

R. Lowenstein, Attorney
Office of the General Counsel

APR 4 1957

Charles T. Edwards, Chief, Facilities Section
Licensing Branch, Division of Civilian Application

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT
TO CURTISS-WRIGHT CORPORATION, DOCKET NO. F-39

SYMBOL: CAL:CTE

Attached is a draft package on the notice of proposed issuance
of a construction permit to Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Docket
No. F-39.

Please review the draft and return it to this office with your
comments.

Enclosure:
Drafts & Background Data

Q RA-3 - Curtiss-Wright
D-33

OFFICE ▶	CAL				
SURNAME ▶	CTEdwards:rmd				
DATE ▶	4-3-57				

Office Memorandum • UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

TO : R. Lowenstein, Attorney
Office of the General Counsel

FROM : *[Signature]*
Charles T. Edwards, Chief, Facilities Section
Licensing Branch, Division of Civilian Application

SUBJECT: NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT
TO CURTISS-WRIGHT CORPORATION, DOCKET NO. F-39

SYMBOL: CAL:CTE

DATE: April 4, 1957

Attached is a draft package on the notice of proposed issuance of a construction permit to Curtiss-Wright Corporation, Docket No. F-39.

Please review the draft and return it to this office with your comments.

Enclosure:
Drafts & Background Data

APPENDIX B

Memorandum

Part I - DESCRIPTION OF THE REACTOR

The Curtiss-Wright Corporation has submitted a license application for a reactor to be built and operated on an 80 sq. mile tract of land at Quehanna, Pennsylvania. The proposed reactor is a one megawatt light water moderated and cooled, solid fuel type often referred to as a pool type or swimming-pool reactor. The core is immersed in a 20 ft. wide by 40 ft. long ^{by} 26 ft. deep pool with a minimum of 19 ft. of water covering the core. Considerations of neutron economy may at times dictate the use of a beryllium oxide reflector. The reinforced concrete pool is separated into two sections, one being a three sided end section penetrated by three beam tubes for experimentation purposes, the other a 20 ft. x 24 ft. section used for bulk shielding studies.

The reactor core will be made of the type fuel elements contained in the Materials Testing Reactor (MTR) located at the National Reactor Testing Station, Arco, Idaho. There will be a maximum of ten fuel bearing plates per element. Each plate is essentially a sandwich of aluminum-uranium alloy between two layers of aluminum cladding. A fuel element will contain about 170 gms of U-235 enriched to 90%. These elements are supported by a grid plate capable of accommodating a 9 x 6 array or a total of 54 elements. ^{with} This number of fuel elements would ~~almost certainly not be used, but~~ many flexible arrangements are possible, and present plans do include placing peripheral rows of beryllium

oxide elements as a reflector around the fuel elements. Previous experience with this type of core places the cold clean critical mass at 2.75 - 2.85 kg U-235 but usually the requirements for available reactivity to override xenon poisoning and experimental needs will increase the critical mass to 3.4 or 3.6 kg.

In this case, the applicant states that the maximum reactivity requirements for prolonged operation at 100 kw and 1000 kw are as follows:

Source	Reactivity	
	100 kw	Required at 1000 kw
Negative Temp. Coefficient	.0006	.001
Equilibrium Poisons (Xe, Sm, etc.)	.018	.040
Xe override	.000	.006*
Burnup (1000 days)	.0005	.005*
Adequate rate of change of power level	.003	.003
Addition of smallest increment of reactivity available	<u>.003</u>	<u>.003</u>
Totals	.025**	.053**

* Only one of these values is indicated in ~~total~~ the total column.

** No allowance made for experimental reactivity requirements

The reactor control system consists of three (3) safety shim rods and one (1) control rod. The boron carbide safety-shim rods have a reactivity control worth of 2.5% each for a water reflected core and 3.8% each for a beryllium oxide reflected core. The stainless steel control rod under similar conditions will have reactivity worth of 0.6% and 1.2% respectively. The safety-shim rods are magnetically coupled to the drives which are capable of driving the

rods at 24 in./min. Upon power failure or receipt of scram signal the rods will fall freely into the core. The control rod drive mechanism is rated at 6 in./min.

When operating at low power, up to 100 kw, convective cooling will be sufficient to cool the core. For operation at power levels in excess of 100 kw, water will be pumped through the core at 700 gpm and recirculated via a holdup tank to allow essentially all of the N^{16} activity to decay.

