

March 12, 1968

MEMO TO THE FILES

I called Mr. George Kinsman, Florida Power and Light Co., to talk about the construction problems they were having with cadweld and concrete. I told him I understood he was planning to write a report on the concrete question and he said this was correct. I also said it was my understanding that he d'd not intend to proceed with the "fix" until DRL reviewed the report and Mr. Kinsman said that was correct and that he had talked to Chuck Long and his group. He said it would be submitted to DRL but didn't know whether it would be by letter or report, since this is a new problem that they had run into. When asked if it would go into the Public Document Room I told him "yes". I asked about the cadwelds and if they would also write a report on this subject. Mr. Kinsman said he would be glad to handle it this way. At this point he wanted to put Gardner on the phone who was more familiar with this problem. Gardner said the latest development on the cadweld is that there is a difference of opinion re

B305250116 680521
PDR ADCK 05000250
A PDR

*Copy to Region II
3/14/68 j*

interpretation of cadweld; and in an attempt to resolve the difference of opinion they have developed criteria which will determine in a more specific manner which cadwelds will be accepted and which rejected. I told him his report should cover both the cadweld and concrete problems and give us a chance to look at it before they proceed with the "fix" so that we understand each other. He said they would be glad to do that. Gardner said they were hoping to be able to complete their proposal on cadweld some time this week and to discuss it with the Compliance people and with the Division of Reactor Licensing on the 20th. I told him it sounded like two separate meetings and he said this was the way they were starting out -- the cadweld is about ready to go but the concrete void situation is some time down the road yet.

I told him we will accommodate him the best way we can and if he wanted the cadweld first that would be fine.

I summarized my understanding as follows:

1. You are going to write reports on both cadweld and concrete.

2. You will state the problem and the date.
3. You will propose "fix" on each question and the basis for the "fix".
4. You will send the report (or reports) to DRL.

To each of the above questions Mr. Kinsman answered "yes". I told him it was my understanding that he did not plan to proceed with the "fix" until DRL and Compliance have had a chance to review and comment on the reports.

Marvin M. Mamm

cc: Harold L. Price
Pete Morris
L. D. Low

MEMO ROUTE SLIP

Form ABC-28 (Rev. May 14, 1967)

See me about this.
Note and return.

For concurrence
For signature.

For action.
For information.

TO (Name and unit)
Mr. Low

INITIALS
[Handwritten initials]
DATE
3/14

REMARKS
*Your question is -
Should this be confirmed
in writing?*

TO (Name and unit)
Engelken
O'Reilly
Kornblith

INITIALS
[Handwritten initials]
DATE
3/22

REMARKS
*3/14/68 - E.J. ^{done} Please make copy
for J. Long - Region II.*

TO (Name and unit)
Low
RHE

INITIALS
[Handwritten initials]
DATE
[Handwritten date]

REMARKS
*In answer to J.D. Low's question
I would say that decision is on
the Mann - Price level. My*

FROM (Name and unit)
Kepler
Wahr

REMARKS
*personal feeling is that all of these
"understandings" should be in writing.
We can include an appropriate statement
in our letter to Price indicating
our "understanding" of the agreement.*

PHONE NO. _____ DATE _____

USE OTHER SIDE FOR ADDITIONAL REMARKS

CAS-16-8003-1

GPO : 1967 - 877-337