

April 12, 2002  
5928-02-20102

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Attn: Document Control Desk  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Subject: THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1 (TMI-1)  
OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-50  
DOCKET NO. 50-289  
10 CFR 50.59 REPORT FOR 2000 AND 2001

In accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59, enclosed is the TMI-1 10 CFR 50.59 Report for the period of January 2000 through December 2001. It contains brief descriptions of changes, tests and experiments and a summary of the findings of the respective safety evaluations for each item identified.

Very truly yours,



George H. Gellrich  
Plant Manager, TMI-1

Attachment

cc: Administrator, Region I  
TMI-1 Senior Project Manager  
TMI Senior Resident Inspector

File 02053

IE47

## **I. Experiments and Tests**

A Safety Evaluation or 50.59 evaluation was prepared for each of the experiments and tests conducted at TMI-1 as identified below.

### **Document: - Temporary Procedure TP-00-0053, TP-00-0055, TP-00-0057, TP-00-0059, and TP-00-0061 – “Operation with NR and SR Cross-Tied for NR Line Repair”**

The evaluation (SE-000531-016) reviewed a temporary one-time change from the shutdown requirements of Technical Specification 3.3.2, while repair of the underground Nuclear Services River Water system piping was completed. The evaluation concluded that the change required NRC approval prior to implementation.

### **Document: Special Temporary Procedure STP 1-00-0006 – “Pump CO-T-2 Water to the Condenser via Co-V-107”**

This evaluation reviewed a temporary change to the routing of water from CO-T-2 (Miscellaneous Drains Collection Tank) to the condenser. The evaluation concludes that the change did not create an unreviewed safety question because it did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the USFAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded the change did not pose an unreviewed safety question because (1) controls were in place to insure the temperature of water supplied to the emergency feedwater pumps did not exceed 135 degrees F and (2) the condensate storage tank inventory would not be compromised, consistent with the USFAR.

### **Document: SE-000213-014, “CFT Heater Removal/RB Outage Power Installation”**

This evaluation reviewed changes resulting in the removal of the Core Flood Tank shroud heating system and replacement of the system with local disconnects to provide [electrical] power. The evaluation concludes that the change did not create an unreviewed safety question because it did not increase

the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the USFAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation references a previous Safety Evaluation (SE-000-213-005) which justified Core Flood Tank operating temperatures not less than 70 degrees F and nitrogen injection nozzle temperatures not less than 40 degrees F. The evaluation cited that four years of operating experience has shown that these minimum temperatures can be maintained without the core flood tank shroud heating system. The evaluation also identified that the routing of power supplies would be done with consideration for separation of 1E and non-1E cable.

## **II. Document and Procedure Changes**

A Safety Evaluation or 50.59 evaluation was prepared for each of the documents listed below.

### **Document: Surveillance Procedure 1301-1, “Shift and Daily Check”, Temporary Change Notice 1-00-0140**

This evaluation reviewed the addition of guidance to the procedure for the performance of reactor coolant system leak rate calculations during plant startup. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that performing monitoring of the reactor coolant system leakage does not increase the probability of an accident because there is no change to how the plant equipment is operated nor is existing equipment modified. In fact, monitoring of primary to secondary leak rate during startup had not been previously done, so the implementation of the procedure revision enhanced operator control and monitoring of plant performance.

### **Document: Surveillance Procedure 1302-5.17, “ Makeup Tank Level & Pressure Instrumentation“, (PCR 99-0367)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to include a steady state operating band, to revise the limit curves to prevent gas entrainment in the makeup pumps and to ensure makeup pump net positive suction head during normal and transient operations. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made provide a conservative margin and administrative controls to ensure continued makeup pump continued availability and operation.

**Document: Operating Procedure 1104-2, “Makeup and Purification ”,  
(PCR 99-0362)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the Makeup and Purification operating procedure to bypass the batch controller interlock for MU-V-8 and MU-V-10. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that the change did not increase the probability of a moderator dilution accident as described in FSAR Section 14.1.2.4.

**Document: Abnormal/Transient Procedure 1203-41, “”, (PCR 99-0446)**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of the TMI procedure for Low System (Grid) Voltage to reflect the need to shutdown a single Circulating Water Pump in the event of low system (Grid) voltage and to add other actions related to reducing non-essential electrical loads. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that the actions taken to reduce the probability of separation from the grid due to low system voltage did not increase the probability of occurrence of loss of offsite power.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1038, “TMI Fire Protection Program (PCR 99-0342)**

This evaluation reviewed a change to the site Fire Protection Program procedure to make the procedure consistent with License Amendment 216. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the

consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded the change did not pose an unreviewed safety question because the change is consistent with a license amendment approved by the NRC.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1070, “TMI Maintenance Plan”, (PCR 00-0022)**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to the TMI Maintenance Plan to require the use of a risk evaluation tool (ORAM-Sentinel) to help evaluate the risk of performing on-line maintenance. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Operating Procedure 1105-4, “Integrated Control System”, (PCR 99-0455)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the Integrated Control System (ICS) procedure to standardize terminology used for ICS hardware, to correct typographical errors, to incorporate guidance regarding the calibration of power range nuclear instrumentation and to remove unnecessary guidance. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1031, “Nuclear Plant Staff Working Hours”, (PCR 00-0063)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to this site administrative procedure. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Abnormal Transient Procedure 1210-1, “Reactor Trip”, (PCR 00-0378)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the Reactor Trip procedure to revise the immediate manual action following a Reactor Trip to delete a step that required starting a second makeup pump immediately following a reactor trip. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that not immediately starting a second reactor coolant pump would not result in an unacceptable post trip response or complicate post trip recovery.

**Document : Abnormal Transient Procedure 1210-7, “Large Break LOCA Cooldown (PCR 00-0322)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the Large Break LOCA Cooldown procedure to reflect changes made in the operation of the Auxiliary Building Sump and changes made to FSAR section 6.4.5 to allow the use of the ABS recirculation mode. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Abnormal Transient Procedure 1210-6, “Small Break LOCA Cooldown”, (PCR 00-0322)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to reflect changes made in the operation of the Auxiliary Building Sump and changes made to FSAR section 6.4.5 to allow the use of the ABS recirculation mode. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Operating Procedure 1104-29, “”, (PCR 00-0326)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to update Miscellaneous Waste Tank Storage requirements to be consistent with changes made to the UFSAR regarding changes made in the operation of the Auxiliary Building Sump and changes made to FSAR section 6.4.5 to allow the use of the ABS recirculation mode. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Abnormal Transient Procedure 1210-10, “Abnormal Transients Rules, Guides and Graphs”, (PCR 00-0323)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to reflect changes made in the operation of the Auxiliary Building Sump and to provide specific direction regarding the isolation of a leak while operating in post-LOCA RB sump recirculation mode. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not

create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Operating Procedure 1104-40, “Plant Sump and Drainage System”, (PCR 00-0325)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to reflect changes made in the operation of the Auxiliary Building Sump to clarify when WDL-V-520 can be operated. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically there are not changes made to procedures described in the UFSAR and the changes made to Auxiliary Building Sump operation were evaluated in SE-000573-001.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1038, “Administrative Controls - TMI Fire Protection Program”, (PCR 00-0527)**

