

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

July 26, 1995

United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Attention: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

Serial No. 95-007A
NL&P/CGL R0
Docket Nos. 50-338
50-339
50-280
50-281
License Nos. NPF-4
NPF-7
DPR-32
DPR-37

Gentlemen:

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY
NORTH ANNA POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2
SURRY POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2
REASSESSMENT OF USE OF THERMO-LAG
IN RADIANT ENERGY SHIELD APPLICATION

In a March 28, 1995 letter (Serial No. 95-007), we stated that we no longer rely on Thermo-Lag for any 1-hour or 3-hour rated fire barriers and that we were reassessing our use of Thermo-Lag as radiant energy shields inside containment. Our letter indicated that we would advise the NRC of the results of our reassessment by June 30, 1995. On June 21, 1995, Mr. D. A. Sommers of my staff spoke with Messrs. L. Engle and B. Buckley of the NRC and requested a 30 day extension to complete the reassessment. The purpose of this letter is to advise you of the results of that effort and our planned actions.

Our reassessment addressed the following two options regarding the use of Thermo-Lag as radiant energy shields inside containment at North Anna and Surry.

- Develop technically justified exemption requests for North Anna and Surry for review and approval by the NRC.
- Replace the Thermo-Lag radiant energy shields inside containment. This option considered the use of rigid, fire-resistant, structural insulation (i.e., Marinite board) for use as free-standing panels or box enclosures and the use of 1-hour rated cable where conduit wrap is required.

010061

9508010111 950726
PDR ADDCK 05000280
P PDR

A029
110

Both the exemption request and replacement options are identified by the NRC as possible solutions in Attachment 1 to Information Notice 95-27, "Thermo-Lag 330-1 Combustibility Evaluation Methodology Plant Screening Guide," issued on March 13, 1995. Based upon detailed review of these options, we have decided to develop technically justified exemption requests for review and approval by the NRC. The replacement option was not chosen in view of the technical merit of the exemption requests, as well as the estimated cost and the potential radiation exposure associated with the replacement effort.

We will submit the North Anna and Surry exemption requests to the NRC by December 15, 1995 for review and approval. This schedule allows us to consider any near-term developments that may result from the ongoing discussions between the NRC and NEI regarding Thermo-Lag applications. In the interim, continued operability is technically justified by the existing Engineering Evaluations 24 and 16 for North Anna and Surry, respectively. These engineering evaluations were previously transmitted to the NRC for information by a December 23, 1993 letter (Serial No. 92-834A) and will be retained in the North Anna and Surry Appendix R reports pending NRC review and approval of the associated exemption requests.

If you have questions regarding this information or require additional information, please contact us.

Very truly yours,



James P. O'Hanlon
Senior Vice President - Nuclear

cc: U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, N. W.
Suite 2900
Atlanta, Georgia 30323

Mr. R. D. McWhorter
NRC Senior Resident Inspector
North Anna Power Station

Mr. M. W. Branch
NRC Senior Resident Inspector
Surry Power Station

Mr. R. E. Bradley
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006