicants correct me if I'm
6 wrong, but what I understand that I'm hearing is that
7 there are some U-Bolts, there are some pipe support
8 designs using U-Bolts which are specifically designed to
9 be cinched up for whatever reason, and that applicants
10 will be addressing the technical aspects of that kind of
11 design in another affidavit or another set of filings or
12 summary disposition. In that the U-Bolt acting as
13 one-way versus two-way restraint question, involves
14 designs where U-Bolt cinching has never been part of the
15 original design concept, I guess. Is that correct,
16 applicants.

17 MR. WALSH: I believe that's correct.

18 MR. FINNERAN: This is John Finneran. I think
19 what Dr. Iotti said that is in these particular
20 supports, the U-bolts were never intended to be cinched.
21 They were always intended to have 1/16 inch gap.

22 MR. MIZUNO: O.K. So therefor --

23 MR. FINNERAN: The information is on the
24 drawing, some of which are in cases on exhibit.

25 MR. MIZUNO: O.K. Mrs. Ellis?

1 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. I think one of the things
2 we're going to see is documentation that there was an
3 original intention that some of these U-Bolts should be
4 cinched up and some of them shouldn't. For instance is
5 that in the PFP Manual somewhere, or --

6 MR. WALSH: I believe this is specified on the
7 drawing, Mrs. Ellis.

8 MR. FINNERAN: This information is on the
9 drawing.

10 MR. WALSH: Yeah, but we want to see a
11 criteria, that would say which ones need to be cinched
12 up and which ones need not to be cinched up.

13 MR. FINNERAN: Mark, this is John Finneran,
14 again. What better criteria could you have than the
15 fact that the drawing shows it to be cinched up or not?

16 MR. WALSH: We want to know why on the drawing
17 it says to be cinched up.

18 MR. HORIN: Mark, I think, this is Bill Horin,
19 what John is indicating is that the determination of
20 whether or not to cinch up or not to cinch a U-Bolt was
21 made by the original designer and his decision is placed
22 on the drawing. The correctness of that decision is
23 addressed in this affidavit and the one that we're going
24 to be filing shortly with respect to both uncinched and
25 cinched U-Bolts.

1 MR. WALSH: All right, the beginning statement
2 says a 1/16 inch gap was designed to each U-Bolt, now it
3 says each U-Bolt.

4 MR. HORIN: -- covered by this affidavit.

5 MR. WALSH: -- in this statement of material
6 facts.

7 MRS. ELLIS: That is one of the problems that
8 is not clear, that its for this affidavit.

9 MR. WADE: I believe that this whole subject
10 of discussion this U-Bolt's acting as two-way
11 restraints.

12 MR. WALSH: And we indicated in our cover
13 letter that this was addressing item fourteen of
14 applicant's plan, as Mr. Wade indicated the cinched
15 U-Bolt question is addressed, will be addressed shortly
16 and that covers items 3, 4, and 5 of applicant's plan.

17 MRS. ELLIS: I think, my feeling is that it's
18 going to be awfully hard to address this adequately
19 without seeing what's said in the otherone also.

20 MR. HORIN: Well, I don't think it is. This
21 is Mr. Horin. I think it's simply a matter of Mark
22 noting as he goes down his questions and perhaps the
23 best that he decide on his own, if the question is
24 directed at some effect or some consideration relating
25 to cinch to U-Bolts, he should hold those questions.

J.L.H.
NRC/46
Tape 1

1 If it's relating to U-Bolts used as two-way
2 restraints, which as we indicate here are U-Bolts which
3 are not cinched down, then we should go ahead with that,
4 those questions as well as the other ones, until the
5 other affidavit comes in.

6 DR. IOTTI: Bill. Bill? This is Bob Iotti.
7 I have no problems with Mr. Walsh and or the answer to
8 his questions if he feels that they're best addressed in
9 the next affidavit (inaudible).

10 MR. HORIN: Fine. Did you hear that, Mark?

11 MR. WALSH: No.

12 MR. HORIN: He said that, he doesn't have any
13 objection or problem with your just going through each
14 of your questions, we'll indicate as you give the
15 question, whether we think it's best answered or the
16 answer can be best given if we will await the coming
17 affidavit, or whether it's one that we can answer now in
18 the context of this affidavit.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: O.K.

