



Consumers  
Power  
Company

James W Cook

Vice President - Projects, Engineering  
and Construction

General Offices: 1945 West Parnall Road, Jackson, MI 49201 • (517) 788-0453

August 11, 1981

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

MIDLAND PROJECT  
DOCKET NOS 50-329, 50-330  
MIDLAND SITE SPECIFIC RESPONSE SPECTRA  
FINAL REPORTS, PARTS I, II AND III - DISCUSSIONS  
REGARDING 1966 PARKFIELD EARTHQUAKE ACCELEROGRAMS  
FILE: B2.5.2, 0505.802 UFI: 42\*05\*22\*01, 70\*01\*10\*02 SERIAL: 13358  
ENCLOSURE: BASIS FOR THE REJECTION OF THE 1966 PARKFIELD  
EARTHQUAKE ACCELEROGRAMS FOR USE IN  
MIDLAND PLANT SITE SPECIFIC SPECTRA

To meet the commitment made in our meeting with the NRC staff on June 30, 1981 we are forwarding forty (40) copies of the report titled "Basis for the Rejection of the 1966 Parkfield Earthquake Accelerograms for Use in Midland Site Specific Spectra." This report is in response to discussions with the NRC staff concerning the use of accelerograms from the Parkfield, California earthquake of 1966. The discussions presented in the enclosed report address the appropriateness (or non-appropriateness) of these accelerograms for use in the site specific response spectra developed for Midland site as presented in Parts I and II of the report. Included with this report is a letter by Dr Otto Nuttli which addresses the same issue.

We have earlier submitted to the NRC Part III of the report titled "Seismic Hazard Analysis." In the development of site specific response spectra in Parts I and II, no credit whatsoever was taken for the very low probability of occurrence of a seismic event in the vicinity of the Midland Plant site. At the same time, occurrence of an earthquake event with a relatively high deterministic value of  $M_b = 5.3 \pm 0.5$  at a close epicentral distance was required to be the basis for choosing accelerograph records. Since only Part III of the report addresses the low seismicity of the region near the plant site, we request a formal review of Part III. The evidence of very low seismicity of the region forms another basis for not including 1966 Parkfield earthquake accelerograms for use in the Midland site specific response spectra.

We feel that the enclosure addresses the concerns of the NRC staff and provides sufficient bases for the exclusion of the 1966 Parkfield earthquake accelerograms from site specific response spectra data set. In addition, the

oc0781-0392a100

8108190214 810811  
PDR ADOCK 05000329  
A PDR

Boo  
1/46

results reported in Part III further support our conclusions as reported in Parts I and II. Therefore, we request a timely approval of the spectra submitted in Parts I and II to support completion of the Soils Hearing.



R A Wells  
Executive Manager

For J W Cook

JWC/TRT/cr

CC RJCook, Midland Resident Inspector w/o

BCC RCBauman, P-14-312B, w/o  
WJBeckius, P-24-602, w/a  
JEBrunner, P-24-513, w/a  
WJCloutier, P-24-611, w/a  
LHCurtis, Bechtel (3), w/a  
RHolt, Weston Geophysical, w/o  
GSKeeley, P-14-113B, w/a  
RPKennedy, SMA, w/a  
DBMiller, Midland (3), w/a  
MIMiller, IL&B, w/a  
FJMiraglia, NRC (2), w/a  
OWNuttli, St Louis University, w/a  
TJSullivan/DMBudzik, P-24-517, w/o  
RLTeuteberg, P-24-507, w/a  
TRThiruvengadam, P-14-400, w/a