

NOV 24 1981



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

APPLICANT: Consumers Power Company  
FACILITY: Midland Plant, Units 1 and 2  
SUBJECT: Record of Telecon - Staff Requests Regarding Technical Report on Underpinning the Auxiliary Building and Feedwater Pits

On October 30, 1981 the NRC staff and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers participated in a conference call with Consumers Power Company (CPCo) and bechtel. The purpose of the call was to provide CPCo with geotechnical comments resulting from review of Enclosure 3 to CPCo's letter of September 30, 1981, "Technical Report on Underpinning the Auxiliary Building and Feedwater Isolation Valve Pits". CPCo's responses will be provided, in part, during a meeting with NRC in Bethesda scheduled for November 4, 1981.

A record of this telephone conversation, including thirty requests for additional information and identification of participants, is provided by Enclosure 1.

*151*

Darl hood, Project Manager  
Licensing Branch No. 4  
Division of Licensing

*Call 3*

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION

- ~~Docket File~~
- LB#4 r/f
- DHood
- EAdensam
- TERA
- MDuncan

8112110281

*XA*

OFFICE	DL: LB#4	DL: LB#4					
SURNAME	DHood:eb	EAdensam					
DATE	11/23/81	11/23/81					

cc: Commander, Naval Surface Weapons Center  
ATTN: P. C. Huang  
White Oak  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Mr. L. J. Auge, Manager  
Facility Design Engineering  
Energy Technology Engineering Center  
P.O. Box 1449  
Canoga Park, California 91304

Mr. William Lawhead  
U.S. Corps of Engineers  
NCEED - T  
7th Floor  
477 Michigan Avenue  
Detroit, Michigan 48226

Charles Bechhoefer, Esq.  
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Mr. Ralph S. Decker  
Atomic Safety & Licensing Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dr. Frederick P. Cowan  
Apt. B-125  
6125 N. Verde Trail  
Boca Raton, Florida 33433

Jerry Harbour, Esq.  
Atomic Safety and Licensing Board  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D. C. 20555

- Q.13. (Pg. 8, Sect 7.2.3, 1st Para.) The estimates of settlement using the referenced NAVFAC DM-7 do not include secondary consolidation. What secondary consolidation would be indicated if the consolidation test results using the appropriate load increment were used? Compare this estimate with values for permanent wall conditions "after jacking, long term". Please provide basis for the three estimated settlement values for "Load transfer points for temporary load to reactor footing" at the bottom of pg. 8 and discuss any effects of this settlement on the reactor and pipe connections.
- Q.14. (Pg A-1, Sect. 1, 2nd Par.) Please indicate how the soil spring constants were established for long term loads.
- Q.15. (Pg C-2, last Par. and Pg. C-6, Par. B) What are the protective construction measures planned for the Turbine Building and Buttress Access Shafts and when will they be placed? Please provide discussion on the sequence of operations to complete the drift beneath the Turbine Building and show sectional views of this work with respect to the Turbine Building foundations and affected piping and conduits.
- Q.16. (Pg C-3, Par. A.1.a) Please explain what is meant by minimizing the amount of concrete to be removed.
- Q.17. (Pg. C-3, Par. A.1.c. and A.1.d) What is the magnitude of the load for testing the temporary support pier and how was it established and how will it be applied? Is the EPA foundation slab capable of supporting this load at this time?
- Q.18. (Pg. C-4, Sect. A.1.f., 1st complete para.) Provide discussion on monitoring of the control tower behavior at this time. What criteria will be used to decide if preload should be stopped and support capacity should be added to the control tower?
- Q.19. (Pg. C-4, Sect. A.2.) What are the reasons why the three temporary supports under the EPA should not be completed before the permanent support at the control tower is initiated?
- Q.20. (Pg. C-4, Sect. A.3.a) Questions are raised as to whether the EPA structure can withstand the overhang condition which results if the initial temporary supports is assumed to fail. What is the basis and need for this extreme assumption? Is the EPA structure capable of withstanding this loading condition?
- Q.21. (Pg. C-4, Sect A.3.b and A.3.c) The distinction between 3.b and 3.c is unclear. What is the magnitude of the load for testing and how established? Is there a problem with the EPA foundation slab providing a sufficient reaction load?
- Q.22. (Pg. C-5, Sect. 14 and 15) It appears the operations described in these items are intended only for the wings and not the control tower. How is the load test and load transfer for the control tower to be completed. For the long term load test on the wings, what is the load magnitude and how was it established? What is the final