20 MR. HORIN: You can jus' mark down which ones
21 to hold as we go through.

22 MR. WALSH: All right. That sounds fair.
23 Well, let's continuing on then. I don't know if we
24 accomplished anything on the first one on this. The
25 last sentence of item number one, the same subject

J.L.H.
NRC/46
Tape 1

1 says, all such U-Bolts had been considered only as
2 one-way restraints. We want documentation showing that,
3 that they were only considered as one-way restraints.

4 MR. FINNERAN: Again, this is John Finneran.
5 The drawings, again, that CASE has, and I think there
6 are a couple that CASE has in their exhibits that are
7 being typed only show one-way loads on the load chart on
8 the drawing, so it's obvious that they were modeled in
9 the analysis from the beginning as one-way restraints.

10
11 MR. WALSH: Well, we would like to know if
12 allowables had been established for these U-Bolts to act
13 as two-way restraints.

14 DR. IOTTI: Well, this is Dr. Iotti. This is
15 of course the crux of the matter, and it's CASE's
16 allegation that applicant has failed to consider that
17 these U-Bolts would act as a two-way restraint, and that
18 is precisely what we have addressed in our affidavit.
19 We have gone back for those U-Bolts which could mainly
20 shape or form, really act as two-way restraints, we try
21 and determine what the effect of modeling those U-Bolts
22 as two-way restraints would be to answer your specific
23 concerns. So you're now going back to square one to ask
24 the question in reverse. We've already conceded the
25 fact that they could, under some circumstances, act as

1 two-way restraints and have determined what the
2 consequences would be.

3 MR. FINNERAN: This is John Finneran, again.
4 It seems that major allegation is that these have been
5 modeled as one-way restraints, and they would in effect
6 act as two-way restraints. We have in effect agreed to
7 that allegation as directly accordingly.

8 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. That's helpful.

9 MR. MIZUNO: Mrs. Ellis?

10 MRS. ELLIS: Huh.

11 MR. MIZUNO: This is Geary Mizuno. It seems
12 to me that you ought to have some better idea as to why
13 these motions for summary dispositions were filed in the
14 first place. I mean, I guess I was a little bit puzzled
15 by the fact, when you responded to applicant's statement
16 saying that, you know, modeling, you know, to analyze
17 the one-way, the U-Bolts that were originally modeled as
18 a one-way restraints as two-way restraints was, you
19 know, in accordance with what CASE originally alleged
20 should be done, and then you said, that is helpful,
21 indicated to me that you didn't even remember that that
22 was your -- that was the position of CASE.

23 MRS. ELLIS: What I meant was, Geary, that
24 it's helpful for the applicants to admit this, it's a
25 little unusual for them to admit that they agreed with

1 one of our allegations. I was a little surprised at
2 this.

3 MR. WALSH: I don't think they said they
4 agreed with you.

5 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I don't think we've
6 ever said that we didn't model them as one-way
7 restraints. In our analysis in our growing showed that
8 we had modeled them as one-way restraints. We're simply
9 saying that there was no need to model them as two-way,
10 and we have proven that by our affidavit.

11 MRS. ELLIS: I understand what you're saying

12 ---.

13 MR. MIZUNO: Let's get down to the crux of the
14 matter. Did you find, Mark, did you find some technical
15 problems with your modeling of the restraints as two-way
16 restraint, the U-Bolts as two-way restraints?

17 MR. WALSH: We have, and I think it was in
18 either in (inaudible) supposition, which is CASE exhibit
19 669D or in PSE Manual, allowable for lateral restraint.
20 Now the question is, there's actually two of them, is
21 that truly a restraint for lateral load or are the other
22 U-Bolts that are acting out there actually restraining
23 the pipe? And that restraint is not considered by the
24 applicants.

25 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: There's actually two

1 questions here.

2 DR. IOTTI: Let me see if I can rephrase your
3 question. This is Dr. Iotti.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Speak up Bob.

5 DR. IOTTI: The purpose for rephrasing the
6 question is to make sure that I understood the question.
7 I believe Mr. Walsh stated that there may be some
8 technical errors in the modeling of these U-Bolts as a
9 two-way restraint right now? Is that correct?

