NORTH ANNA ENVIRONMENT & COALITION

Mr. Edson G. Case, Acting Director Nuclear Reactor Regulation U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D. C. 20555 P.O. BOX 3951

CHARLOTTESVILLE, VIRGINIA 22903 (717)533-7694 or (804)293-6039

January 7, 1978

Please Reply To NAEC/ 112 Hallmark North Briarcrest Gardens Hershey, PA 17033

Dear Mr. Case:

Thank you for your letter of December 27, 1977. Since it arrived in Charlottesville on December 30, I was not able to thank you in person on December 29.

At another time, I hope to have an opportunity to discuss its content with you. For today, let me ask you just one additional clarifying question: upon what date did your office or the AEC receive the <u>Dames & Moore Foundation Con-</u> ditions Report of May 8, 1969?

The purpose of today's letter is to call your attention to VEPCO's <u>REGIONAL EPICENTER MAP--Period</u>: January 21, 1974 through August 1, 1977.

The map would appear to provide undeniable evidence of the on-going seismic influence of Lake Anna -- most particularly at the point where the lake is intersected by Neuschel's or the Spotsylvania Lineament, a point marked by a cluster of 46 micro-earthquakes.

Does your position agree with that of VEPCO -- that the cause of the cluster "remains obscure"? If so, what is the logical step that translates obscurity into safety?

Should it not be the NRC position that such an anomalous cluster of 46 micro-earthquakes should be studied in relation to regional structures -- particularly the 38th parallel fracture zone and the Stafford and Neuschel's (Spotsylvania) Faults -- before monitoring is discontinued and approval given?

Has the NRC Division of Site Safety looked into the National Science Foundation 1977 studies of the Neuschel structure -- studies that move toward its confirmation as a regional fault? You may recall that Dr. Donald Wise, Piedmont geologist from the University of Massachusetts, expressed reservations about defending the North Anna site if the Neuschel's Lineament were actually a fault.

If the NRC has not looked into these matters thoroughly, are its licensing actions an act of faith rather than of proof?

A second purpose of today's letter is to ask the status of the SEISMIC RE-EVALUATION OF NORTH ANNA requested on April 22, 1977 by NRC's J. P. Knight, Assistant Director for Engineering, DSS. Did the NRC Staff ever apprise the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board of the existence of this re-evaluation called "a major milestone in the completion of the licensing action"? <u>Given its licensing significance</u>, how can you recommend licensing of North Anna before its completion? Thank you again.

June Allen (Mrs. P. M.) President, NAEC

cc: Sen. Gary Hart Rep. John Moss

24 850722