



50-329
50-330

J D Selby
Chairman of the Board
and President

General Offices: 212 West Michigan Avenue, Jackson, Michigan 49201 • (517) 788-1600

March 2, 1981



Mr Harold R Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Mr Denton:

I appreciate your February 10, 1981, response to my letter to Chairman Ahearne of January 16, 1981, regarding licensing schedules for the Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2. Since my previous letter we have noted with some interest the NRC Staff reassessment of target schedules (post-SSER licensing durations and construction completion dates) for facilities with expected completion dates in CY 1981 and 1982 as reflected in the Commission's December 1980 and January 1981 reports to Congress. I am pleased to learn that this reassessment is currently underway for plants such as Midland with construction completion expected during CY 1983.

I agree with your goal of establishing realistic schedules and proper prioritization for all plants so that NRR resources can be applied to avoid or minimize delays. In this regard I have directed my Staff to cooperate in any efforts which will advance the Midland docket review. I understand that our Staffs have recently agreed to the protocol, board composition, and outline for a final design review meeting on cold shutdown capability which is scheduled for March 26, 1981. We have requested a subsequent meeting on Auxiliary Feedwater during April.

Beyond this, I believe that a realistic assessment of the Midland licensing schedule will dictate the need for additional design review meetings as well as other alternative review techniques such as direct presentations by CP Co to the NRC Staff or the draft SER/open item resolution meeting approach. We remain flexible in this regard and believe that timing and the particular review technique can be tailored to the specific issue or area of review, the interested NRC branches, and the availability of NRC Staff reviewers.

I have been personally involved in the determination of Midland's response to post-TMI issues and think that it is comparable to, and in many aspects exceeds, that of other applicants and licensees. Our responses to NUREG-0694 are currently being reformatted to correspond to NUREG-0737 and additional information regarding the new requirements and clarifications of NUREG-0737

8103060643

A

Boo!
S 1/0

will be provided in Revision 33 of the FSAR scheduled for submittal in April 1981. This revision together with our recently submitted Revision 32 of several thousand pages should substantially improve the reviewability of the FSAR.

I look forward to receiving the results of your schedule re-examination of the Midland Plant and a description of the effect on Midland 2. I hope that Consumers Power Company's continued efforts to upgrade the FSAR together with the initiation of the design review board or other alternative review techniques during the first quarter of 1981 will signal the resumption of formal review of the Midland OL application.

Yours very truly,



J. D. Selby