This evaluation reviewed the changes made to the procedure to provide flexibility in the assignment of personnel to the Fire Brigade Leader function to allow any qualified person to fill the Fire Brigade leader position. The change made was found to be consistent with Shift Manning requirements. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1090, “Shift Technical Advisor Program”, (PCR 00-0589)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the STA program administrative procedure to reflect the change in reporting from the Manager, Shift Engineering to the Shift Manager. This change was administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation found the changes made would not impact the ability of the STA to perform the required STA functions.

**Document: Operating Procedure 1104-1, “Core Flooding System”, (PCR 00-0270)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to establish operating bands for the core flood tank level, pressure and boron concentration to account for measurement error. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states the new limits allow for potential measurement uncertainty when evaluating compliance with the TMI-1 Technical Specifications.

**Document: Operating Procedure 1107-2, “Emergency Electrical System ”, (PCR 00-0377)**

This evaluation reviews changes made to the procedure to prevent the inadvertent opening of MS-V-10A and MS-V-1B to provide greater assurance of reliable operation of EF-P-1 if it is called upon. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the

UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes evaluated per this safety evaluation were evaluated in SE-000424-016 which was attached to the procedure change request and is described elsewhere in this biennial 50.59 document.

**Document: Surveillance Procedure 1300-3A, “IST of BS-P-1A/B and Valves”, (PCR-00-0497)**

This evaluation revised the in-service test surveillance procedure for the Building Spray System pumps and valves to incorporate allowances for instrument error. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that allowance for measurement error did not impact the ability of the Building Spray pumps to perform their intended function and that there will be adequate system flow against accident pressures.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1000-PLN-1000.01, “TMI Organization Plan” (PCR –00-0593)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site Organization Plan to reflect changes in the reporting relationship for the Shift Technical Advisors, to make minor corrections and to correct typographical errors and to delete the accountability for the Manager, Rad Engineering to serve as the site Rad Protection Manager and to add this accountability to that for the Director, Rad Controls and Industrial Safety. These changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1092, “TMI Emergency Plan”,  
(PCR-00-0782)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site Emergency Plan to revise a position title and to transfer responsibility for emergency training to the Emergency Preparedness department. These changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Abnormal Transient Procedure 1202-12, “Excessive Radiation Levels”, (PCR-00-0772)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to reflect the configuration of the Control Building Ventilation System as a result of modifications evaluated in SE-120067-001. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes to the procedure were bounded by SE-120067-001 (described elsewhere in this biennial 50.59 report) which evaluated the modifications made to the Control Building Ventilation System.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1092, “TMI Emergency Plan”,  
(PCR-00-0918)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site emergency plan to that reflected the change in ownership of a local railroad and deleted the requirement for a current whole body count due to the new passive monitoring program implemented at TMI. The changes were administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the

consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document Operating Procedure 1104-47B, “Chemical Addition Nuclear”, (PCR-00-0746)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to provide procedural guidance for making up to the Borated Water Storage Tank (BWST) using demineralized water. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the guidance in the procedure continues to stress the importance of maintaining adequate BWST volume and boron concentration.

**Document: Alarm Response Procedure MAP-C Panel, (PCR-00-1462)**

This evaluation reviewed the changes made to the procedure decrease the administrative limit for primary-to-secondary leakrate prior to shutdown, to address the possibility of “spiking” or “oscillating” primary-to-secondary leakrates and to make a correction to a note regarding radiation monitors RM-A-5 and RM-A-15. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made implement more conservative criteria for plant shutdown therefore they do not increase the possibility of an accident and will tend to minimize the consequences should an accident occur.

**Document: Surveillance Procedure 1303-11.14, “Reactor Building Purge Exhaust Filter Efficiency Test”, (PCR-00-0140)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure in accordance with Technical Specification Change Request 289. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the acceptance criteria of testing activated charcoal were revised to be consistent with NRC guidance provided in Generic Letter 99-02.

**Document: Surveillance Procedure 1303-11.13, “Control Room Filtering System Test”, (PCR-00-0139)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure in accordance with Technical Specification Change Request 289. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the acceptance criteria of testing activated charcoal were revised to be consistent with NRC guidance provided in Generic Letter 99-02.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1000-PLN-7200.01, “”, (PCR-00-1679)**

This evaluation reviewed changes to the site Quality Assurance Plan to reflect a reorganization of the Work Management Division. The changes made are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not

create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Operating Procedure 1104-28I, “Waste Solidification Process Control Program ”, (PCR-00-0929)**

This evaluation reviewed changes to the procedure to reflect the change in the plant ownership, changes in the Quality Assurance oversight function and to delete a note regarding Class B and Class C waste. The changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1092, “TMI Emergency Plan ”, (PCR-00-1774)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site emergency plan to reflect the standard Exelon site organization for a single unit site, to reflect a re-assignment of the responsibilities for direction of field monitoring teams to the Met/Dose coordinator and to reflect the change from the FTS 2000 system to the corporate PBX system. The changes are administrative in nature with the exception of the phone system change. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that the change in the phone system did not impact any functions specified in the Emergency Plan.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1000-PLN-7200.01, “TMI Operational Quality Assurance Plan”, (PCR-00-1811)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site quality assurance plan to reflect the new Exelon single unit site management organization. The changes were administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1001E, “Writer’s Guide for Abnormal Transient Procedures”, (PCR-00-1833)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to reflect the guidance provided by B&W owners group Operator Support Committee regarding emergency operating procedures. The changes to the writer’s guide specify generic procedure writing guidance and are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Surveillance Procedure 1303-11.56, “Fuel Handling Building ESF Air Treatment System Air Filter Efficiency Test”, (PCR-00-0141)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to comply with revised activated charcoal testing requirements. The changes were imposed by the NRC approval of TMI Technical Specification Change Request 289. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any

Technical Specification. Specifically, the revised testing requirements are consistent with NRC Generic Letter 99-02.

