



ENG-033 - PEERDRS - PEER REVIEW SUMMARY

Design Review Summary for the Vacuum Vessel Support Legs Insulation Repair

NSTXU_1-1-2-1-3_PEERDRS_100

Work Planning #:
Effective Date: **11/13/2019**
Prepared By: **William R. Blanchard**

Reviewed By	William R. Blanchard, Preparer	11/11/2019 10:33:22 AM
Reviewed By	Mojtaba Safabakhsh, Cognizant Individual	11/11/2019 11:50:55 AM
Approved By	Steve Raftopoulos, Responsible Engineer	11/11/2019 14:34:25 PM



DESIGN REVIEW DOCUMENTATION – RESULTS – No:

Title: VV Support Legs Insulation Repair (WP# 3064 , WBS# 1.1.2.1.3)

CAT: ☒A1 ☐A2 ☐A3

Type of Review: ☒ Peer ☐ CDR ☐ PDR ☐ FDR

Cognizant Individual: M. Safabakhsh _____ **Date of Review:** 11/7/19

Review Board Members:

W. Blanchard, Chairperson
S. Raftopoulos, VVIH RE
R. Ellis, CE & Mechanical TA
P Titus, Analysis TA
S. Gerhardt, Physics Rqmts & Sys Integration
W. Que, Electrical SME
J. Winston, Machine Assembly SME
W. Slavin, IH TA & ES&H
T. Stevenson, Operations Head
Y. Zhai, NSTX-U Project Head
A. Castaneda, QA

Other Attendees

F. Cai
L. Hill
J. Galayda
M. Cropper
W. Gattoni
S. Weidner

Items Reviewed:

	Sat.	Unsat.	Comments or n/a if not applicable
Appropriate requirements identified	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Development plans and schedules	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A _____
Reg. compliance incl. USI/USID and NEPA	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	NEPA 1631 _____
Disposition of CHITS from previous reviews	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	N/A _____
Cost objectives	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____
Other review objectives addressed	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	_____

SUMMARY OF RESULTS:

Field inspection of the G10 insulators for the support legs of NSTX-U showed signs of arcing. The purpose of this Peer Review was to review three possible options for addressing the compromised insulation. The first is to continue with the present configuration, the second to inject epoxy to fill in voids and the third to raise the vacuum vessel off the support legs and install new insulators that eliminate gaps and voids. After discussing all three options the Peer Review committee recommends that the project proceed to an FDR with the epoxy injection design. There were no chits generated during the review and the committee found the review to be acceptable.

Disposition: [check one]

 X **Acceptable**

 Acceptable pending resolution of concerns- CHITS identified above must be resolved prior to installation.

 Incomplete - Additional design work is required prior to another design review.

 Unsuccessful – Corrective actions must be taken and another review process must be initiated.

Design Review Chair Person _____ **Date:** _____

Cognizant Individual Acceptance _____ **Date:** _____

Distribution: Review Board Members, Operations Center, Responsible Engineer (RE), Cognizant Individuals, Project Manager, Project Director, relevant Technical Authorities (TAs), Chief Engineer (CE), Fire Protection Engineer, Attendees, QA, ES&H, Security, Requesting & Performing Dept. Head

Approved 11/13/2019

NSTXU 1-1-2-1-3 PEERDRS 100

Page 2 of 2