



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 14 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-50

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY  
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY  
PENNSYLVANIA ELECTRIC COMPANY

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-289

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated December 29, 1975, the Metropolitan Edison Company (MetEd) requested that the Technical Specifications appended to Facility Operating License No. DPR-50 for Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1) be amended. The proposed amendment would modify the tendons selected for inspection in the TMI-1 Tendon Surveillance Program.

DISCUSSION

MetEd completed the first tendon inspection of the TMI-1 Tendon Surveillance Program in June, 1975. In conducting this inspection MetEd noted that many of the tendons selected for inspection in ensuing inspection periods are impractical for the necessary testing associated with the inspection program. These tendons are either physically inaccessible to the necessary testing equipment or impractical for personnel to work near since the tendon anchors are located in the discharge path of steam vent lines. In order that tendon surveillance be carried out and further be conducted while the reactor is operating (not necessitating a special shutdown) MetEd has requested that other representative tendons be selected and scheduled in the inspection program.

MetEd has proposed specific tendons for the inspection program that were selected on a random but representative basis so that the substitute tendons would have the same probability of corrosion and have similar structural functions. We have reviewed the proposed substitute tendons and concur that these selections meet the criteria stated above and are in accordance with Regulatory Guide 1.35, Revision 1.

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR § 51.5(d)(4), that an environmental statement, negative declaration, or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

#### CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the change does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Dated:

April 1, 1976