

ocket File

R. S. Boyd, Assistant Director for Reactor Projects, DRL

MEETING WITH CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.  
INDIAN POINT NUCLEAR GENERATING UNIT NO. 3, DOCKET NO. 50-286

A meeting was held on August-12, 1969 with representatives of Consolidated Edison, United Engineers and Constructors, and Westinghouse to discuss some changes in the details of construction of the Consolidated Edison Indian Point 3 facility. An attendance list is attached.

Con Ed proposed the following changes:

- (1) Use of Type 2 rather than Type 1 cement. Type 1 cement is not available in the New York area. Both types of cement meet ACI standards.
- (2) Change in the specifications of the containment liner protective coating. The interior surface of the liner above elevation 63 feet 8 1/2 inches would be sand blasted rather than pickled and coated with Phenolene 305 rather than Carbolene 368. The liner below 63 feet 8 1/2 inches will be covered by stainless steel insulation. The surface will be pickled and then coated with Carbozinc 11.
- (3) Change in the rebar splice staggering specification. Con Ed proposes to change the staggering specification to a minimum of 1 foot 2 inches rather than 2 feet 4 inches as stated in reply to Question 5.4 Supplement 2. The dome stagger pattern would remain the same.
- (4) Change in the length of time between successive concrete lifts. Question 5.7 Supplement 2 states a one week elapse between pours. Con Ed proposes three days.
- (5) Some detail changes in the method of achieving drainage around the containment structure.

8111200165 690812  
ADOCK 05000286

OFFICE ▶

SURNAME ▶

DATE ▶

--	--	--	--	--	--	--

- (6) Relax the number of concrete slump tests from one per truckload to approximately one per 100 yards of concrete.

Except for the last item which may require some review on our part, we told Con Ed that we can see no evident problems, but would like to think them over before we commit ourselves. Con Ed will follow the present slump test schedule (one per truckload) until they again discuss it with us.

Len Trosten would prefer that Con Ed did not document these changes on the grounds that the construction permit has not yet been issued and any communication indicating changes could be grounds for reopening the hearing. Further, in his opinion a letter from Con Ed describing such changes would not be legally binding to the Company. He proposed to document all of these changes in the FSAR. I suggested that the only way to be sure of the basis of our technical review is to review written material. Further, informal agreements reached at meetings could appear as collusion. Len Trosten agreed to discuss this further with Arvin Upton and Troy Conner and felt that we could meet a mutual agreement in the matter of documentation.

Subsequently, by telephone, Len Trosten informed me that since the Commission does not have a set policy on documenting such changes, his advice to Con Ed will be to document the changes in the FSAR rather than by letter.

Original Signed by  
D. R. Muller

D. R. Muller, Chief  
Reactor Project Branch #1  
Division of Reactor Licensing

**Enclosure:  
Attendance list**

Distribution:  
Docket File  
RL Reading  
RPB-1 Reading  
D. J. Skovholt  
S. Levine  
D. R. Muller  
Branch Chiefs/RP  
CO (2)  
J. A. Murphy

N. M. Blunt  
G. Arndt  
A. Gluckmann  
RPB-1 Staff

OFFICE ▶	RL:RPB-1				
SURNAME ▶	Muller:lm				
DATE ▶	8/12/69				

ATTENDANCE LIST

CONSOLIDATED EDISON COMPANY OF NEW YORK, INC.

Consolidated Edison

J. Grob  
J. Souter  
V. Donella  
F. Flugger  
J. Prestele

Westinghouse

J. Stevenson  
R. Devine

United Engineers & Constructors

J. Slotterback  
S. Barnes

LeBoeuf, Lamb, Leiby & MacRae

L. Trosten

AEC/DRL

D. Muller  
A. Gluckmann  
G. Arndt

OFFICE						
SUP						