

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8106230135 DOC. DATE: 81/06/19 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-250 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 3, Florida Power and Light Co. 05000250
 50-251 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 4, Florida Power and Light Co. 05000251
 AUTH. NAME: UHRIG, R.E. AUTHOR AFFILIATION: Florida Power & Light Co.
 RECIP. NAME: VARGA, S.A. RECIPIENT AFFILIATION: Operating Reactors Branch 1

SUBJECT: Advises that util cannot respond to SER re: environs
 qualification of safety-related electrical equipment until
 concerns submitted 810227, in response to partial review
 equipment evaluation rept are addressed.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A048S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 3 ENCL 0 SIZE: 11/11/11
 TITLE: Equipment Qualification (OR & PRE-OL)

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTR ENCL		RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTR ENCL
ACTION:	VARGA, S.	10	7				
INTERNAL:	DIR/DOLI	17	1		EQUIP: QUAL BR05	5	5
	I&EI	18	3		NRC: PDR	02	1
	OELD	20	1		OGC	21	1
	<u>REG. FILE</u>	01	1		WILLIAMS, M.H.	22	1
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	23	16		LPDR	03	1
	NSIC	04	1				

JUN 25 1981

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTR 39 ENCL 0

5




Figure 1. The effect of the number of trials on the number of correct responses. The number of correct responses was significantly higher than the number of incorrect responses in all cases. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean.

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension on the transformation efficiency of *Agrobacterium* strains.



June 19, 1981
L-81-256

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. Steven A. Varga, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #1
Division of Licensing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555



Dear Mr. Varga:

Re: Turkey Point Units 3 & 4
Docket Nos. 50-250 & 50-251
Environmental Qualification of
Safety-Related Electrical Equipment

Your letter of May 29, 1981 transmitted the Safety Evaluation Report (SER) for the Environmental Qualification of Safety-Related Electrical Equipment for Turkey Point Units 3 & 4. This letter requested that we provide within 90 days of its receipt an item-by-item re-evaluation of specific information identified in the SER. It was further stated that the action required of us which would be necessary to comply with the Order for Modification of License Concerning the Environmental Qualification of Safety-Related Electrical Equipment dated October 24, 1980; was identified in the SER.

Our preliminary review of the SER revealed that it is essentially identical to the Partial Review Equipment Evaluation Report (PREER) transmitted to us by Mr. Thomas M. Novak's letter dated February 11, 1981. Following receipt of the PREER, and after discussion with your staff, FPL submitted a response to your office dated February 27, 1981, addressing a number of specific staff concerns contained in the PREER. It appears that these comments may not have been considered in the SER. Since the SER does not clarify the staff's concerns beyond the letter codes provided in the PREER, we remain in a position of being unable to respond explicitly to the staff's concerns in an item-by-item manner as requested. We noted our inability to respond to the letter codes in our response to the PREER dated February 27, 1981. At that time we also requested a meeting between our engineers and your staff to explicitly identify each concern. It is our sincere hope that our request can be granted as soon as possible, in order to avoid a waste of manpower in responding to assumed concerns and to prevent delays in resolving the staff's concerns. We emphasize that we are willing to meet with your technical staff at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Uhrig

Robert E. Uhrig
Vice President
Advanced Systems & Technology

REU/JEM/ah

cc: J. P. O'Reilly, Director, Region II
Harold F. Reis, Esquire

A048
S
3/0

P

8106280135



10-1-74