The reactor is to be housed in a 48' wide x 120' long bay of the Radioactive Materials Laboratory Building. The exterior construction consists of aluminum panels fastened to structural framework. Estimated leakage rate with all doors closed and the ventilator off is estimated to be one air change in 32 hours.

The site selected by Curtiss-Wright for its research facilities comprises 51,175 acres of which 8,579 are owned outright and 42,596 leased from the State of Pennsylvania for 99 years. This tract, approximating a circle of 10 miles diameter, lies in North Central Pennsylvania encompassing portions of Elk, Cameron and Clearfield Counties.

The reactor itself will be located a minimum of 3 miles from the present boundary of the property. The countryside surrounding the site is largely uninhabited with the closest towns of any appreciable size being 10 miles from the reactor. The area within a 25 mile radius has a population density of approximately 28 people/sq. mile.

PART II - HAZARDS ANALYSIS

1. General Considerations

There is an extensive body of relevant knowledge and successful operating experience for reactors of the type under consideration. Pool-type

reactors using fuel elements and having core arrangements generally similar to those proposed for this reactor have been safely and successfully operated for several years. The power levels of these reactors are in the 10-100 kilowatt range for the Geneva demonstration reactor and the Penn State Reactors, the few megawatt range for the Oak Ridge Reactors and the many megawatt range for the MTR.

Although none of these previously built and operated units ¹⁵ are exactly duplicated in the design of the proposed reactor, and while there are certain features proposed for this reactor, such as the greater flexibility occasioned by the large number of available fuel positions (54), which will require special attention prior to the issuance of operational approval, the stability and predictability of pool-type reactors has been demonstrated by the extensive successful operation of these reactors and there is no reason to doubt that an adequately engineered and carefully constructed reactor of the type proposed by the applicant should be capable of safe operation.

One feature of importance in these considerations is the characteristic of negative temperature coefficient shared by this reactor in common with others of this type. The negative temperature coefficient contributes to both the static stability and the dynamic stability of the reactor. A reactor possesses static stability in changing temperatures if it decreases in reactivity with an increase in temperature (negative temperature coefficient), i.e., if for any cause there is a rise of temperature within the reactor, the effective multiplication factor, or its ability to sustain a chain reaction, will then tend to decrease. Consequently, the rate of heat production or power level will

also decrease, tending to offset the rise in temperature. Conversely, if the temperature coefficient were positive, the reactor would be unstable to temperature changes. The proposed Curtiss-Wright reactor possesses a relatively strong negative temperature coefficient of reactivity, which tends to insure stability in the event of probable types of power excursions. This characteristic of a strong negative temperature coefficient is consistent with the operating experience of other reactors of the MTR type.

The extent of density changes in the coolant or moderator brought about by changes in temperature ^{has} have a strong influence on the sign and magnitude of the overall temperature coefficient. However, such density changes do not result instantaneously from temperature variations in the fuel elements, and as a result oscillations may develop in the neutron flux and reactor power. If such oscillations are rapidly damped out because of the inherent features of the reactor, the reactor is said to have good dynamic stability. Although this phenomenon has not been completely analyzed with respect to the proposed reactor, its general aspects should not be significantly difference from satisfactory observations of this characteristic made in existing reactors having similar nuclear characteristics.

2. Radiation

INSERT

Realistic appraisal of the maximum accidents considered credible for this reactor has not been made. This will be done at a later time. In lieu thereof the applicant presents results of calculations on the consequences of total release of all fission products in the most unfavorable physical state and under various meteorological conditions, including the most pessimistic

2. Radiation. Since an appraisal of the maximum credible accident has not yet been made, it has not been possible accurately to evaluate the effects of such an accident on the operating personnel of the applicant or upon the public in the areas adjacent to the reactor site. The present plans of the applicant do not include a vapor shell, and the protection of the public in the event of an accident is largely dependent on the isolation of the reactor. Whether operation under these conditions will prove to be acceptable will, of course, depend upon the results of an analysis of the maximum credible accident (which must be defined and ^{agreed upon} ~~agreed upon~~ prior to initial operation) and a determination that the level of containment proposed, when considered in conjunction with the isolation of the reactor, is sufficient to protect the public.