10 MR. WALSH: Yeah.

11 DR. IOTTI: I guess I would have to ask you to
12 elaborate as to why you need so for every restraint
13 where we have computed that either the thermal or the
14 seismic or the combination of the two could in fact
15 bring the pipe in contact with the U-Bolt laterally. We
16 have modeled the U-Bolt as a two-way restraint. So the
17 U-Bolt is acting as a two-way restraint in the analysis
18 that you will find submitted with the affidavit.

19 MR. WALSH: When you get to the large diameter
20 pipe with small diameter U-Bolts, the U-Bolt is quite
21 flexible in the lateral direction, and it cannot provide
22 restraint, but when you go down to the smaller diameter
23 pipe with respect to the diameter of the U-Bolt, the
24 U-Bolt provides restraint. And this can be shown
25 through the NPF9 lateral load, that they have

1 tabulated.

2 DR. IOTTI: Well, I believe that some of the
3 problems that we re-analyzed to address your concern
4 range in pipe size from, what, six inch, sixteen inch
5 and, what, 30 -- 24? So, I don't know. Are you telling
6 me that the six inch pipe is considered now a large
7 pipe?

8 MR. WALSH: What you're saying is the U-Bolt,
9 when it reacts with, the U-Bolt, when it reacts with
10 the pipe, is providing a lateral restraint, possibly. I
11 don't know what the load or the stiffness of the U-Bolt
12 is in the lateral direction.

13 DR. IOTTI: Well, we've actually used --
14 we've conducted testing that insured (inaudible) works
15 that were attached to an affidavit.

16 MR. WALSH: Well, then I guess the crux of my
17 question is, in the statement, all such U-Bolts had been
18 considered as only one-way restraints.

19 (Interrupted by Dr. Iotti - inaudible)

20 MR. WALSH: Within that statement, I want to
21 know why NPSI had allowables for both directions --
22 documentation showing why they had them.

23 DR. IOTTI: I don't know. I cannot speak for
24 NPSI, but I presume that any manufacturer would want to
25 provide allowables in both directions, because they

1 would now want to confine the way the particular
2 U-Bolt is used by whoever wants to use them. The fact
3 that they haven't been used as a two-way restraint here,
4 O.K., would indicate that in that particular
5 application, the allowable in the lateral direction
6 would not be used. On the other hand even if there had
7 been instances where the U-Bolt was always intended to
8 be used as a two-way restraint, in which case the
9 lateral allowable is used. It really depends on the
10 application.

11 MR. WALSH: In the PSE Manual it lists the
12 allowable lateral load.

13 DR. IOTTI: And when the U-Bolt was always
14 intended to act as a two-way restraint from the
15 beginning, that lateral would have been used as the
16 allowable.

17 MR. WALSH: But that contradicts the statement
18 that is written here in the material facts.

19 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: What statement is that?

20 DR. IOTTI: No Sir, it does not.

21 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: And the initial
22 pipe-support design --

23 DR. IOTTI: -- to those U-Bolts which were
24 invented to act as one-way restraints. This does not
25 cover those U-Bolts which were always intended to act

1 as two-way restraints.

2 MR. WALSH: That's contradictory to what's
3 stated in the Statement of Material Facts. It states,
4 and the initial accordingly, in the initial pipe support
5 design prior to (inaudible) conditions, all such U-Bolts
6 had been considered as only one-way restraints.

7 MR. FINNERAN: This is John Finneran, again.
8 The term, all such U-Bolts, refers back to the very
9 first sentence that says, U-Bolts on rigid frames are
10 intended to act as one-way restraints, so there's no
11 contradiction at all.

12 DR. IOTTI: This is Dr. Iotti. For the sake
13 of being repetitive, I think it's important that we
14 clarify there are different types of U-Bolts employed in
15 the plans. The ones that are referred to in this
16 particular affidavit, the Statement of Material Facts,
17 are only those which are intended to act, were intended
18 to act as one-way restraints, as U-Bolt restraints on a
19 rigid frame. Now there are other types of U-Bolts,
20 which are not addressed, so if we keep trying to read
21 into the affidavit something that isn't there, or the
22 Statement of Material Facts that isn't there, we are all
23 going to be very confused.

