GEORGE A. THOMPSON 421 Adobe Place Palo Alto, California 94306

June 29, 1980

Dr. William Kerr Chairman, Subcommittee on GETR Department of Nuclear Engineering University of Michigan Ann Arbor, MI 48109

THIS DOCUMENT CONTAINS
POOR QUALITY PAGES

Dear Dr. Kerr:

This is a summary of my observations and conclusions from the Subcommittee meeting of June 16 and 17.

Faulting. That the topographic elevation behind the GITR is produced by faulting is now widely accepted. I made this point in my letter of December 12, 1979. It should also be emphasized that the fault strands at the base of the hill northeast of the GETR have orders of magnitude greater cumulative displacement there are of the strands as the search of CETT for the displacement than any of the strands southwest of GETR, for the latter have relatively negligible topographic displacement.

Cld photographs of the GETF foundation show fairly strong

evidence against any existing faults under the foundation. This reenforces evidence from the nearby trench. Future slips beneath the foundation are highly unlikely as shown by the probability

Flements of conservatism in the assignment of a 1-meter analysis. seismic slip for design purposes include (1) the neglect of aseismic slip or creep in producing offscts observed in trenches and (2) our inability (in the trench geology) to resolve multiple events that may have produced what we assume is a single earthquake offset. The error bars in this sort of measurement

tend to be highly unsymmetrical. Evidence from the geology and seismic focal mechanisms supports a straightforward tectonic model for the Livermore Valley, which I won't take space to outline here. It is important to note, however, that this kind of tectonic setting is not unusual in basins along the San Andreas fault zone, contrary to claims made in the meeting. The model (and direct evidence) indicates that the USGS (Brabb) is incorrect in inferring <u>left</u>-lateral slip on a Pleasanton fault. Putting the picture together shows that the San Fernando comparison is inapporpriate, at least in the scale of the hazard.

Landsliding. The tectonic setting is one of thrustfaulting, modified at the upper toe of the thrust by a topographic load. In addition, like most California hillslopes, this one is characterized by creeping soil and minor shallow landslides. Any attempt to monitor a hypothetical major slide will be hopelessly bogged down in the 'noise' of creeping soil. On the other hand, the hillslope should be analyzed for small superficial slides in relation to the safety of the emergency water reservoirs and piping.

Conclusion. In my judgement the staff recommendations for design accelerations and offset are appropriate and conservative.

Sincerely,

Seafhysicist Phorpion

tome to 1 /je