



UNITED STATES
ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION
DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE
REGION II - SUITE 818
230 PEACHTREE STREET, NORTHWEST
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

TELEPHONE: 526-4557

MAR 12 1971

Files

THRU: W. C. Seidle, Senior Reactor Inspector, Region II,
Division of Compliance

DRL MEETING - FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY (TURKEY POINT 3), LICENSE
NO. GPPR-27, DOCKET NO. 50-250 - FEBRUARY 23, 1971

1. Varela and Lewis attended a meeting at Bethesda on February 23, 1971,
to participate in a DRL/FP&L/Bechtel meeting on the containment dome
failure to establish the degree of repair and surveillance of the dome
that would be acceptable to Regulatory.

2. The following persons were in attendance:

G. Kinsman - FP&L	R. DeYoung - DRL
C. Halligan - Bechtel	P. Check - DRL
K. Lawes - Bechtel	C. Long - DRL
P. Marsh - Bechtel	R. Engelken - CO:HQ
J. Loenichen - Bechtel	J. Henderson - CO:HQ
R. Bensen - FP&L	A. Dromerick - DRS
N. Bhatia - Bechtel	R. Fraley - ACRS Staff
J. Olmstead - FP&L	B. Siess - ACRS
T. Johnson - Bechtel	E. Case - DRS
A. Glucksmann - DRS	L. Kornblith - CO:HQ
R. Maccary - DRS	L. Beratan - CO:HQ

3. Prior to commencement of the meeting, Check presented FP&L and their
consultants with a Regulatory position paper which listed two alter-
natives for the acceptable repair and surveillance program, if accepted,
that would be acceptable to Regulatory. Alternative 1 required that
all tendons whose sheaths had been punctured during concrete removal
be removed and replaced; that all damaged reinforcing steel that did not
meet acceptable standards be removed and replaced; and that surveillance
requirements be increased. Alternative 2 is a repair program which
permits acceptance of tendon wires with damage (indentations) up to
0.01 inch and reinforcing steel with a damage up to 1/4 inch. The
alternative also specified a significant increase in the surveillance
and testing of the dome tendons during the first three years of reactor
operation.

EJ05190126 710319
PDR ADOCK 05000250
A PDR

MAR 12 1971

Files

- 2 -

Bechtel made a presentation of their inspection effort and the preparation for concrete placement and stated that at about 95% of the inspection effort completed, approximately 1,000 tendon wires have damage of some magnitude, of which about 97 will exceed the maximum acceptable indentation of 0.01 inch. (The maximum permissible number of damaged wires that could exceed the acceptable criterion is 2% of the dome tendons or about 297 wires.) Bechtel discussed the tendon wire testing that had been performed at Prescon of wires that had been intentionally damaged by an air hammer and stated that none of the wires with damage up to 0.01 inch failed below the 240,000 psi tensile strength. Also, rebar with damage up to 1/4 inch successfully passed the 70,000 psi tensile strength. Bechtel also stated that they were developing a procedure which would permit repair of the rebar with damage in excess of 1/4 inch by welding. FP&L accepted Alternative 2, the repair and increased surveillance program. Following a complete discussion of each one of the Alternative 2 requirements, the Regulatory staff, including Dr. Siess, adjourned and discussed the requirements of Alternative 2 in private. The decision was made that no welding would be permitted on the damaged reinforcing steel and that 1/4-inch maximum indentation would be the maximum acceptable damage on the rebar. Also, since observation ports were part of the concrete placement program and would be permanent, an in-depth inspection of the replaced concrete could be performed and the application of Elastomeric coating prior to the proof test would be acceptable. The increased surveillance requires that 12 tendons (increased from 3) from the dome group be selected and surveyed at 6, 12, 24, and 36 months; and the data is to be reported to DRL within 10 days following performance of tests.

Technical Specification Meeting

Lewis attended a Technical Specification meeting with Check (DRL), Olmstead (FP&L Project Manager), and R. Bensen (FP&L Plant Superintendent) at Bethesda on February 24, 1971, to discuss the Technical Specification items that remain to be resolved prior to final submittal by FP&L. FP&L voiced no major disagreement during the discussions and plans to make a timely submittal of revised Technical Specifications.

R. C. Lewis
R. C. Lewis
Reactor Inspector

CO:II:RCL