**Document: Procedure 1420-DC-3, “Station Battery Cell Replacement and Charging”, (PCR-00-02680)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure regarding a single cell (online) recharge. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that the station batteries remain electrically and seismically protected during the single cell recharging operation therefore the likelihood of a malfunction of equipment important to safety is not increased.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1057, “TMI Purchase Requisition Review and Approval”, (PCR-00-2636)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the procedure to reflect the transfer of the Engineering Configuration Management group from Design Engineering to Supply Chain Management. The changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1000-PLN-7200.01, “TMI Operational Quality Assurance Plan”, (PCR-00-2690)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site operational quality assurance plan to reflect the change from one computerized work management system, GMS2 to a different work management system, PIMS. The changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1092, “TMI Emergency Plan”, (PCR-00-2855)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site emergency plan that deleted reference to the Medical Representative position and made an editorial correction. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that the effectiveness of the emergency plan is not reduced because the first aid functions previously assigned to the Medical Representative will be performed by qualified on-shift first aid providers. In addition, the responsibility for the Medical Representative to administer Potassium Iodide during a radiological event will also be assigned to the on-shift first aid providers who will be able to adequately administer the Potassium Iodide utilizing the guidance in the Thyroid Blocking Procedure.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1000-PLN-7200.01, “TMI Operational Quality Assurance Plan”, (PCR-00-2967)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site operational quality assurance plan to reflect implementation of the new Exelon 10 CFR 50.59 program. The evaluation determined that the changes are administrative in nature and do not

decrease the effectiveness of the plan. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1000-PLN-7200.01, “TMI Operational Quality Assurance Plan”, (PCR-00-3696)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site operational quality assurance plan to delete certain procedure review requirements and to add clarification to the plan. The evaluation determined the changes were administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: Administrative Procedure 1000-PLN-7200.01, “”, (PCR-00-3808)**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the site operational quality assurance plan to align the corrective action program with the requirements of ASME NQ1-1, 1989 and to revise the performance frequency of all aspects of the Fire Protection Program Assessment to a biennial frequency. The evaluation determined the changes were administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-00020-003, “Change to UFSAR Chapter 6 Appendix 6B Section 2.0**

This safety evaluation revised Section 2 of Appendix B of UFSAR Chapter 6 to make editorial changes, to change a reference and to add a paragraph to describe the evaluation of an Auxiliary Steam Line Crack. The evaluation concluded that the changes made do not represent an unreviewed safety question because an engineering evaluation that an Auxiliary Steam Line crack would not impact electrical equipment required for safe plant operation or safe plant shutdown.

**Document: SE-00020-004, “Addition of NI-YE-11A and NI-YE-12A to Environmental Qualification Master List (EQML)”**

This safety evaluation evaluated the addition of NI-YE-11A and NI-YE-12A to the EQML. The evaluation concluded that adding these instruments to the EQML did not involve an unreviewed safety question because the instruments were purchased and are maintained in accordance with Environmental Qualifications. Therefore reliance on these instruments would not represent a reduction in the reliability of the wide-range neutron flux detectors.

**Document: SE-000122-002, “QCL for Dike/Flood Control System”**

This safety evaluation addressed the revision of the existing quality control list to re-classify the Dike/Flood Control System from Nuclear Safety Related to Regulatory Required. The evaluation concluded the change would not involve an unreviewed safety question because the protection of plant systems, structures and components from damage in the event of the Probable Maximum Flood is not provided by the Dike/Flood Control System but by Flood Protection equipment on the Safety Related Buildings (Flood panels, etc.). Therefore, downgrade of the QCL classification of the Dike/Flood Control System does not represent a downgrade of the components and structures that will provide flood protection to safety related systems and components.

**Document: SE-000210-003, “Revision of UFSAR section 1.2.5”**

This safety evaluation addressed changes made to UFSAR section 1.2.5.d, 1.2.5.f and 1.2.5.h. The changes revised the description of the building spray function, revised the description of the function of the containment isolation system and deleted the description of the hydrogen purge system. The

evaluation concluded that the changes restored the intent of the original FSAR. The changes to the descriptions of the building spray function and the containment isolation system function were editorial in nature. The deletion of the description of the hydrogen purge system revised the description in the UFSAR to reflect that the hydrogen recombiners are the emergency safeguards equipment relied upon to address post-accident hydrogen gas inside the Reactor Building. The change to section 1.2.5.h makes 1.2.5.h consistent with the existing description in section 5.6 of the UFSAR that the hydrogen purge system is a “backup” to the hydrogen recombiners. Therefore, the evaluation concluded the changes did not involve an unreviewed safety question because the changes did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000210-004, “UFSAR Section =6., 6.32, 6.4 & 6.7 Revision (PFU 2000-T1-033)”**

This safety evaluation addressed several changes made to Section 6.0 of the TMI-1 UFSAR. The changes made editorial corrections to the description of the penetration seals between the “A” and “B” decay heat vaults; removed two sentences regarding the hydrogen recombiners from section 6.1.2.1.c that conflicted with information in section 6.5.3; revised the description of the plant condition during which core flood check valve testing is performed from “during plant heatup or cooldown” to “when the reactor is shutdown”; deleted non-relevant information from section 6.1.3.1; revised the description of when the LPI injection valves are tested; revised the description of core flood valve testing to be less prescriptive regarding the pressure at which the valves are tested; deleted a phrase in section 6.1.4 to restore the language that which was in the original FSAR; added a paragraph to describe the design features for maintaining the decay heat pumps operable when the Decay Heat vaults are inaccessible due to high radiation levels; added a description of the BWST; revised section 6.1.2.9 to the original FSAR language. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a

different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000210-005 “UFSAR Section 9.1 & 9.5 Revision (PFU 2000-T1-0029)”**

This safety evaluation made several editorial changes to section 9.1 and 9.5 to revise the text to more accurately reflect plant operation and design and the original FSAR. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because the changes made did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-0213-013, “UFSAR Table 7.3.2 Core Flood Valve Position Revision (PFU 2000-T1-120)”**

This safety evaluation reviewed a change to section 7.0 of the TMI-12 UFSAR to add to the description of CF-V-1A, B (the Core Flood Tank isolation valves) a statement that they are not operated in response to an accident nor are they operated to mitigate the consequences of an accident. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000213-015, “Licensing Basis Commitments Related to Manual RC Pump Trip”**

This safety evaluation reviewed a revision of the TMI-1 licensing basis to incorporate a Framatome analysis that supports manual trip of the Reactor Coolant Pumps as an immediate action upon loss of sub-cooling margin. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or

malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the peak cladding temperature stated in the UFSAR (prior to the change) is 1412 degrees Fahrenheit. The revised analysis shows the peak cladding temperature will be equal to or less than 1354 degrees Fahrenheit. In addition, the evaluation notes that early RC pump trip was already addressed in docketed correspondence and has been incorporated into plant procedures.