In lieu of a calculation based on the as yet undetermined maximum/credible accident, the applicant has presented the results of calculations which would indicate that, ~~even~~ should all the fission products from equilibrium operation at 1 MW be released under the most unfavorable meteorological conditions, ~~the~~ ^{SOME} ~~chances that persons off-site would receive dangerous exposure are reasonably low.~~ ^{MIGHT BE SUBJECT TO LEVELS OF IRRADIATION EXCEEDED WHEN ARE CONSIDERED SAFE FOR CONTINUED EXPOSURE AND IT WOULD PROBABLY BE NECESSARY TO INSTITUTE EVACUATION PROCEDURES} However, based on a rather extensive body of relevant knowledge and successful operational experience with pool-type reactors, we believe that, when the maximum credible accident for this reactor has been defined, it will involve a release of much less than 100% of the fission products and ^{THAT} the risk to the public will, ~~therefore,~~ be shown to be acceptably low.

3. Summary. The application has been reviewed at this time only for the purpose of determining whether, based on information contained in the application, and taking into account the wealth of experience which has been gained from operation of reactors of this general type, there is reasonable assurance that a facility of this general type, to be operated in the range of power

levels proposed, can be designed, constructed and operated at the proposed site without undue risk to the health and safety of the public.

In making this determination, it has not been necessary ^{as has been pointed out previously,} to define the magnitude of the maximum accident which it is credible to expect might actually occur in this reactor. It has also not been necessary to examine closely those details of reactor design, the proposed instrumentation system, or the plan of operating procedures which have been presented thus far by the applicant.

Prior to the time when the reactor, as built, is allowed to go critical, a final evaluation of the hazard aspects of the completed reactor, the operating and supervisory procedures, and the emergency plans, must show that there is reasonable assurance that the reactor, whose detailed design is then known, can be operated as proposed without undue risk to the health and safety of the public.

ones. Even under these conditions, which may be conceded to be unrealistic, the maximum radiation dose at the nearest site boundaries does not greatly exceed what is considered a non-injurious, permissible emergency dose and is not in the lethal range. Realistic doses which ^{might} could be expected from more credible accidents and dispersal conditions would be many times lower, ^{and hence} ~~would be in the acceptable range.~~

3. Summary

~~The application has been reviewed as has been pointed out previously. Based on the above considerations, but without attempting at this time to ascertain what credible accident ^{the magnitude of the maximum} might actually occur in this reactor (through ^{which} there would certainly be less than the maximum situation assumed above) ~~or~~ and without examining closely those details of the reactor design, the proposed instrumentation system, or the plan of operating procedures, which have been presented thus far by Curtiss-Wright in its application for license, ^{only for the purpose of determining} ~~it is concluded that there~~ ^{whether} is reasonable assurance that a reactor of this general type, to be operated ^{in range of} ~~at~~ the power level proposed, can be designed, constructed and operated at the proposed site without undue risk to the health and safety of the public.~~

~~This conclusion is reached with the understanding that, prior to the time when the reactor, as built, is allowed to go critical, a final evaluation of the hazard aspects of the completed reactor, the operating and supervisory procedures, and the emergency plans, must show that there is reasonable assurance that the reactor, whose detailed design is then known, can be operated as proposed without undue risk to the health and safety of the public.~~

PART III - TECHNICAL QUALIFICATIONS

Since 1947 Curtiss Wright in conjunction with the AEC and the Air Force has been actively engaged in the study of various proposals for nuclear aircraft

power plants including calculations relating to a large number of reactor types. The Nuclear Power Department of the company's Research Division now employs about 200 persons of whom fifty are directly involved in nuclear physics and instrumentation and health physics.

Supervisory Personnel associated with ^{the} proposed reactor have had broad and experience at a number of varied installations devoted to nuclear research and technology including the Oak Ridge School of Reactor Technology, the Oak Ridge School of Nuclear Studies, the Oak Ridge National Laboratory, the Argonne National Laboratory, the Savannah River Plant, Pennsylvania State University, and the University of Rochester.

PART IV - FINANCIAL QUALIFICATIONS OF APPLICANT

Estimated cost of the facility is \$2,470,549 and its estimated annual operating expense ¹⁵⁴ ~~is~~ \$960,000. The inventory of special nuclear material is not expected to exceed \$60,000 at any one time.

Curtiss Wright's total current assets at December 31, 1955, were \$194,000,000 while current liabilities were \$69,000,000 making a current ratio of 2.8 to 1. Its total assets amounted to \$227,000,000 in which stockholders' equity was \$158,000,000 or 69.4 per cent. There is no long term debt.

