

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



APR 21 1981

Docket Nos.: 50-329/330 OM, OL

MEMORANDUM FOR: Ellen Brown, Attorney, Office of the Executive Legal Director
FROM: Darl Hood, Project Manager, Licensing Branch No. 3, DL
SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO A. FARNELL'S LETTER OF MARCH 20, 1981

Mr. A. Farnell's letter of March 20, 1981 requests clarification and/or additional response to some of the NRC Staff's Answers to Interrogatories Filed by Consumers Power Company. A reply to each of Mr. Farnell's concerns follows:

One concern expressed by Mr. Farnell is the use of the word "primarily" at page 9. The answer to Interrogatory 6, page 9, states that the means by which the staff communicated its position as to the inadequacy of the licensee's response was "primarily" by the issuance of additional questions on the same subject. Additional means by which the staff communicated its position was by handouts and discussions at meetings. The only case for use of meeting handouts to this end is identified by footnote number 1 to Table 6-1 of the answer to Interrogatory 6. Except for the seismic input matter discussed below, where meeting discussions were used to communicate staff positions as to the inadequacy of the applicants response with respect to criteria, these discussions were followed up by issuance of additional questions identified in the staffs answer.

The followup communications to the staffs seismic input requests^{1/} prior to December 6, 1979 were communicated as "Open Items Associated with Staff Review of Midland Plants, Units 1 & 2 FSAR" (S. Varga letter of March 30, 1979, Enclosure 1, item 1 under "Geology and Seismology,"), and then orally during meetings with Consumers as documented in Enclosure 4 (Item 1 under "Geology/Seismology Branch") to "Summary of April 10-11, 1979 Meetings on Open Items Regarding FSAR Review", dated April 25, 1979, and in "Summary of July 19, 1979 Meeting on Site Geology and Seismicity" dated October 16, 1979. Relevant staff communications after December 6, 1979 were identified in the answer to Interrogatory 11.

^{1/} Staff Requests 361.4 and 361.5 from enclosure 1 to S. Varga's letter of June 20, 1978, and followup Request 361.7 from enclosure 1 to S. Varga's letter of February 14, 1979.

8104220580

APR 21 1981

The word "essentially" on page 35 (second paragraph of answer) and on page 38 (occurring twice in the first paragraph of answer) may be deleted, except that the answers also identify the Staffs need for information with respect to (1) seismic input and (2) underground piping and associated components.

The word "essentially" in the second paragraph on page 42 may be deleted, except that the preceeding two paragraphs of the answer refer to the difficulties attributed to the on-going aspects of the review, and the need for resolution of seismological input, and except that the subsequent paragraph of the answer (page 43) identifies information needed with regard to underground piping.

With respect to Mr. Farnell's requests regarding Interrogatory 11 and Table 8-1, meetings have been scheduled to discuss Staff review of Amendment 85 containing responses to requests 39-53 and are being scheduled to discuss Consumers plans and findings with respect to cracking of the concrete foundation of the Borated Water Storage Tank, errors in the seismic analyses for the Control Tower, the emerging concept of a bin wall support concept for the Service Water Intake Structure, and other remedial items. We will endeavor during the conclusion of these meetings to identify any resolutions which may be achieved and any needs for further information.

A. J. Muraglia
for Darl Hood, Project Manager
Licensing Branch No. 3
Division of Licensing