**Document: SE-000214-016, “Deletion of RBS Pressure Switched From EQML”**

This safety evaluation reviewed a change that deleted Reactor Building Spray system pressure switches from the Environmental Qualification Master List. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the switches perform their function prior to being subjected to any harsh post-accident environment and are not required to “re-fire” or de-actuate the Building Spray pumps.

**Document: SE-000224-027, “License Change Application 291”**

This safety evaluation addressed the change of surveillance specifications for the TMI-1 Once Through Steam Generator tube inspection criteria in Technical Specification 9. The evaluation concluded that the proposed change required prior NRC approval because it was a change in Technical Specifications but that the proposed change did not involve an unreviewed safety question.

**Document: SE-000231-006, “FSAR Section 11.2.2.4”**

This safety evaluation addressed a revision of the UFSAR to describe that the Waste Gas Decay Tanks can withstand a detonation of internal combustible gas and to remove information that is redundant in Section 11.2.2.4 to information already provided in Section 9.2.2. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of

equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the change is descriptive in nature and does not change the operation or control of the Waste Gas Decay system in any manner.

**Document: SE-000244-014: PFU for FSAR Section 1.4.53**

This safety evaluation addressed a deletion of a reference to a Figure in the TMI-1 Technical Specifications that was removed by a prior license amendment. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000244-005, "UFSAR Section 5.3 Revision (PFU 2000-T1-119)"**

This safety evaluation addressed a revision to Section 5.3.2 of the UFSAR to state that there is no automatic isolation of the reactor building penetrations that serve RCP seal injection or main steam. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the paragraph added is consistent with the original licensing basis and Chapter 14 of the UFSAR.

**Document: SE-000244-006, "Plant UFSAR Update for Containment Leakage Testing"**

This safety evaluation addressed the revision of the UFSAR to designate sections 5.7.2, 5.7.3 and 5.7.4 and the associated tables as historical information in accordance with NEI 98-01. In addition, Table 5.7.2 was revised to identify

additional valves that undergo local leak rate testing. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000251-007, “Biennial Review of UFSAR Update 14, Section 9.4”**

This safety evaluation deleted information regarding Spent Fuel Cooling that was in conflict with the original UFSAR that had been changed in Rev. 1 with no stated reason, deleted redundant information stated elsewhere in the UFSAR and revised UFSASR section 9.4 to reflect the revised licensing basis Spent Fuel pool bulk temperature analysis that was incorporated into the licensing basis for the plant via Technical Specification Change Request 170. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000301-006, “Review of Selected PM Tasks for Reschedule from 14R to 15R (6019, 6020, 6021, 6022, 6024, 6027, 6028, 3051, 3054, 7133, 7137, 7139, 7141, 6045, 6046)”**

This safety evaluation evaluated the postponement of inspections on various Turbine and Turbine Support System components. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that the postponement of the inspections did not result in operation of any of the subject components outside to the design basis for each component.

**Document: SE-000411-0425, “Plant FSAR Update to Section 4”**

This safety evaluation determined that changes to Section 4 of the TMI-1 UFSAR regarding the steam capacity values for the turbine bypass valves and the atmospheric dump valves. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made ensure consistency with section 10.3.2 of the TMI-1 UFSAR and are primarily editorial in nature.

**Document: SE-000411-026, “Plant FSAR Update to Section 10”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Sections 10.3.1.1.a, 10.3.1.1.b, 10.3.1.1.c, 10.3.1.2,, 10.3.2.1.b, and 10.7.4 regarding the main steam system, the main steam system isolation valves, the turbine bypass valves and the main steam safety valves. Specifically, the changes made clarify the function of the MSIVs following a main steam line break, delete information provide for reference only and provide more clarity regarding the turbine bypass valves steam capacity. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. The change evaluated do not change how a safety function is performed and are consistent with the existing Chapter 14 accident analysis.

**Document : SE-000411-027, “PFU for Moving Break of 4 Min Steam Line Due to Aircraft Impact”**

This evaluation reviewed an editorial change to the UFSAR that moved information regarding the rupture of main steam lines as a result of an aircraft accident from Chapter 14 to Chapter 2 of the UFSAR. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question

because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the information moved was historical in nature and was included in the UFSAR in response to NRC questions during the initial licensing of the plant. The impact of an aircraft crash at TMI is discussed in Chapter 2 of the UFSAR. Therefore the relocation of the information was appropriate.

**Document: SE-000411-029, “UFSAR Appendix 6B, Section 2.4.2.1”**

This evaluation addressed changes to Appendix 6B of the TMI-1 UFSAR that revises the discussion of a main steam line break accident regarding the environmental qualification of electrical equipment inside containment. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation describes why a higher short-term (14 minute) temperature inside containment following a main steam line break (MSLB) inside containment does not invalidate earlier assumptions that electrical equipment environmentally qualified to function after a LOCA accident will also function after a MSLB inside containment event.

**Document: SE-000414-006, “Review FSAR Chapter 10.3.4.2”**

This evaluation reviews a change to the UFSAR that states that low pressure steam in the Auxiliary steam line in the Auxiliary Building is operated at a nominal 5 to 8 psi rather an absolute 5 psi. This change is editorial in nature and provides additional clarity. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any

evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000424-015, “FSAR Revision Paragraph 5.4.3.2.4”**

This evaluation reviews the changes made to Section 5.4.3.2.4 of the UFSAR to correct inaccuracies regarding the description of effects and consequences a turbine missile could have on the Emergency Feedwater System (EFW). The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically the conclusions of the discussions of the impact that a turbine missile would have on EFW operation remain unchanged. The UFSAR revisions describes that a single turbine missile could not simultaneously impact the supply of water to EFW via the hotwell and the condensate storage tanks and that a turbine missile could not impact components in the Intermediate Building because of the thickness of the concrete between the turbine and EFW piping and pumps.

**Document: SE-000424-016, “Basis for Inclusion of Equipment in the Environmental Qualification Program for Turbine Driven EFW Pump”**

This evaluation addresses the taking credit for several components (MS-V-13A, MS-V-13B, MS-PC-5 and the positioner on MS-V-6) to operate in a harsh environment following a feedwater line break in the Intermediate and Turbine Building. In addition, the evaluation describes why mis-operation of MS-V-10A/B need not be considered in a feedwater line break event because they will be de-powered. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. This evaluation was the basis for several procedure changes.

