T.12
50-338
339

Vepco

VIRGINIA ELECTRIC AND POWER COMPANY, RICHMOND, VIRGINIA 23261

August 31, 1979

Mr. James P. O'Reilly, Director
Office of Inspection & Enforcement
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Region II
101 Marietta Street, Suite 3100
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Serial No. 552C/070279
PSE&C/CGC:mac:wang

Docket Nos. 50-338
50-339

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

This letter is a report of our progress concerning NRC I.E. Bulletin 79-14. In our letter of August 1, 1979 (S.N. 552/070279), we stated that we would re-verify that valve and operator weights used in computer analyzed seismic analyses are correct; this re-verification would be accomplished by determining weights used in the analyses and comparing them to weights given on design documents. The status of this effort is summarized below.

Table 1 (attached) is a numerical summary. Based on Unit 2 data, we have determined that approximately one half of all the computer analyzed seismic MSK's are acceptable and require no further review. Approximately one half of the remaining MSK's require valve weight verification from vendors. Based on results to date we expect that about one half of the valves requiring vendor weight verification will be compatible with the analyzed weight. Therefore, we expect roughly 65 percent of the total number of MSK's investigated will be acceptable without any detailed evaluation. Of those MSK's requiring further evaluation, none has to date been identified as a nonconformance. Should a nonconformance be found, we will comply with the Bulletin supplement of August 15, 1979 and immediately make an initial engineering judgement (within 2 days), followed by an analytical engineering evaluation (within 30 days) for Unit 1; for Unit 2 we will comply with the Bulletin as specified for licensees or permit holders as the case may be when the nonconformance is identified. Our target date for completing this valve and operator weight verification program and submitting our final report is October 30, 1979, which satisfies the Bulletin's requirements.

If you have any questions, please contact this office.

Very truly yours,

Sam C. Brown, Jr.
Senior Vice President - Power Station
Engineering and Construction

cc: Mr. Victor Stello, Director
Office of Inspection & Enforcement

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

TABLE 1*

SUMMARY OF VALVE AND OPERATOR WEIGHT REVIEW

	Unit 1	Unit 2
Total Number of Computer-Analyzed Seismic MSK's**	145	143
Total Number of MSK's with Acceptable Review	-	77
Number of MSK's containing no valves	46	37
Number of MSK's acceptable per previous I.E. Bulletin 79-04 review	5	2
Number of MSK's with valve weights within 10% of actual weight	-	36
Number of MSK's acceptable after engineering evaluation	-	2
Total Number of MSK's Requiring Evaluation or Vendor Verification of Valve Weights	-	66
Number of MSK's requiring vendor valve weight verification before review can start	77	33
Number of MSK's identified which require further evaluation	-	33

*This Table is a summary of the computer analyzed seismic MSK's. For Unit 1, 17 MSK's have not been reviewed to the point where they can be entered on the Table, which accounts for the blanks on the Unit 1 side.

This Table only represents data for MSK's analyzed originally by Stone & Webster. Data for MSK's (20 total) analyzed originally by others (Teledyne and Nuclear Services) is still being developed and is not included on this Table.

**An MSK is an isometric piping drawing.