

UNITED STATES GOVERNMENT

Memorandum

TO : Files
(THRU) R. H. Bryan, Chief, Research and
Power Reactor Safety Branch, DL&R

DATE: March 27, 1964

FROM : F. N. Watson, Research and Power Reactor Safety Branch, Division of Licensing and Regulation *fnw*

SUBJECT: PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY - BODEGA BAY PLANT
CONSTRUCTION PERMIT APPLICATION

50-205

On March 18, 1964, a meeting concerning the above mentioned subject was held in Room 107 of the Bethesda Office. Those in attendance included:

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC CO.

C. C. Whelchel
F. F. Mautz
D. V. Kelly
P. A. Crane

GENERAL ELECTRIC

R. B. Lemon
D. McDaniel

U.S.A.E.C.

C. K. Beck
M. M. Mann
L. Kornblith
G. F. Hadlock
R. H. Bryan
J. F. Newell
F. N. Watson
M. K. Woodard
B. K. Grimes
H. R. Denton

In this meeting, representatives of the Pacific Gas and Electric Company expressed their intention to submit a new amendment to their application for construction permit for a nuclear power plant at Bodega Bay, California. This amendment would state the Company's intention to surround the reactor building, both on the sides and beneath the foundation, with a compressible or crushable material so that two inches of differential motion along the "Shaft Fault" could be absorbed with virtually no movement or other deleterious effect on the reactor building. They also expressed a belief that it could be shown that such a design would accommodate differential motion in the bedrock of as much as one foot without destroying the integrity of the reactor's ultimate containment system.

As a second item, PG&E representatives handed out copies of Amendment No. 7 to their application. An important item of this

(Continued)

amendment is a revised plot of earthquake induced accelerations as functions of period for various damping factors. Since this amendment had not been formally submitted, copies which had been handed out were collected and returned to Mr. Crane who expressed an intention to make a formal submittal immediately.

The PG&E representatives asked for comments from AEC representatives on both of these items. On both items AEC representatives stated that no immediate evaluation could be made but on the other hand no immediate objection to the design plan or the amendment was raised.

PG&E representatives stated they would submit the amendment describing plans for absorbing differential motion along the fault by early April. They further expressed a desire to present their case to the ACRS at the earliest possible date.

cc: E. G. Case
J. F. Newell