24 MR. WALSH: O.K., the next question, how did
25 one determine if the U-Bolt was acting as a one-way

1 restraint or two-way restraint? We'd like
2 documentation to verify that.

3 DR. IOTTI: Well, I believe, if you read the
4 affidavit, which you have found is a sample, which
5 encompasses most of those U-Bolts which were intended to
6 act as one-way, but which could act as two-way
7 restraints. O.K., the affidavit addresses certainly the
8 ones that are most likely to act as two-way restraints,
9 and concludes that the reason was that effect is
10 tolerable. So that is the best information that we can
11 provide you. We went back, searched for all of the
12 instances which the U-Bolts intended to act as one-way,
13 could in fact act as two-way, where we analyze those
14 fresh problems which encompasses some of those U-Bolts,
15 and I say some, because not all were included but most
16 in terms of the one's that were most likely to act as a
17 two-way restraint, and presented to you as a conclusion
18 to those studies. That is the best evidence that we can
19 provide at this point.

20 MRS. ELLIS: Why don't we take a couple of
21 minutes break, and let us kind of talk about this, and
22 we can narrow down some of these questions for tonight
23 and save them for the next round on the other stuff.

24 MR. WALSH: Yeah, I think that would be a good
25 idea.

1 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Don't anybody hang up.
2 (Off the record discussion.)

3 MR. WALSH: All right, going to item number
4 three. First sentence, it references and as built
5 review, how does this differ from the vendor certified?

6 DR. IOTTI: Bill, did you receive it?

7 MR. HORIN: Yes, he asked, with respect to
8 item three, in the material facts, how does the as-built
9 review differ from the vendor certification?

10 MR. WALSH: If this is only for the PSE group,
11 I think it should be noted that including NPSI group for
12 now.

13 MR. HORIN: Did you hear that, John?

14 MR. FINNERAN: No.

15 MR. HORIN: He said, if this is for PSE only,
16 we should indicate that or if it's for -- if it includes
17 NPSI, we should also indicate that.

18 MR. FINNERAN: O.K. I think we're ready to
19 answer his question. Can you hear me?

20 MR. HORIN: Yes.

21 MR. FINNERAN: Can you hear me?

22 MR. HORIN: Yes.

23 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: He said yes.

24 MR. FINNERAN: The as-built review referred
25 here in part three is the normal as-built analysis

1 program at Gibson Hill, and does not just cover the
2 course for PSE, it covers the course for PSE, ITT and
3 NPSI, so as the as-built review program of Gibson Hill.

4 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: All right.

5 MR. WALSH: Continuing on that same item, it
6 states, those reanalyses, and that reanalysis performed
7 by Gibson Hill that it's referencing, what did they use
8 as the lateral stiffness of the U-Bolt?

9 MR. FINNERAN: Bill?

10 MR. HORIN: Yes.

11 MR. FINNERAN: Bill, correct me if I'm wrong,
12 but isn't the Henryman Hill letter one of the CASE
13 exhibits?

14 MR. HORIN: What?

15 MR. FINNERAN: The Henryman Hill letter which
16 documents Gibson Hill's approach to how they're going to
17 model these U-Bolts in the as-built analysis program.
18 Whereas the (inaudible) is over a sixteenth they would
19 write a thermal analysis of it, that letter -- isn't it
20 one of the CASE exhibits? -- that letter has a table of
21 the differences that they would assume listed in it.

22 MRS. ELLIS: It doesn't ring a bell with me by
23 that name, anyway.

24 MR. WALSH: Well, it rings a bell with me, but
25 it doesn't ring a loud enough bell that I can point to

1 which exhibit it might be.

2 MR. HORIN: It seems to me, Bill, that at one
3 of the hearings that we provided, the procedure that
4 was still used, for the revaluation of that U-Bolt -- I
5 don't recall whether that was our exhibit or CASE's
6 exhibit, but I believe we did produce that procedure.

7 MR. FINNERAN: This document was produced to
8 CASE in their discovery on the 15th of (inaudible) the
9 15 references in the said report, and we sent for a copy
10 of it and got it. And one of the pages of that letter
11 is a table of the stiffnesses that they used.

12 MR. WALSH: All right. Well, we'd like to
13 know or rather we'd like to have the -- another
14 statement stating the reanalysis encompassed in regard
15 to this Statement of Material Facts. That's what the
16 (inaudible) report contained.