**Document: SE-0000424-020, “ Update Emergency Feedwater Design Basis Descriptions in the FSAR”**

This evaluation reviewed several changes made to the EFW system design bases and flow delivery requirements, design/licensing basis events and improvements in the clarity of the EFW description. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made did not alter the design or licensing basis in the FSAR regarding EFW, the limiting conditions for operation of TMI-1 Technical Specification 3.4. No changes to plant systems or operating methods were made via the changes evaluated,

**Document: SE-000424-022, “Update EFW Modification Information in FSAR Section 1.3.2”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 1.3.2 of the UFSAR to clarify the start criteria for the motor driven EFW pumps, describe the automatic start signal for all three (3) EFW pumps on low steam generator water level or high Reactor Building pressure, add a description of the cavitating venturies and the locked open minimum flow recirculation valves and redundant flow control valves that are on each steam generator feed line. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made to section 1.3.2 reflect information previously reviewed and concurred with by the Commission and information already contained elsewhere in the UFSAR sections 7.1.4 and 10.6.

**Document: SE-0000424-023, “FSAR Change to Throttle Emergency Feedwater Pump Valves”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to section 10.6 of the UFSAR and to several operating and surveillance procedures regarding Emergency Feedwater and the control of cooling water flow to internal EFW pump components for EF-P-1, EF-P-2A and EF-P-2B. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made to the UFSAR and the procedures only impact the rate of cooling water flow to internal pump component and has no impact on EFW pump flow capability. The evaluation states that since the changes made optimize pump performance and control, they do not increase the likelihood of pump malfunction nor do they introduce a new failure mechanism.

**Document: SE-000531-009, “Safety Evaluation for Revision to SBDB-T1-531, Rev. 1”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to an internal system design basis documents. The SBDB is an internal document to TMI-1 and the changes made were mostly editorial in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000531-016, “Exigent Technical Specification Change Request No. 309 – Nuclear Services River Water System”**

This evaluation reviewed a proposed one-time, temporary change to TMI-1 Technical Specifications to allow the shutdown of Nuclear Services River Water system for more than 72 hours without entering the action statement of TMI-1 Technical Specification 3.2. The request is a Technical Specification Change and was identified as requiring NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-000534-0111, “PFU 2000-T1-174 to Table 7.3-2, #9”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Table 7.3-2 to add flow transmitters for the Reactor River system to the table, to made editorial changes to improve clarity and correct errors and to provide consistency between item 9 and item 13. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically the evaluation concluded that an unreviewed safety question was not posed by the changes because they were editorial in nature and did not change the status or control of plant structures, systems or components.

**Document: SE-000537-003, “River Water Pump Lube System”**

This evaluation reviewed the removal of excessive detail from the UFSAR regarding river water pumps lube water system. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that the removal of the excessive detail was consistent with the guidance given in NEI 98-03 because the lube water system is not necessary to support river water pump functions related to nuclear safety.

**Document: SE-000542-008, “IC-V-3 and IC-V-4 Installed Condition”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of IC-V-3 and IC-V-4, Containment Isolation Valves from a configuration in which they were air to open and spring to close to a configuration in that IC-V-3 and IC-V-4 are air to open and air to close. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the

UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that the modification does not increase the probability of the failure of IC-V-3 or IC-V-4 to close because the valves will continue to go close on the loss of instrument air because a 10 minute air accumulator and a fail safe accumulator that were added will close the valves automatically upon loss of instrument air. Thus, containment isolation via IC-V-3 and IC-V-4 will continue to be assured upon loss of instrument air.

**Document: SE-000542-009, Intermediate Closed Cooling Water System Flow Change”**

This evaluation review changes to the method of operating the Intermediate Closed (IC) Coolers and Letdown (LC) Coolers. The changes are that the standard mode of operation was changed from a single IC cooler to operating both coolers on the shell side. In addition, letdown cooler operation was changed from operating one Letdown Cooler to operating both Letdown Coolers. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, both systems remain capable of supplying adequate cooling in normal operation. During analyzed accidents, the Intermediate Closed Coolers provide no emergency or safety function other than for the associated Containment Isolation valves IC-V-2, IC-V-3, IC-V-4 and IC-V-6 to close (and the closing ability of the valves listed are unaffected). The ability of the letdown coolers to cool letdown flow to the Makeup and Purification system is unaffected by the change in operating method.

**Document : SE-000542-010, ‘Reflecting Design Flow Rate and Design Heat Removal Requirements as Nominal Parameters in FSAR Table 9.3-1**

This evaluation addressed changes made to the UFSAR table 9.3-1 to clarify that information presented in table 9.31 reflects nominal parameters for the Intermediate Closed Cooling Water (ICCW) System operation. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences

of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the information revised simply reflects normal operational parameters and does not impact the credited safety function of ICCW valves IC-V-2, IC-V-3, IC-V-4 and IC-V-6 to close as containment isolation valves.

**Document: SE-000542-011, “PFU 2000-T1-146 Editorial and Reformatting Changes to UFSAR Section 9.3”**

This evaluation addressed several editorial changes made to section 9.3 of the TMI-1 UFSAR. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. All of the changes were editorial in nature.

**Document: SE-000614-002, “Change to FSAR Section 7.4.6 for UFSAR Update 15 (PFU 2000-T1-103)”**

This evaluation reviewed a revision to UFSAR sections 7.4.8 and 9.92 that revises the statement that remote shutdown system testing is controlled by AP 1038 to reflect that the testing is now controlled in accordance with the TMI-1 Technical Specifications I accordance with TS Amendment 216. Document: SE-000542-012, “IC Pump Trip Alarm” In addition, the changes make minor editorial corrections, remove redundant statements and revises some wording for clarity. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the editorial and clarity changes are made in accordance with the guidance of NEI 98-03 and TMI-1 TS Amendment 216.

**Document: SE-000621-008, “ICS Runbacks and CRD Out Inhibit Signals Corrections in FSAR Section 7.2.2.3.2.a.3.b”**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to Section 7.2.2.3.2.a.3.b of the UFSAR that corrects inaccuracies and redundancies regarding ICS runbacks and CRD out inhibit signals. The changes are editorial in nature and do not reflect any change in the manner in which any structure, system or component is operated. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation notes that the integrated control system has not credited nuclear safety functions and that the changes do not increase the likelihood of an accident.

**Document: SE-000621-009, “Removal of Duplicate Capacity Information for TBVs and ADVs in FSAR Section 7.21.3.2.c”**

This evaluation addressed a revision of Section 7.2.3.2.c of the UFSAR to remove information that is also contained in Section 10.3.2.1.b. The change is editorial in nature and the removal of the information is consistent with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000621-010, “Removal of Feedwater Reratioing Example from FSAR 7.2.3.2.d.3”**

This evaluation addressed editorial revisions to Section 7.2.3.2.d.3 of the UFSAR made to correct an inaccuracy and to remove excessive detail. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety

previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes were made consistent with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03 and removed excessive detail.

