

TERA



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

July 28, 1980

Docket No. 50-409

Mr. Frank Linder  
General Manager  
Dairyland Power Cooperative  
2615 East Avenue, South  
LaCrosse, Wisconsin 54601

Dear Mr. Linder:

SUBJECT: LACROSSE BOILING WATER REACTOR

To support your answer to the Order to Show Cause dated February 25, 1980, you initiated a field investigation program to collect data to demonstrate densification of the sands beneath safety related structures due to the piledriving operations. In the course of this work, borings DM 12 and DM 13 showed voids directly under the turbine building mat. You are requested to submit an evaluation of the significance of these voids within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Enclosed are seven questions which we expect you to address in your evaluation.

Sincerely,

*for* *Thomas V. Wambach*  
Dennis M. Crutchfield, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #5  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page

8008080/22

P

Mr. Frank Linder

- 2 -

July 28, 1980

cc w/enclosure:

Fritz Schubert, Esquire  
Staff Attorney  
Dairyland Power Cooperative  
2615 East Avenue South  
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601

O. S. Heistand, Jr., Esquire  
Morgan, Lewis & Bockius  
1800 M Street, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Mr. R. E. Shimshak  
La Crosse Boiling Water Reactor  
Dairyland Power Cooperative  
P. O. Box 135  
Genoa, Wisconsin 54632

Coulee Region Energy Coalition  
ATTN: George R. Nygaard  
P. O. Box 1583  
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601

La Crosse Public Library  
800 Main Street  
La Crosse, Wisconsin 54601

Mrs. Ellen Sabelko  
Society Against Nuclear Energy  
929 Cameron Trail  
Eau Claire, Wisconsin 54701

Town Chairman  
Town of Genoa  
Route 1  
Genoa, Wisconsin 54632

Chairman, Public Service Commission  
of Wisconsin  
Hill Farms State Office Building  
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Alan S. Rosenthal, Esq., Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Appeal Board  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. Frederick Milton Olsen, III  
609 North 11th Street  
LaCrosse, Wisconsin

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

U. S. Environmental Protection  
Agency  
Federal Activities Branch  
Region V Office  
ATTN: EIS COORDINATOR  
230 South Dearborn Street  
Chicago, Illinois 60604

Charles Bechhoefer, Esq., Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. George C. Anderson  
Department of Oceanography  
University of Washington  
Seattle, Washington 98195

Mr. Ralph S. Decker  
Route 4, Box 190D  
Cambridge, Maryland 21613

Dr. Lawrence R. Quarles  
Kendal at Longwood, Apt. 51  
Kenneth Square, Pennsylvania 19348

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

Ms. Anne K. Morse  
Coulee Region Energy Coalition  
Post Office Box 1583  
LaCrosse, Wisconsin 54601

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Resident Inspectors Office  
Rural Route #1, Box 225  
Genoa, Wisconsin 54632

LACROSSE  
QUESTIONS RELATIVE TO VOIDS  
UNDER TURBINE BUILDING  
MAT

Borings 12 and 13 in the NW corner of the turbine building have indicated 7-10 inch voids under the mat. You are requested to provide an evaluation of the significance of these voids within 30 days of receipt of this letter. You should consider the following points:

1. Description of geometry of voids under turbine building;
2. Determination if voids exist under other safety related structures and if so including this in your evaluation;
3. Significance of voids relative to the integrity of the mat under normal operating and seismic loads;
4. Significance of voids relative to the integrity of the pile foundation (e.g. pile cap joint, pile itself, etc.) under dynamic loads.
5. Validity of assumptions made in FTOL dynamic analysis relative to the modeling of the pile/mat foundation (i.e. with or without voids assumed);
6. Need for remedial action to correct voids; and
7. Justification for continued operation during your evaluation and during the period required to correct problems should any be identified.