Net sales have risen from \$176,000,000 in 1951 to \$509,000,000 in 1955. In the same period net income after taxes has increased from \$7,000,000 to \$35,000,000.

It is concluded from the above that Curtiss-Wright is financially qualified to construct and operate the research reactor for which it has sought a license and to pay Commission charges for the use and loss or consumption of special nuclear material loaned it.

PART V - CONCLUSIONS

Based upon the above considerations it is concluded that:

- a. There is reasonable assurance that a facility of the general type proposed can be constructed and operated at the proposed site without undue risk to the health and safety of the public.
- b. The applicant is technically and financially qualified to engage in the proposed activities.

FOR THE DIVISION OF CIVILIAN APPLICATION

H. L~~A~~ Price
Director

MEMO ROUTE SLIP Form AEC-93 (Rev. May 14, 194)		See me about this. Note and return.	For conc. nce. For sign.	For action. For information.
TO (Name and unit) <i>F. Ray</i>	INITIALS DATE	REMARKS		
TO (Name and unit)	INITIALS DATE	REMARKS		
TO (Name and unit)	INITIALS DATE	REMARKS		
FROM (Name and unit) <i>H. J. DeMan</i>	REMARKS <i>I do think we have to make a determination at construction permit stage of maximum credible accident (MCA) & whether or not more provision in discussing the accident postulated by the present and future the</i>	REMARKS		
PHONE NO.	DATE	REMARKS		

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS 16-56667-1 U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE

CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

The Curtiss Wright Corporation (hereinafter referred to as "Curtiss Wright") on October 24, 1956, filed its application for Class 104 license to construct and operate a nuclear reactor (hereinafter referred to as "the reactor").

The Atomic Energy Commission (hereinafter referred to as the "Commission") ~~)~~ has found that:

- A. The reactor will be a utilization facility as defined in the Commission's regulations contained in Title 10, Chapter 1, C.F.R., Part 50, "Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities."
- B. Curtiss Wright proposes to utilize the reactor in the conduct of research and development activities of the types specified in Section 31 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954.
- C. Curtiss Wright is financially qualified to construct and operate the reactor in accordance with the regulations contained in Title 10, Chapter 1, C.F.R.; to assume financial responsibility for the payment of Commission charges for special nuclear material and to undertake and carry out the proposed use of such material for a reasonable period of time.
- D. Curtiss Wright is technically qualified to design and construct the reactor.

of the same type

E. Curtiss Wright has submitted sufficient information to provide reasonable assurance that ~~the~~ ^a reactor can be constructed and operated at the proposed location without undue risk to the health and safety of the public and that additional information required to complete its application will be supplied.

F. The issuance of a construction permit to Curtiss Wright will not be inimical to the common defense and security and to the health and safety of the public.

Pursuant to the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and Title 10, C.F.R., Chapter 1, Part 50, "Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities", the Commission hereby issues a construction permit to Curtiss Wright to construct the reactor as a utilization facility. This permit shall be deemed to contain and be subject to the conditions specified in Sections 50.54 and 50.55 of said regulations; is subject to all applicable provisions of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954 and rules, regulations and orders of the Atomic Energy Commission now or hereafter in effect; and is subject to any additional conditions specified or incorporated below.

4
A. The earliest completion date of the reactor is ~~June~~ ^{July} 1, 1957. The latest date for completion of the reactor is ~~December~~ ^{January 31} 31, 1957. The term "completion date" as used herein means the date on which construction of the reactor is completed except for the introduction of the fuel material.

~~SECRET~~

B. The site proposed for the location of the reactor is the location at Quehanna, Pennsylvania specified in the Preliminary Hazards Evaluation Report accompanying the application filed October 29, 1956.

C. ~~The general type of facility authorized for construction is a 1000 kilowatt pool-type research reactor. The reactor shall be constructed in accordance with design and performance specifications set forth in the Preliminary Hazards Evaluation Report accompanying the application filed October 29, 1956.~~

light water cooled and moderated research reactor

designed to operate at a thermal power level of 1,000 kilowatts as described in the application

When did the permit expire?

This permit is subject to submittal by Curtiss Wright to the Commission (by proposed amendment of the application) of the complete, final Hazards Summary Report (portions of which may be submitted and evaluated from time to time) and a finding by the Commission that the final design provides reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation of the reactor in accordance with the specified procedures.