**Document: SE-000621-007, “ Removal of Maneuvering Rate Information from ICS Design Basis FSAR 7.2.3.1”**

This evaluation addressed a change made to Section 7.2.3.1 of the UFSAR description of Integrated Control System plant maneuvering rates. The change removed excessive detail that was redundant to information provided in section 7.2.3.2.b of the UFSAR. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000621-012, “ Removal of ICS Detailed Design Information, FSAR Sections 7.2.3.3.a & 7.2.3.4”**

This evaluation addressed changes to FSAR Sections 7.2.3.3a and the deletion of Section 7.2.3.4 to remove excessive detail and redundant information from the UFSAR. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. The changes made were consistent with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03.

**Document: SE-000621-013, “Correct Loss of Load Consideration, FSAR Section 7.2.3.3.d”**

This evaluation addressed changes made to FSAR Section 7.2.3.3.d to correct nomenclature and inaccuracies regarding the plant response to loss of load. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety

question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made describe the plant response to a load rejection transient to reflect the post-accident changes made to the PORV lift setpoint.

**Document: SE-000621-014, “Additional Information on SASS and MWg to FSAR Section 7.3.2.2.b”**

This evaluation addressed changes made to Section 7.3.2.2.b of the UFSAR to add additional information regarding the Smart Actuation Select System (SASS) and to describe an additional process variable description for generated Megawatts (MWg). The change to add the information was found to be consistent with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000621-015, “Replace Detailed Referenced ICS Drawings with an Overview Drawing, FSAR Section 7.2.3”**

The evaluation reviewed the change made to UFSAR Section 7.2.3 to replace reference Bailey Meter Co drawings and FSAR figure 7.2-4 with a TMI integrated control system (ICS) overview drawing to improve clarity. The change to add the information was found to be consistent with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000641-031, “UFSAR Section 7.1.1.7”**

This evaluation revised Section 7.1.1.7 of the UFSAR to improve clarity by clarifying that only those protection system detectors that are required to complete their protective function after the Reactor Building becomes a harsh environment are required to be environmentally qualified. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, no changes were made to any plant structure, system or component. Only the description of which instruments must be qualified to operate in a harsh environment was revised to improve clarity.

**Document: SE-000641-003, “Addition of RC3APT2 and RC3BPT2 to the Environmental Master Qualification List”**

This evaluation reviewed the addition of two instruments to the Environmental Master Qualification List (EQML). The instruments had been incorrectly deleted from the EQML in 1989 and they were returned to the EQML in response to a corrective action program action item (see CAP T1999-1128). The change to add the information was found to be consistent with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000642-010, “Regulatory Guide 1.97 Containment Isolation Valve Position Indication”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of a change made to Table 7.3-2 of the UFSAR that clarified that there would not be continuous position verification for MU-V-2A/B and IC-V-2 in the event that in a post-accident environment the RB water level rose to above the location of the components. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question

because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that the valves would continue to be able to perform their safety function, containment isolation prior to being exposed to flood conditions. In addition, flood conditions would not cause the valves to re-open because the valves would be closed prior to flood conditions and would then fail as-is.

**Document: SE-000642-011, “SEDR for FSAR Section 1.3.2.11**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to clarify Section 1.3.2.11 to state that RB spray valves are actuated by the 4 psig ESAS actuation. The word “by” in the phrase “by RB pressure 30 psig ”was replaced by the word “before” so the phrase now reads “before RB pressure exceeds 30 psig”.. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000642-012, “SBDB-T1-642”**

This evaluation addressed several changes made to a system design basis document (SDBD) that is an internal TMI-1 document. The change updated the system design basis and reformatted and reorganized the SBDB but not change was made to how any plat structure, system or component was operated. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000664-008, “Change to FSAR Section 6.5.2 for UFSAR Update 15”**

This evaluation addressed changes made to UFSAR Section 6.5.2 to correct a mis-statement in the UFSAR regarding the number of sample locations for monitoring Hydrogen gas in the Reactor Building. The information was revised to delete a statement that there were provisions to sample from multiple locations. In fact, there is one sample location, near the top of the dome. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000770-001, “Separation of Class 1E Conduit ED117 from Non-Class 1E Conduit EA6891 and Class 1E Conduit Me51 and RV28 from non-Class 1E Conduit RX3”**

This evaluation reviewed the as-found physical separation difference between Class 1E and non-Class 1E circuits. The evaluation found the physical separation between redundant circuits as described in the design basis was met. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000811-004, “Plant FSAR Update”**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to FSAR section 9.9.4.2 to clarify that the fire system deluge system that protects charcoal filters are manual and not automatic. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the

possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000824-008, “Editorial Update to FSAR Section 5.3.3”**

This evaluation reviewed a change to Section 5.3.3.2.a of the FSAR that added a reference to the appropriate Technical Specification section and deleted and incomplete description of when the RB Purge Isolation Valves can be opened. The changes were editorial in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000826-020, “Update to FSAR Section 7.4.5”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to update Section 7.4.5 of the UFSAR to update the section to reflect the current licensing basis for Control Room Habitability, to clarify the air leakage into and out of the Main Control Room, to improve clarity, to delete outdated information and to update the references. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made update the section to reflect the current licensing basis regarding Control Room Habitability and as stated in License Amendment 215.

**Document: SE-000826-021, “Update to FSAR Section 9.8.1”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Sections 9.8.1, 9.8.1.2.c, 9.8.1.4 and 9.8.1.5 section to reflect the current licensing basis regarding Control Room Habitability and as stated in License Amendment 215. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences

of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-000852-046, “PFU for FSAR Section 9.10.1”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the UFSAR to correct wording used in Section 9.10.1.2 to correct wording from Seismic Class II to Anti-Falldown, to add a reference to drawing 302270. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that since the Instrument Air System is not required to be functional during or after a seismic event, the system needs only to be supported to prevent it from falling and damaging other safety-related systems.

**Document: SE-000852-047, “PFU for FSAR Section 7.3.2.2.c.17”**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to UFSAR Section 7.3.2.2.c.17 to include the Reactor Building Emergency Cooling System and RR—V-6 in the section that describes the two (2) hour backup instrument air system. The modification that added RRV-6 to the two hour backup instrument air system was evaluated in a separate safety evaluation, SE-128216-001. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the change to the UFSAR did not represent an unreviewed safety question based on the conclusion of SE-128216-001.

**Document: SE-000853-002, “PFU FSAR Section 9.10.2 Hydrogen”**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to Section 9.10.2 of the UFSAR to correct errors in the system design description and to improve clarity in the section. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, no changes were made to how the hydrogen system is operated or controlled or to the procedures utilized to operate the hydrogen system.