17 MR. FINNERAN: I guess I missed the question,
18 Bill, could you relay it to us?

19 MR. HORIN: He's asking, what the reanalysis
20 referenced in item three --

21 MR. FINNERAN: -- in the affidavit? I don't
22 recall what the people (inaudible), but (inaudible).
23 It's all in the affidavit. It's perfectly clear --

24 MR. HORIN: Mark, did you have a chance to
25 read through the affidavit?

1 WALSH: Just briefly and the values that were
2 stated do not reflect the testing that I've seen on
3 these U-Bolts.

4 MR. HORIN: Can you provide us with the
5 results of this testing?

6 MR. WALSH: Yes, and I'd like to see some
7 documentation that shows a Gibson Hill, what stiffness
8 Gibson Hill actually used for the systems that they
9 evaluated. It could be a statement in a form of a
10 letter.

11 MR. HORIN: Didn't John just answer that?

12 MR. FINNERAN: We'll provide them or tell them
13 when they were given it before.

14 MR. HORIN: All right.

15 MR. FINNERAN: We'll tell you what CASE
16 exhibit it is.

17 MRS. ELLIS: If you can identify, you know, a
18 little bit better -- I can't just identify from what
19 you've said so far. I don't think I can (noise).

20 MR. WALSH: Yeah, we need you to --

21 MRS. ELLIS: O.K.

22 MR. WALSH: Item number four, it states
23 applicants decided to replace all U-Bolts. Does
24 applicants include ITT and NPSI?

25 MR. FINNERAN: Yes.

1 MR. WALSH: Now moving on.

2 MR. FINNERAN: (noise - inaudible) item four.
3 The question was asked in context of item four. Is that
4 correct?

5 MR. WALSH: Yes.

6 MR. FINNERAN: Right. That -- our answer is
7 yes.

8 MRS. ELLIS: O.K.

9 MR. FINNERAN: (noise) where the thermal
10 movement equal or exceeded 1/16 of an inch.

11 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. (inaudible)

12 MR. WALSH: On item number six, that is
13 continued on to page three of Material Facts, we would
14 like to see some documentation showing that the
15 manufacture allowable values are consistent with the
16 NPSI design of 1982, i.e., the actual stiffness of the
17 U-Bolt of the support and the struts.

18 DR. IOTTI: Bill, would the repeat the
19 question, please. Bill?

20 MR. HORIN: Yes. (inaudible) Mark is asking
21 for some documentation showing that the manufacturer's
22 allowable values referenced in or applicable to item six
23 of the Statement of Material Facts is consistent with
24 that used by an NPSI design in 1982.

25 DR. IOTTI: (inaudible) sum of those values

1 (inaudible)

2 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I couldn't hear that.

3 MR. HORIN: He said, that in the affidavit, we
4 state that we did not use those values. Bob, did you
5 mean the manufacturer's allowables.

6 DR. IOTTI: Yeah, we computed new allowables
7 on the basis of values (inaudible)

8 MR. HORIN: Bob says, that we developed new
9 allowables, we did not use the manufacturer's, based on
10 tests for the purpose of this affidavit.

11 MR. FINNERAN: We so stated that in the
12 affidavit.

13 MR. HORIN: And it stated in the affidavit.

14 MRS. ELLIS: On some of these things the
15 referenced in the affidavit, I'm not sure it's always
16 exactly clear in the affidavit, one of the problems
17 we're having from time to time on this. So we're just
18 trying to clarify some of these things.

19 DR. IOTTI: The easiest way to answer that
20 question -- this is Dr. Iotti -- is to clarify where in
21 the affidavit we can find that information, and we'll
22 provide that at the same time that we provide that
23 information that we had promised in regards to Gibson
24 Hill reanalysis. They're acceptable.

25 MRS. ELLIS: Good.

1 MR. HORIN: Bob, wouldn't it be on, perhaps
2 not, would it not be in the affidavit in the pages
3 referenced in the particular Statement of Material Fact?

4 DR. IOTTI: That's correct.

5 MR. HORIN: I think part of the problem, Mrs.
6 Ellis, is that you have put your emphasis on reviewing
7 Material Fact in much more detail than is provided in
8 the Affidavit, which you may or may not be aware of, and
9 I think that's part of the situation we're coming across
10 here.