Upon completion (as defined in Paragraph "A" above) of the construction of the facility in accordance with the terms and conditions of this permit, upon the filing of any additional information needed to bring the original application up to date, and upon finding that the facility authorized has been constructed in conformity with the application as amended and in conformity with the provisions of the Act and of the rules and regulations of the Commission, and in the absence of any good cause being shown to the Commission why the granting of a license would be in accordance with

the provisions of the Act, the Co

the provisions of the Act, the Commission will issue a Class 104 license to Curtiss Wright pursuant to Section 104c of the Act, which license shall expire twenty (20) years after the date of this construction permit.

Pursuant to Section 50.60 of the regulations in Title 10, Chapter 1, C.F.R., Part 50, The Commission has allocated to Curtiss Wright for use in the operation of the reactor, 8.1 kilograms of uranium 235 contained in uranium at the isotopic ratios specified in Curtiss Wright's application as amended, Estimated schedules of special nuclear material transfers to Curtiss Wright and returns to the Commission are contained in Appendix "A" which is attached hereto. Deliveries by the Commission to Curtiss Wright's return to the Commission of special nuclear material substantially in accordance with schedule 2 of Appendix "A".

Curtiss Wright in accordance with schedule 1 in Appendix A will be conditional upon

FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

Director
Division of Civilian Application

Attachment:
Appendix "A"

Date of Issuance:

APPENDIX "A" TO CURTISS WRIGHT'S
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT
DOCKET NO. F-39

SCHEDULE 1

Estimated Schedule of Transfers of Special Nuclear Material from the Commission to Curtiss Wright

<u>Calendar Year of transfer</u>	<u>Kilograms of Contained U-235</u>
1957	6.0
1959	4.0
1960-1976 (17 yrs. total of 5.0 per year)	
Total transfers	<u>85.0</u> 95.0

SCHEDULE 2

Estimated Schedule of Transfers of Special
Nuclear Material from Curtiss-Wright to the Commission

<u>Calendar Year of Transfer</u>	<u>Kilograms of Contained U-235 Recoverable Scrap</u>	<u>Spent Fuel</u>	<u>Total</u>
1957	1.5	-	1.5
1959	0.8	3.0	3.8
1960 - 1976 (17 years total)	17.0 <u>1/</u>	64.6 <u>2/</u>	81.6
1977 - <i>Return of Inventory</i>	-	4.4	4.4
		<u>72.0</u>	<u>91.3</u>

1/ 1.0 kilogram per year.

2/ 3.8 kilograms per year.

UNITED STATES ATOMIC
ENERGY COMMISSION

CURTISS-WRIGHT CORPORATION
(DOCKET NO. F-39)

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT

Please take notice that the Atomic Energy Commission proposes to issue to the Curtiss Wright Corporation a construction permit substantially as set forth in Appendix A below unless on or before ~~XX~~ 15 days after publication of this notice in the Federal Register a request for formal hearing is filed in the manner prescribed by Section 2.102(b) of the Commission's Rules of Practice (10 CFR Part 2). There is annexed as Appendix B a Memorandum submitted by the Division of Civilian Application which summarizes the principal features of the proposed reactor and the principal factors considered in reviewing the application for license. For further details see the application for license at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W. Washington, D. C.

FOR THE ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

H. L. Price, etc.

Dated at Washington, D. C.
this ____ day of March 1957.

Mr. James T. Ramsey
~~Honorable Carl T. Durham~~ *Executive Director*
Chairman, Joint Committee on Atomic Energy
Congress of the United States

Dear Mr. ~~Durham~~ *Ramsey*:

This is to advise the Joint Committee that the Atomic Energy Commission is submitting for publication in the Federal Register the attached notice of its proposed issuance of a construction permit to Curtiss Wright Corporation for a 1000 kilowatt pool-type research reactor to be located at Quehanna, Pennsylvania. Attached to the notice is a memorandum of the Director, Division of Civilian Application setting forth principal features of the proposed reactor and the principal factors considered in reviewing the application.

You will be advised of ~~any~~ further action taken in this matter.

Sincerely yours,

~~General Manager~~

H. P. ...

etc

D R A F T

Curtiss-Wright Corporation
Research Division
Brighton Road
Clifton, N. J.

Gentlemen:

Transmitted herewith is a notice of the proposed issuance of a construction permit for a 1000-kilowatt pool-type research reactor proposed to be constructed by you at Quehanna, Pennsylvania.