**Document: SE-000854-002, “PFU FSAR Section 9.10.2”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 9.10.2 of the UFSAR to correct errors in the system design description and to improve clarity in the section. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, no changes were made to how the nitrogen system is operated or controlled or to the procedures utilized to operate the nitrogen system.

**Document: SE-000861-001, “Emergency Diesel Generator Maintenance Frequency Extension”**

This safety evaluation reviewed a change to the frequency of maintenance inspections for the TMI-1 Emergency Diesel Generators from 1 year to 2 years. The evaluation concluded that change requires a Technical Specification change prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-000864-001, “FSAR Change for SBO Diesel Initiating Events Definition”**

This evaluation reviewed an evaluation of what is meant in UFSAR Section 8.5.2. The evaluation concluded that the Section did not mean that an event initiated by flood is part of the SBO diesel design bases. correct errors in the system design description and to improve clarity in the section. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, no changes were made to how the hydrogen system is operated or controlled or to the procedures utilized to operate the hydrogen system.

**Document: SE-000900-012, “FSAR Chapter 14 Maximum Hypothetical Accident Doses for TSCR 290 Using AST Guidance from Reg. Guide 1.183”**

This evaluation reviewed revisions of the UFSAR Chapter 14 Maximum Hypothetical Accident Doses using the alternative radiological source terms provided in Regulatory Guide 1.183 and changing the Technical Specification 4.5.4 Accident Recirculation System Leakage limit to 15 gallons per hour. The evaluation concluded that NRC approval is required prior to implementation of the changes.

**Document: SE-000901-007, “T.S. Bases Update for Post LOCA H2 Control in Containment”**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to a Bases statement of Technical Specification 4.4.4 to revise the requirement for initiation of using a recombiner from 9.8 days to 5 days after a LOCA. correct errors in the system design description and to improve clarity in the section. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a

different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the concentration of hydrogen inside Containment will be maintained below 3 % by volume and will be maintained below 3 % as described in FSAR Section 6.5.

**Document: SE-1113202-868, “Peerless River Water Pump Tube Stabilizer”**

This evaluation reviews the installation of a rubber stabilizer in the columns of the Peerless River Water pumps, correct errors in the system design description and to improve clarity in the section. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that installation of the tube stabilizers will decrease the likelihood of malfunction of the river water pumps due to vibration.

**Document: SE-113202-879, “UFSAR PFU Section 5.2.25”**

This evaluation reviewed changes to Section 5.2.2.5 of the UFSAR to clarify the design provision for protection of Containment against corrosive influences. The changes made deleted misleading wording in Section 5.2.2.5.a, clarified wording in 5.2.2.5.b and deleted a misleading statement from Section 5.3.3.5.d. correct errors in the system design description and to improve clarity in the section. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-115201-053, Rev. 1, “TSCR 262, Supplement 1**

This evaluation found that proposed changes to the TMI-1 Technical Specifications that revised certain Technical Specifications to be consistent with NUREG 1430, B&W Revised Standard Technical Specifications and revised the sampling requirements for the Spent Fuel Pool required NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-115201-059, Rev. 1, “License Change Application (LCA) No. 287, Revision 1, Supplement 1 – Makeup Tank Level and Pressure Limits”**

This evaluation determined that proposed changes to impose new requirements for the makeup/high pressure injection system operation, testing and calibration frequencies for Makeup Tank level, HPI flow, LPI flow and BWST instruments required NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-115201-061, “License Change Application (LCA) No. 286 – Emergency Feedwater Technical Specification and Bases Changes”**

This evaluation determined that changes proposed for TMI-1 Technical Specifications 3.4, 3.5.5 and 4.9.1 and associated Bases statements for Specifications 3.4 and 3.5.5 regarding the TMI-1 Emergency Feed Water System (EFW) required NRC approval prior to implementation. The proposed changes to revise the Technical Specifications clarified the wording in the Technical Specifications and added limiting conditions of operation consistent with the results of an EFW flow system analysis.

**Document: SE-115201-066 “TSCR 292 – Request for Exemption from Requirement for Combustible Gas Control Systems”**

This evaluation determined that proposed changes to TMI-1 Technical Specifications Table 3.5-3, 4.4, 3.6, 4.4.4 and to Bases statements in sections 3.5.5.2 and 4.12.2 regarding the hydrogen recombiner requirements required NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-115970-001, “Safety Evaluation for PFU-2000-T1-196, “Fuel Cask Drop Analysis””**

This evaluation reviewed a change to the UFSAR Sections 14.2.2.8.a and 14.2.2.8.b that deletes a statement regarding the maximum cask height of 43 feet that is inconsistent with the referenced supporting analysis and is therefore misleading. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-116001-009, “UFSAR Chapter 14, Section 14.2.2.4.5.c, Discussion of RCP Trip”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 14.2.2.4.5.c of the UFSAR to clarify that during a small break loss of coolant accident scenario (SBLOCA) the operator action to trip the Reactor Coolant Pumps will be initiated upon loss of sub-cooling margin. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the change does pose an unreviewed safety question because the NRC had previously reviewed and approved this treatment of RCP trip via a NRC Safety Evaluation report.

**Document: SE-116001-013, “UFSAR Chapter 14.2.2.3, “Revise Description of Boron Concentration Control following LBLOCA”**

This evaluation reviewed changes to UFSAR Section 14.2.2.3.3.c.2 concerning boron precipitation following a loss of coolant accident. The changes made included timing information for the hot leg injection method of boron precipitation using Auxiliary Spray and revising Reference 91. to include an additional case to address the expected Auxiliary Spray flow rate of 65 gallons per minute. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of

occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-116001-014, “Revise Description of Condensate Usage for Loss of All AC”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 14.1.2.8.c.4 of the UFSAR to describe the amount of time the inventory of a single Condensate Storage Tank will provide decay heat removal following a loss of all AC event. The time previously stated was 24 hours. The time was revised to 18.6 hours to be taken into account the current plant licensed power level of 2568 MWt. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-116001-021, “PFU 2000-T1-001, FSAR Section 14.2.2.9 – Feedwater Line Break Accident”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 14.2.2.9 of the UFSAR to incorporate and expand upon information that was previously discussed in Section 14.2.2.7 to differentiate the event acceptance criteria and to reference the current analysis for EFW flow requirements. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. The changes made clarify EFW flow requirements and update references.