11 MRS. ELLIS: One of the things we've read the
12 summary statements more closely, but in looking back at
13 the affidavit sometimes it's not completely clear to us
14 on some of these items as well. We're just trying to
15 clarify some of it, so we're sure we understand what's
16 really being said.

17 MR. WALSH: In regards to item number eight,
18 states applicant's commission ITT Grinnell, and this is
19 in regards to the testing of the U-Bolt's capability.
20 We request documentation showing why ITT was chosen and
21 not another independent laboratory.

22 MRS. ELLIS: I guess what we want to know
23 there is what criteria was used to have ITT Grinnell do
24 this rather than an independent outside laboratory.
25 With independence of criteria, in other words, I guess.

1 MR. HORIN: Did you hear that, Bob?

2 DR. IOTTI: I guess so. I guess the prime
3 criterion is expediency in the sense that we have to
4 have this done in a short time; secondly is that the
5 devices employed to test for ultimate capability are
6 essential, universal and, you know, there is no way you
7 can hide the results of the test, so it's really
8 immaterial who conducts them.

9 MRS. ELLIS: But, doesn't it also, is it sort
10 of, here I'm a little out of my element, please bear
11 with me, but when you do tests, isn't it similar to a
12 situation where the input, like with a computer program
13 for instance, what you put in determines what comes out
14 to a certain extent?

15 DR. IOTTI: No, ma'am.

16 MR. WALSH: No on a physical test.

17 DR. IOTTI: Not on a physical test, Mrs.
18 Ellis. The U-Bolt is pushed or pulled, whatever until
19 it either exceeds the deflection that you preordain or
20 it basically breaks. Now, there isn't very much you can
21 do other than simply observe what happens, and we have
22 provided the attachment to the affidavit to complete
23 test results.

24 MR. WALSH: But didn't anybody else contact to
25 do these tests?

1 MR. HORIN: He asked, if anybody else was
2 contacted to do these tests.

3 MR. FINNERAN: Mark, could you perhaps clarify
4 it for us what your concern is with the test results?

5 MR. WALSH: Yes. Well, I'm concerned that
6 Grinnell provided the U-Bolts, and Grinnell is also one
7 of the parties involved.

8 MR. FINNERAN: So you're saying that they lied
9 and cheated. Is that correct?

10 MR. WALSH: Right.

11 MRS. ELLIS: Or that they have a vested
12 interested?

13 MR. WALSH: (inaudible) new design (inaudible)
14 being acceptable.

15 MR. HORIN: I don't think there is any basis
16 for stating that there's any wrong doing in the test.
17 There's absolutely no basis for that. I think our
18 point, Mark, is that we've provided the complete test
19 results, and as you're surely aware on physical tests
20 such as this, the type of testing performed would
21 provide the same results independently of who happens to
22 be performing it. We don't consider it material as to
23 who carried out the test, as Dr. Iotti stated. We
24 thought a party capable of carrying out these tests,
25 consistent with the schedule that the board and parties

1 agreed to and we don't consider it material, a
2 material factor. The fact that is at all, even if
3 disputed material to the outcome of this matter, who
4 carried out the test.

5 MR. WALSH: O.K.

6 MRS. ELLIS: What do you think about this one,
7 Mark?

8 MR. WALSH: No.

9 MRS. ELLIS: Do you think (inaudible)?

10 MR. WALSH: Item nine, states these
11 conservative consumptions, it was determined. I don't
12 quite understand how this determination was made, what
13 analytical procedure was made.

14 MR. HORIN: Could you hear that, Bob?

15 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Play it back for him
16 again, Bill.

17 MR. HORIN: He asked with respect to number
18 nine of the Statement of Facts, how the determination
19 was made, what analytical method may have been used to
20 determine that the U-Bolts were within the
21 manufacturer's interaction formula limits.

22 DR. IOTTI: If Mr. Walsh would go through the
23 affidavit again, what he will find is the actual
24 solution of the interaction formula where both the
25 actual normal load, ratio to the allowable normal loads,

1 plus the actual side load, divided by the allowable
2 side is compared to the value unity in all instances,
3 and the value turns out to be less than unity. That's
4 on page fourteen of the affidavit and actual numerical
5 examples are given for, we believe, the three worst
6 U-Bolts. The affidavit actually lists four, but I
7 believe I only worked out a numerical example for three.

