

FROM: Federal Power Commission
 Washington, D. C. 20427
 T. A. Phillips

DATE OF DOCUMENT: 2-9-72 DATE RECEIVED: 2-11-72 NO.: 77
 LTR. MEMO: REPORT: OTHER:

TO: Lester Rogers

ORIG.: I signed & I cc CC: OTHER:

ACTION NECESSARY CONCURRENCE DATE ANSWERED:
 NO ACTION NECESSARY COMMENT BY:

FILE CODE: 50-269 (ENVIRO FILE)

REFERRED TO	DATE	RECEIVED BY	DATE
Keppler W/2 cys for ACTION	2-11-72		
DISTRIBUTION:			
Reg Files			
AEC PDR			
Compliance (2)			
Paulina			
M. Fitzpatrick			
DeYoung			
N. Dube			
Morris/Schroeder			
Schwencer			
Karas			
J. DiMunno, A-170	GT		

CLASSIF: U POST OFFICE REG. NO:

DESCRIPTION: (Must Be Unclassified)
 Ltr re their 1-13-72 ltr...furnishing corrections to inconsistency that was included in tabulation on page 2 regarding the projected capacity-

ENCLOSURES: load-reserve margin situation.....

REMARKS:
 1 Cy local PDR (Walhalla, S. C.)

DO NOT REMOVE
 ACKNOWLEDGED

727 fod

012300 224 A



FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION
WASHINGTON D.C. 20426

IN REPLY REFER TO:
PWR-ER

50 - 269

Mr. Lester Rogers
Director, Division of Radiological
and Environmental Protection
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Mr. Rogers:

It has come to my attention that an inconsistency was inadvertently included in the tabulation on page 2 of my letter to you dated January 13, 1972, regarding the projected capacity-load-reserve margin situation that may obtain on the Duke Power Company system with and without the capacity expected from the Oconee No. 1 nuclear fueled unit.

The Cliffside No. 5, 590 megawatt, fossil fueled unit of the Duke Power Company was included in the net capability of the Virginia-Carolina Subregion, but not in the net capability of the Duke Power Company. Initial information had indicated that this unit was scheduled for commercial operation in April 1972, and thus would aid in meeting the 1972 summer peak load. Subsequent information indicated that the commercial operation of this unit in time for the 1972 summer peak was unlikely, and it was therefore not included in the net capability of the Duke Power Company. Please subtract this 590 megawatts of capacity from the net capability of the Virginia-Carolina Subregion for this period. This reduces the projected subregion reserves to 1,042 megawatts (5.1 percent) without Oconee No. 1 and to 1,928 megawatts (9.4 percent) with Oconee No. 1. This makes the impact of the absence of the Oconee No. 1 unit on the reserve margin situation of the subregion even greater than initially indicated.

Since the January 13, 1972 date of my letter, a further note of concern has been observed. There is increasing likelihood that the Surry No. 1 unit of the Virginia Electric and Power Company will not be in commercial operation at the time of the 1972 summer peak. If this should be the case, the subregion's reserve margin would be further reduced to 222 megawatts without Oconee No. 1 and to 1,108 megawatts with Oconee No. 1.

Very truly yours,

T. A. Phillips
Chief, Bureau of Power

727