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

DOCKET NO.: 50-70 DATE: December 14, 1977 GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY (GE) LICENSEE:

GENERAL ELECTRIC TEST REACTOR (GETR)

REGULAN

FACILITY:

7812190004

03114C

SUMMARY OF MEETING HELD ON DECEMBER 2, 1977, TO DISCUSS THE SEISMIC REEVALUATION OF THE GETR

On December 2, 1977, representatives of GE and its consultants, Engineering Decision Analysis Company (EDAC) and Earth Sciences Associates (ESA) met with the NRC staff to discuss geological and seismological matters relating to the seismic reevaluation of the GETR.

A list of attendees is attached. Important highlights of the meeting are summarized below.

As a matter of background, during the staff's review of GE's application for license renewal for the GETR a new interpretation evolved with respect to the "Verona fault". Postulation of this fault in closer proximity to the GETR than previously mapped and presumption of its potential for surface faulting resulted in the October 24, 1977 NRC Order to Show Cause which directed suspension of operation of the GETR. GE's November 11, 1977 response to the NRC Order included a summary of additional geological investigations made at the GETR site, an explanation that the geological features of concern are the result of landsliding and GE's contention that the Verona fault does not exist. As a result of its review of the geological information submitted by GE in support of its license renewal application and in response to the October 24, 1977 NRC Order, the staff found that this information is not sufficient to resolve the issue of surface faulting. The purpose of this meeting was to inform GE of our concerns and to identify possible alternate approaches to provide additional information needed to complete the review.

Comments made during the meeting are summarized below:

. With regard to the "Verona fault", the potential for surface faulting, and GE's contention that the geological features of concern can be explained by landsliding, we indicated that at the present time we do not have sufficient data to rule out faulting as the primary genetic cause of the geological features observed in the site area. Attachment A "Comments for the GETR Meeting 12/02/77" which was provided as a handout during the meeting outlines the points made by the staff on the geological matters of concern.

- We informed GE that we are taking steps to formally request U.S. Geological Survey (U.S.G.S.) consultation and advice in our review of the potential for surface faulting in the GETR site area. This would be in addition to the limited U.S.G.S. involvement to date.
- GE presented a series of slides in further support of its contention that the geological features of concern are the result of landsliding. The staff noted that much of the information presented by GE at the meeting was new and requested that all geological information including the new information be consolidated in one document and submitted on the GETR docket to facilitate the review process.
- GE expressed its concern to be able to get the GETR back into operation as soon as possible and to be able to operate the GETR while the overall license renewal review is proceeding. GE asked how much longer it would take to resolve the staff's geological concerns related to the Show Cause Order. We indicated that the results of needed additional geological investigations are difficult to predict and that we would also have to consider expected input from the U.S.G.S. to resolve the concerns over surface faulting. Therefore, at this time, it is not possible for us to estimate the additional time needed, although it could be substantial.
- We told GE that in lieu of proceeding with the additional work to resolve the geological concerns, on the basis of there being no surface faulting, an alternate acceptable approach would be to assume surface faulting and to provide an analysis that would support a conclusion that the GETR can be operated safely and without unacceptable concequences to the health and safety of the public, even assuming an unlikely event of an earthquake with peak ground acceleration coincident with surface faulting. GE would have to justify the manner in which it proposes to account in the analysis for the combined effects of the assumed seismological events. We also mentioned that in the analysis, GE would also need to address potential sliding and tilting of structures; magnitude of concrete cracking; sloshing of water out of the pool (seismic slosh), and missile potential from the polor crane.

As indicated during the meeting, the staff will continue to prepare questions relating to our geological concerns that will be formally transmitted to GE, to obtain responses needed to continue our review of the information submitted to date in support of GE's request to lift the suspansion imposed by our October 24, 1977 Show Cause Order.

A the and the man

Alfred Purger. Project Manager Operating Reactors Branch #1 Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures: 1. Attendence List 2. NRR "Comments for GETR Meeting 12/02/77"

cc w/encl: See mext page

··. ··.

LIST OF ATTENDEES DECEMBER 2, 1977 MEETING WITH GE CONCERNING GETR

NRC

••. ••.

A. Burger D. Swanson G. Bagchi W. P. Gammill R. E. Jackson J. Kelleher R. Turnbull H. E. Lefevre J. T. Greeves H. J. Wong A. Schwencer R.J. Stuart <u>GE</u>

D. Hoggatt R. W. Darmitzel D. L. Gilliland L. S. Gifford (Bethesda, Md.)

EDAC

J. Reed R. Sharpe

ESA

R. H. Wright R. C. Harding

PLEASANTON VALLEY TIMES

Martin Gottlieb