8 MR. WALSH: The testing results that were done
9 -- have these been requested in NPSI designs, where they
10 utilized the lateral restraint of the U-Bolts? Besides,
11 it was utilizing it to my knowledge as well as PSE,
12 using the U-Bolt as a two-way restraint, considering the
13 lateral stiffness of the Bolt.

14 MR. HORIN: John and Bob, could you hear the
15 question?

16 DR. IOTTI: The best way to answer that
17 question, were to go back to a table in the affidavit.
18 I think you will find it ultimately, none of these needs
19 to be considered as a two-way restraint. We have chosen
20 to do so to alay the concerns of CASE. Demonstrate to
21 CASE that even is they were considered as two-way
22 restraints, nothing would happen to jeopardize the
23 safety of the plant. But we are in no way saying they
24 will act as a two-way restraint at this juncture.

25 MR. WALSH: Well the question here is, for

1 those U-Bolts, the pipe designer is assuming is acting
2 as a two-way restraint. The test results being
3 utilized, showing that they actually don't act as a
4 two-way restraint.

5 DR. IOTTI: The U-Bolt is acting as a two-way
6 restraint, the test results are not utilized. The
7 allowables given by the manufacturer, the side loads
8 were utilized for those instances.

9 MR. WALSH: Is Gibson Hill utilizing these
10 stiffness values for lateral restraint?

11 MR. HORIN: I think we're getting off the
12 track here. For I think what we're trying to establish
13 with this affidavit is the fact that you don't need to
14 consider it. I think we've clearly established that you
15 don't need to considerate it, as a result we don't
16 considerate it.

17 MR. WALSH: All right.

18 MR. HORIN: Is that right, John and Bob?

19 MR. FINNERAN: Let me answer that question.
20 Gibson Hill did not utilize those test results.

21 MRS. ELLIS: O.K.

22 MR. HORIN: You don't need to. We've clearly
23 established that the effects are not significant.

24 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: That's it Juanita.

25 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. Any other questions? Does

1 the staff have any questions or anything?

2 MR. MIZUNO: John, Dave, do you have any
3 questions?

4 MR. FAIR: This is John Fair. I'd like to
5 clarify one point, if we could just go backwards a
6 little bit. When we were talking about item three in
7 the Material Facts as to what you use the analysis for
8 lateral stiffness, those supports were corrected in item
9 four and therefore, those analyses are no longer the
10 analyses of record for those pipes. Is that correct?

11 DR. IOTTI: Excuse me. This is Dr. Iotti.
12 The other phone chose now to ring, so we missed the
13 entire conversation.

14 MR. FAIR: O.K.

15 DR. IOTTI: Will you please relay that?

16 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I'll start over again.

17 MR. HORIN: Are you guys ready? John or Bob
18 are you --

19 DR. IOTTI: No, the phone is still ringing.
20 Can we take one minute?

21 MR. MIZUNO: It's O.K. John must have picked
22 up the phone to answer and all of a sudden he was --

23 DR. IOTTI: We can't hear anything, can we
24 just have one minute to answer that phone, and then
25 we'll get back.

1 MR. MIZUNO: All right. John Fair, why don't
2 you repeat your question.

3 MR. FAIR: I just wanted to clarify a previous
4 discussion on the U-Bolt on item three of the Material
5 Facts, there was a discussion about the modeling of the
6 U-Bolts as two-way restraints and the fact that you used
7 a stiffness for the lateral direction. Was that
8 correct?

9 DR. IOTTI: Yeah, we did use a stiffness for
10 the lateral direction.

11 MR. FAIR: O.K. Now these same ones that you
12 reanalyze, you eventually took all those U-Bolts out.
13 Is that also correct?

