



# United States Department of the Interior

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY  
RESTON, VA. 22092

In Reply Refer To:  
Mail Stop 905

July 22, 1982

Dr. Robert E. Jackson  
Chief, Geosciences Branch  
Division of Engineering  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20055

50-522

Dear Bob:

As a result of our review of the seismic and geologic data for the Skagit/Hanford Nuclear Project and our participation in the meeting held in Bethesda with the applicant, we have reached the conclusion that additional work is necessary to evaluate the May Junction lineation near the site. In particular, we have the following comments:

1. As shown on cross-section lines 8 and 3, the applicant is uncertain, as indicated by question marks on contacts, as to the interpretation of the sediments crossing the May Junction lineament. This uncertainty needs to be resolved because of the evidence of possible faulting in the line 8 refraction profile and the proximity of the May Junction lineament to the DB-10 fault and the Central fault. We recommend that the applicant determine, by drilling, if the May Junction lineation is a fault and if it is a fault, is it capable?
2. A table and/or other comparison showing the relationship between the various lithologic logs and the geophysical logs in the drill holes is highly desirable. Such a comparison would help to remove uncertainty and ambiguity concerning possible reflection and refraction horizons and their continuity throughout the area.

These recommendations are based on analyses of the data and recommendations by D. D. Dickey, D. M. Perkins, S. T. Harding, and myself. I hope you will find these comments useful.

Sincerely,

S. T. Algermissen

COO2B

7-30-82

Mike:

Please see that the  
VSH letter in  
Anketes.

David Levine  
X27732