



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

JUL 25 1980

TERA

Docket No. 50-338

Mr. J. H. Ferguson
Executive Vice President - Power
Virginia Electric and Power Company
Post Office Box 26666
Richmond, Virginia 23261

Dear Mr. Ferguson:

We have reviewed the information provided in your letter dated June 6, 1980 regarding the North Anna, Unit 1 Multiple Structure Amplified Response Spectrum (ARS) Concern. Your letter describes the actions which are being taken by you to resolve our concern regarding the response spectra used for calculating the response of systems attached to two or more structures with independent structural responses.

In order to complete our review of these matters for North Anna, Unit 1, it is necessary for us to obtain the additional information provided in the Enclosure to this letter. We request that you submit this information within 10 days following the completion of your evaluations. We understand that these evaluations are currently scheduled to be completed by you on September 15, 1980. Please inform us of any change in this completion date.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Tom Novak".

Thomas Novak, Assistant Director
for Operating Reactors
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

8008060450 P

Mr. J. H. Ferguson
Virginia Electric and Power Company

cc: Richard M. Foster, Esquire
1230 A Pearl Street
Denver, Colorado 80203

Michael W. Maupin, Esquire
Hunton, Williams, Gay and Gibson
P. O. Box 1535
Richmond, Virginia 23212

Alderman Library
Manuscripts Department
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, Virginia 22901

Mr. Edward Kube
Board of Supervisors
Louisa County Courthouse
P. O. Box 27
Louisa, Virginia 23093

Ellyn R. Weiss, Esquire
Sheldon, Harmon, Roisman and Weiss
1725 I Street, N.W., Suite 506
Washington, D. C. 20006

Commonwealth of Virginia
Council on the Environment
903 Ninth Street Office Building
Richmond, Virginia 23129

Mr. W. R. Cartwright, Station Manager
P. O. Box 402
Mineral, Virginia 23117

Mr. Anthony Gambardella
Office of the Attorney General
11 South 12th Street - Room 308
Richmond, Virginia 23219

Mr. Allan Tattersall
Resident Inspector/North Anna
c/o U.S. NRC
P. O. Box 128
Spotsylvania, Virginia 22553

Mrs. June Allen
412 Owens Drive
Huntsville, Alabama 35801

Mr. James Torson
501 Leroy
Socorro, New Mexico 87801

Mrs. Margaret Dietrich
Route 2, Box 568
Gordonsville, Virginia 22042

Mr. James C. Dunstance
State Corporation Commission
Commonwealth of Virginia
Blandon Building
Richmond, Virginia 23209

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Region III Office
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR
Curtis Building
6th and Walnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19106

Director, Technical Assessment Division
Office of Radiation Programs (AW-459)
U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
Crystal Mall #2
Arlington, Virginia 20460

Mr. Paul W. Purdom
Environmental Studies Institute
Drexel University
32nd and Chestnut Streets
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

Atomic Safety and Licensing
Appeal Board Panel
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

NORTH ANNA UNIT 1 - MULTIPLE
STRUCTURE ARS CONCERN

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

1. Summarize the results of your Phase I evaluations. Include a description of the evaluations performed and provide the bases for their acceptability. List the problems and systems found acceptable after the Phase I evaluations and the bases for their acceptability.
2. List the problems and systems requiring further evaluation under Phase II. For each problem, describe in detail the evaluations performed and provided detailed bases for the acceptability of these evaluations. Where the Independent Support Method of ARS is used to calculate system response, provide a detailed description of the program used and a detailed basis for the acceptability of both the program and the method of calculation. Where any method of evaluation has been accepted by the NRC on North Anna Unit 2, it is sufficient to refer to those evaluations for acceptability of the method. In cases where NRC acceptance has not been attained, a commitment to implement any restrictions on or modifications to the method required for NRC acceptability is appropriate.
3. Describe any modifications to the systems which were required, the reason(s) for these modifications, and the bases for their acceptability.