DR Central File

UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIRECTORATE OF REGULATORY OPERATIONS
REGION I
631 PARK AVENUE
KING OF PRUSSIA, PENNSYLVANIA 19406

NOV 14 1974

Niagara Mohawk Power Corporation
Attention: Mr. R. R. Schneider
Vice President
300 Erie Boulevard, West
Syracuse, New York 13202

Docket No. 50-410
License No. CPPR-112
Insp. No. 74-01

Reference: Your letter dated November 8, 1974
In response to our letter dated October 16, 1974

Gentlemen:

Thank you for your letter informing us of your review of the documents submitted with the referenced letter.

In accordance with Section 2.790 of the AEC's "Rules of Practice", Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of your letter and this letter will be placed in the Public Document Room.

Please note that a typographical correction should be noted in the report Details, Paragraph 3.c, where PSAR section "R-D.7" should read "R-D.8."

Sincerely,

Robert T. Carlson
for Robert T. Carlson, Chief
Facility Construction & Engineering
Support Branch

cc: Eugene B. Thomas, Jr., Esquire

bcc: (w/Reference)
RO Chief, FC&ES Branch
RO:HQ (5)
DL (13)
DR Central Files
RS (3)
PDR
Local PDR
RO Files
NSIC
TIC
~~RO:I Regulatory Re. Hng. Room~~
OGC
State of New York

BN

NIAGARA MOHAWK POWER CORPORATION

NIAGARA MOHAWK

300 ERIE BOULEVARD WEST
SYRACUSE, N.Y. 13202

November 8, 1974

Mr. Robert T. Carlson
Facility Construction & Engineering Support Branch
United States Atomic Energy Commission
Directorate of Regulatory Operations
Region 1
631 Park Ave
King of Prussia PA 19406

Dear Mr. Carlson:

RE: Docket No. 50-410
License No. CPPR-112
Inspection No. 74-01

We have reviewed the subject report and find no proprietary information which would necessitate petitioning a separation from this document under the rules of Section 2.790 of the AEC's "Rules of Practice", Part 2, Code of Federal Regulation.

We find one statement in the report which we feel is either misstated or misleading as stated. In the section titled "Details", paragraph 3-C, it is stated; "No design review meetings have yet been held in accordance with PSAR section R-D.7 and Project Procedure No. 7". Since design review meetings have been held and we have documentary evidence of the same, we feel it would be more accurate to state; "Design review meetings have been held but no systems have completed the design review cycle in accordance with PSAR section R-D.7 and Project Procedure No. 7". We request that you make an appropriate change in the final report.

Very truly yours,

R. R. Schneider
Vice President -
Electric Operations

JJB:RRS:ls