Paragraph E of your application ~~is~~ amendment filed on December 28, 1956, states in part as follows:

...To allow the fuel element fabricator sufficient working excess, application is hereby made for 6 KG of U-235 in the following form:

indent { 4.5 Kg of U-235 to be delivered to the applicant named herein. Accountability and return to the Atomic Energy Commission, of the balance, to be the responsibility of the Fabricator.

You will note, however, that the issuance of the special nuclear material allocation in the proposed construction permit is not to be ^{constructed} ~~constructed~~ as an approval by the AEC of the transfer to your fabricator of financial responsibility for any portion of the material which may be shipped to it by the Commission on your order.

In order that your fabricator may assume this responsibility, it will be necessary for it to submit to the Commission a request for authorization to assume financial responsibility for all or a portion of the special nuclear

material. Such a request should include information regarding the fabricator's financial qualifications to assume that responsibility.

Sincerely yours,

HLPrice

Enclosure:
Notice of Proposed Issuance
of Construction Permit

bcc: Nelson
Davis, Attn: Loeb
Musser
Southwick
Lowenstein
Stank

f-39

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT
TO CURTISS WRIGHT CORPORATION
DOCKET NO. F-39

(Note by the General Manager)

1. This is to advise the Commission that the Director, Division of Civilian Application, has submitted for publication in the Federal Register a notice of the proposed issuance of a construction permit to Curtiss Wright Corporation for a 1000 kilowatt pool-type research reactor to be located at Quehanna, Pennsylvania.
2. Accompanying the notice submitted for publication to the Federal Register is the memorandum attached hereto.

K. E. Fields
General Manager

H. L. Price, Director
Division of Civilian Application

NOTICE OF PROPOSED ISSUANCE OF CONSTRUCTION PERMIT TO CURTISS WRIGHT CORPORATION,
DOCKET NO. F-39

Subject to your approval, I propose to submit for publication in the Federal Register the attached notice of the proposed issuance of a construction permit to Curtiss-Wright Corporation for a 1000 kilowatt pool-type research reactor sought to be constructed at Quehanna, Pennsylvania. Included in the construction permit will be an allocation of ~~8.1~~^{8.1} kg. of contained uranium 235 in accordance with a schedule of transfers and returns of special nuclear material attached as Appendix A to the construction permit.

The license application for the subject facility was filed by Curtiss - Wright on October 29, 1956. The requested period for the license is twenty (20) years. Notice of the application was published in the Federal Register on November 15¹⁹⁵⁶,₂₁ FR 8892.

The proposed facility is to be used for an experimental program to include shielding studies, reactor component and instrument development, investigation of radiation damage, and neutron physics. In addition the reactor is proposed to be used for isotope production, activation analysis, and a very limited scale, training purposes.

A Preliminary Hazards Evaluation Report submitted by Curtiss-Wright has

been reviewed by the technical staff and the details of its review are contained in the attached Memorandum, which Memorandum will also accompany the notice proposed to be submitted for publication in the Federal Register.

Also included in the Memorandum is the Division of Finance's evaluation of Curtiss-Wright's financial capabilities respecting this project and a discussion of Curtiss-Wright's technical qualifications. The special nuclear material allocation contained in the proposed construction permit and the schedule of transfers and returns attached to the construction permit were prepared by the Division of Nuclear Materials Management.

The following additional action is proposed to be taken:

- a. The Commission will be informed. A draft Information Paper is attached for your approval.
- b. The JCAE will be informed. ~~The attached letter to its Chairman has been prepared for your signature.~~
- c. A public announcement will be made. A draft announcement prepared by the Division of Information Services is attached for your approval.
- d. If no ~~protests~~ or petitions to intervene are filed within the time fixed in the attached notice, the construction permit will be issued; notice thereof will be published in the Federal

Register; the JCAE will be informed; and a public announcement will be made. If ~~protests~~ petitions to intervene are filed you will be immediately notified.

APPROVED:

CONCUR:

General Manager

Office of the General Counsel

Date

Date

Enclosures:

1. Notice of Proposed Issuance
2. Draft information Paper
- ~~3. Draft Public Announcement~~
3. Draft Public Announcement

cc: R. Lowenstein, OGC
B. S. Loeb, RD
D. F. Musser, NMM
C. A. Nelson, INS
R. Southwick, IS

*W.B. Mohr, SEC, w/ copy of memo.
Stall*