

April 8, 1974

Note to File

NUCLEAR METALS PENDING ENFORCEMENT ACTIONS

Mr. Tuffin, President, Nuclear Metals, called me on April 4, 1974, and talked to me personally for over an hour. The purpose of Mr. Tuffin's call was to continue his efforts to familiarize me with his arguments against taking strong enforcement actions against Nuclear Metals. Mr. Tuffin was personally friendly, but his attitude was clearly one of bringing up every possible problem we had caused Nuclear Metals over the last year. Mr. Tuffin used expressions like "harassment", "prejudicial review by the office in general", threats made to him by senior Region I personnel (two cases: Nelson and Smith; Nelson and Knapp). He reiterated several times that Region I's efforts were out of proportion to the health problems at Nuclear Metals.

Mr. Tuffin mentioned several times the newness of their company (he recently purchased the company a year or two ago) and the cooperative attitude displayed by the company with Region I personnel. Mr. Tuffin stated several times that he was pleased that I had called him following the recent problem (possible inadvertent criticality) in which I congratulated him on the cooperative nature extended by his staff. Mr. Tuffin indicated that he was not knowledgeable of any one particular individual within Region I who was very knowledgeable on his particular type facility and he felt that our inspector's observations were not factual; he stated that our inspector did not fully inform him of all the items at the exit interview.

A186

I explained to Mr. Tuffin our views on the matters he discussed. I carefully informed him of our, once again, history with Nuclear Metals and reiterated the policy of Regulatory Operations. I reiterated that we were Regulators and our responsibilities were to enforce license provisions and the regulations. I indicated that our responsibilities were never popular with licensees who had a poor enforcement history, but that we were nevertheless always concerned with problems of the nature he was discussing. I told Mr. Tuffin once again that I would look into all matters that he brought up and that we were conducting a de- review of the issues without prejudice. Mr. Tuffin again mentioned the recent "problem" he had when a Miss Bradshaw from the AEC Public Information Office provided <sup>ed</sup> information to a Boston newspaper. He <sup>was</sup> quite annoyed at this matter; however, I was reasonably familiar with the issue and tried to put it into perspective. I do not believe that Miss Bradshaw did anything incorrectly. It is obvious that Mr. Tuffin is quite sensitive to criticism. Although this was not discussed with Mr. Tuffin it was my clear opinion, combined with separate telephone calls from his lawyer and telephone calls from his lawyer to my superiors in Washington, that Mr. Tuffin was going out of his way to influence Region I.

Although the information contained in this "note to file" sounds like he is making all sorts of tremendous allegations against Region I personnel and Regulatory Operations inspection program, the conversation really was not accusative. The entire conversation was quite friendly and each issue related to our enforcement posture. It was clear to me that there would have been no harassment, complaints, problems, etc., if there were no items of non-compliance or, as Mr. Tuffin will readily state, Region I had <sup>C</sup> more serious enforcement action under active consideration.

Dictated by JPO'R  
cc: Martin; Crocker; Kinnev; Nelson; Knapp

Jim