

*file*

Project 245 ✓

January 24, 1961

Files

R. W. Sliger *Pres.*  
Test & Power Reactor Safety Branch

APPLICANT MEETING WITH DL&R

A meeting was held at 2:00 p.m. January 24, 1961 at AEC Headquarters for the purpose of discussing the Construction Permit for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station. Some of those in attendance were:

<u>AEC-DL&amp;R</u>	<u>AEC-GC</u>	<u>AEC-DRD</u>
H. Price	R. Lowenstein	F. Pittman
M. Biles	L. Kestenbaum	R. Pöhler
R. Sliger		D. Groelsema
L. Johnson		

<u>Philadelphia Elec. Co.</u>	<u>HTRDA</u>	<u>Bechtel</u>	<u>Gen. Atomics</u>
L. Gaty	I. McChesney	W. Dickenson	B. Fry
L. Everett			T. LeClair
E. Bradley			Kreutz
Fisher			S. Koutz

The following are the result of notes taken during the meeting.

Gaty: Mr. Price, I would like to have you repeat your statement made during our morning talk for the benefit of those now in attendance.

Price: Early this month I called Mr. Gaty to suggest a meeting to clarify the standing of his application. Earlier meeting dates than this one were not possible because of conflicts one way or the other.

To go back a little, we and ACRS began looking at the preliminary site about a year ago. Shortly after, we and ACRS agreed on the site for this kind of project. It is important to note that at that time the AEC proposed to adopt changes in rules to provide certain clauses to avoid construction without first getting a permit, and also to allow provisional construction permits and we could then reserve on the R&D results while design was firming up.

Then came the court decision on PRDC and under terms of that ruling was a question on the authority of AEC.

In late August 1960, AEC had to decide whether proposed rules would be allowed. They did not accept the provisional construction permit

A-158

proposal, principally because of the PRDC case.

Later in the year we received your more final preliminary report.

On the basis of this information you know better the ACRS remarks. I might add the staff is also optimistic about the project.

At this time, under the present rules we cannot let a construction permit. When could we release a provisional permit? In any case we do not intend to act before the pending Supreme Court ruling. We can look at the schedule of work to re-open case based on your results. I would guess this would be later than June 1961.

Fry: What is enough information?

Gaty: Yes - I was surprised to find Mr. Biles does not get information from all of the development labs.

Price: We only get information from you for the record that you wish to become public.

Pittman: Explains to Mr. Gaty the progress reports and the fact that we do see them but not for record.

Biles: ACRS members do not get all reports.

Fry: I don't know that all quarterly reports should be made public but then I don't know that reports is the answer.

Price: The only way we can clarify our position is to submit information for the public record.

Pittman: The reports referred to thus far would not necessarily give DL&R all the answers because much of the contents are raw data with no specific conclusions.

Price: We could not be bound to review everything submitted, we need to handle things for formal public record.

General Discussion: Subject of handling reports, there was no resolution.

Price: One way is to have informal meetings to present information.

Fry: I would like to ask two questions;

- 1) Is the R&D program as outlined agreeable in scope?
- 2) On graphite integrity - do the capsule and loop tests give enough information to allow acceptance of the data?

January 24, 1961

Price: It is my understanding that the scope of the R&D program was considered good.

Biles: Regarding item 2, probably if the results are good and depending on the PRDC decision then it could be that the present program is useable.

Gaty: Can we set up a meeting in La Jolla?

Fry: It seems that a series of meetings to put forth the evaluation of the problems and data is needed.

Sliger: Mr. Price, I'd like to say that these meetings should not be for purpose of showing us labs, work, and data collected but to show us what resolution to problem is reached, why valid and conclusions.

Price: Agreed, I'm sure these people accept this. Would it be helpful to present to you Mr. Gaty the items which are of concern to us?

Gaty: I'm sure it would.

Fry: Would it be possible to have a list of such items available for the meeting?

Gaty: A meeting in La Jolla could be very helpful if we could have such a list to discuss. May I suggest the middle of February?

Price: Third week of Feb. is bad. How about week of March 6?

Fry: Week of March 13-17 is better.

General Agreement of March 13-17 as a tentative date for review meeting in La Jolla, California.

General Group: Discussion on subject of detail drawings and operating conditions which were in general to be resolved in the final hazard report.

Biles: You people should consider that you may want to make the design such that during initial operating phases you may need to frequently shutdown and open the vessel for core examination.

The meeting was then adjourned by Mr. Price.

CC: File 245  
Biles (2)  
Sliger

TPRSB:DL&R  
Sliger;jwl  
1/27/61