14 DR. IOTTI: That is correct.

15 MR. FAIR: And therefore all those analyses
16 would not be the analysis of record for those piping
17 systems.

18 DR. IOTTI: That is also correct.

19 MR. FAIR: I just wanted to clarify that,
20 thank you.

21 MR. MIZUNO: Dave, do you have any questions?

22 MR. TERAQ: No questions.

23 MR. MIZUNO: O.K. The staff has no questions.
24 For the questions, I guess we should end the conference
25 call at this point. I'm sorry, we should end

1 the transcript at this point, but I'd like the parties
2 to stay on the line.

3 MRS. ELLIS: One more thing before we do that.

4 MR. MIZUNO: O.K.

5 MRS. ELLIS: -- go off the record. Could you
6 kind of give me an idea of when we can get the
7 information we, you know, asked for at the last
8 conference call, and kind of give me an idea of
9 scheduling, since we've got this scheduling conference
10 coming up, Friday. Any ideas on that?

11 MR. HORIN: David, have you had an opportunity
12 to assess that one, yet?

13 MRS. ELLIS: I know that you all have quite a
14 few things to get for us, and needless to say your
15 response on that will have to do with the amount of time
16 it will take us from then.

17 MR. HORIN: David, are you there?

18 MR. WADE: Yes.

19 MR. HORIN: Did you have a chance to look at
20 that -- or should we --

21 MR. WADE: I'm sorry, Bill, I've left the
22 phone here for about two minutes and I missed the
23 question.

24 MR. HORIN: Juanita was wondering what
25 schedule we might be on for providing the information

1 requested on the last conference call. I talked to
2 John this afternoon, and we're going to review that in
3 the morning to see exactly where we are on providing
4 those requests. Hopefully, David can get back to you on
5 two subjects, then, tomorrow.

6 MRS. ELLIS: O.K. Very good.

7 MR. MIZUNO: And I think the staff owes you
8 one bit of information, and that involves talk with Dr.
9 Chin, and I've been unable to get ahold of him, but I'll
10 try tomorrow.

11 MRS. ELLIS: Very good. And, Oh yes, I just
12 wanted to verify the conference call the last time, I
13 guess you all have just now gotten the copies of that
14 ready for us, hopefully?

15 MR. MIZUNO: Right.

16 DR. IOTTI: Sorry, Bill, I've lost this last
17 conversation. What is it all about?

18 MR. HORIN: That's a song title, isn't it?

19 MR. WADE: SPEAKER: Tell him I'll tell him in
20 the morning, Bill.

21 MR. HORIN: David can tell you, it's not
22 related to the technical stuff. I still don't have a
23 transcript from the previous conference call. Geary,
24 is that coming out very shortly?

25 MR. MIZUNO: Yes. We just got it, I just got

1 it in my hands, today, and I had a transmittal letter
2 all written out, and Stuart Trebee (PH) is sitting on it
3 right now. He has some problems.

4 MR. HORIN: It's important that we get that.
5 I have reviewed my notes from the last conference call,
6 and I think I know what we agreed to send Mrs. Ellis,
7 but I'd like to review the transcript to make sure that
8 we've covered all the bases.

9 MR. MIZUNO: Right.

10 MRS. ELLIS: I'm in the same situation.

11 MR. MIZUNO: Well, we'll send it out express
12 mail.

13 MR. WADE: Geary, could you put me on direct
14 distribution for a copy of that, please. This is David
15 Wade.

16 MR. MIZUNO: You'll have to give me your
17 address.

18 MR. WADE: I'll call you in the morning and
19 give you that.

20 MR. MIZUNO: O.K. Fine. O.K. Can we now go
21 off the record?

22 MRS. ELLIS: Yeah, I guess so. I don't guess
23 there's any point at this point of discussing too much,
24 when we'll be talking about the rest of these things,
25 until we --

1 MR. MIZUNO: Thank you for the conference call
2 and we'll end the transcript now, but all parties stay
3 on after this.
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

J.L.H.
NRC/46
Tape 1

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATE OF PROCEEDINGS

This is to certify that the attached
proceedings before the NRC COMMISSION

In the matter of:

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE - RE: COMMANCHE PEAK

Date of Proceeding: Monday, June 11, 1984

Place of Proceeding: 7735 Old Georgetown Rd.
Room 10117
Bethesda, Maryland

were held as herein appears, and that this is the
original transcript for the file of the Commission.

Official Reporter - Typed
Kim Schroeder

Kim Schroeder / D 712
Official Reporter - Signature