**Document: SE-116001-022, “PFU 2000-T1-099, “FSAR Section 14.2.2.2. Update – Rod Ejection Accident”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 14.2.2.2 of the TMI-1 UFSAR to enhance and clarify the description of a rod ejection accident, to incorporate current analysis changes into Table 14.2-11 and to correct typographical errors in Table 14.2-11. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-116001-024, “FSAR Section 14.2.2.7.b.4 – Evaluation of Anticipatory Reactor Trip (ART) on the need for a low steam generator level trip for feedwater events**

This evaluation reviewed the elimination of information in section 14.2.2.7.b.4 that was redundant to information provided in Section 7.1 and references to the UFSAR. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-116001-028, “PFU – 2000-T1-097, Main Steam Line Break Accident update – FSAR Section 14.2.2.9”**

This evaluation reviewed a revision made to Section 14.2.2.9 of the UFSAR to incorporate the most current analysis. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made per the current analysis revised assumptions in

the original FSAR analysis to more conservative assumptions regarding a split core model, a moderator temperature coefficient, EFW flow to the affected generator for 10 minutes and a high flux trip setpoint based on NI instrument error. The changes made however still found via the new analysis that the consequences of a main steam line break accident were not increased.

**Document: PFU 2000-T1-191, “FSAR 14.1.2.4, Moderator Dilution Accident PFU”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 14.1.2.4 of the UFSAR to change the description of the moderator dilution accident to improve the clarity of the information provided, to provide more specific information and to remove excessive detail. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-116615-002, “Hydrographic Update”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 2.6.3 of the UFSAR that incorporated the results of a 1998 Susquehanna River hydraulic study. The results of the study confirmed that earlier conclusions that river water level would be 272' above sea level upon loss of both the York Haven Dam and the East Channel. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-135425-017, “TSCR 302, U-235 Loading Criteria”**

This evaluation reviewed a proposed change to TMI-1 Technical Specification 5.4.2.f regarding the linear density of U-235 in a re-designed fuel pellet. The evaluation concluded that the proposed change to Technical Specifications required NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-135425-018, “TSCR-303, “Pressure-Temperature Protective Limits”**

This evaluation reviewed a proposed change to TMI-1 Technical Specifications to relocate Technical Specification Figures 2.1-1, 2.1-3 and 2.3-1 from the Technical Specifications to the TMI-1 Core Operating Limits Report (COLR). The evaluation concluded that the proposed change to Technical Specifications required NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-412658-003, “C-1101-153-5310-022, TMI-1 Reactor Building Max. Flood Level”**

This evaluation reviewed the recalculation of the maximum flood level in the TMI-1 Reactor Building that would result from a large-break loss of coolant accident (LBLOCA). The new calculated flood level is 286’- 9.32’’. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that the new calculated LBLOCA flood level remains below the lowest elevation for safety related instrumentation that cannot be submerged during a transient condition. Therefore, there is no increase in the probability for a malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR.

**Document: SE-945100-228, “PFU 2000-T1-015, FSAR Table 14A-7”**

This evaluation reviewed a revision made to the UFSAR Table 14A-7 regarding the peak pressure inside the Intermediate Building following a Main Steam Line Break accidents to change the pressure units from psid to psia. This corrects a typographical error in the UFSAR. Document: SE-412658-003, “C-1101-153-5310-022, TMI-1 Reactor Building Max. Flood Level”

This evaluation reviewed the recalculation of the maximum flood level in the TMI-1 Reactor Building that would result from a large-break loss of coolant accident (LBLOCA). The new calculated flood level is 286’- 9.32’’. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety

question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-257, “TMI-1 UFSAR Update for AmerGen Sale”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the TMI-1 UFSAR to reflect the sale of the plant from GPU to AmerGen. The sale of the facility was approved by the NRC in accordance with license and technical specification change requests. The changes made to the UFSAR are editorial in nature replacing GPU with AmerGen as it pertains to the current owner/operator. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-260, “PFU Table 9.6-1”**

This evaluation reviewed to table 9.6-1 of the TMI-1 UFSAR to designate the table as historical information. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the change to the UFSAR was made consistent with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03.

**Document: SE-945100-267, “FSAR Correction – Valve Flow Capacities”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of table 4.2-8 of the TMI-1 UFSAR to be consistent with other portions of the SAR and other plant design documentation in regards to total capacity values for the pilot operated relief valve. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the

consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the accident analysis uses the actual valve flow capacity as compared to the total flow capacity that had been previously stated.

**Document: SE945100-271, ‘PFU for Transfer of OE from Shift Engineering to PRG’**

This evaluation reviewed a revision of Chapter 12 of the UFSAR to reflect that the responsibility for a review of Operating Experience was transferred from the Shift Engineering group to the Plant Review Group. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. The change was administrative in nature and did not impact the status, control of or monitoring of any plant structure, system or component.

**Document: SE-945100-296, “FSAR Section 2.6 Revisions June 1999 (Rev. 15)”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 2.6 of the UFSAR to incorporate the results of a recent analysis of low water in the Susquehanna River. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made show the water level in the Susquehanna remains above the prior low water level reported in the UFSAR in the event of the loss of the east channel and the York Haven Dam.

**Document: SE-945100-301, “Plant UFSAR Update”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to several sections of the UFSAR to improve the clarity of the information provided regarding the Engineered Safeguards Actuation System. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made are editorial in nature and do not reflect any changes in the operation of the ESAS nor in the consequences of any design basis accident.

**Document: SE-945100-304, “FSAR/Review of Assigned Sections**

This evaluation reviewed editorial changes made to sections 1.4-17, 1.4-20, 1.4-22 and 1.4-27 to improve clarity. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-306, “Plant UFSAR Update for FSAR Section 4.3.10.3”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 4.3.10.3 of the UFSAR to remove a paragraph regarding RCS leakage because the information is addressed by a specific Technical Specification, 3.1.6. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-307, “FSAR 4.4.1, PFU 2000-T1-090, FSAR Section 4.4.1**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 4.4.1 to reflect the addition of reference to Subsections IWE and IWL of the 1992 Edition through 1992 Addenda of ASME Section XI as mandated by 10 CFR 50.55. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the additional requirements are consistent with 10 CFR 50.55a.

**Document: SE-945100-320, “Revise Chapter 5 Figure”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of UFSAR Figure 5.2-35 to graphically represent the as-built configuration of the Reactor Building structure in the region of the liner lower knuckle to improve the clarity of the information provided by the figure. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-321, “Proposed Changes to Section 5.1.1”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of Section 5.1.1 of the TMI-1 UFSAR to improve the clarity of the information provided regarding the diesel generator fuel oil day tanks, to add additional information regarding the diesel generator air start tanks and piping and to delete information regarding the seismic classification of the water gates in the Spent Fuel Pools that is incorrect. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR.

and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-322, “FSAR PFU 2000-T1-135”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Table 7.3-2 of the TMI-1 UFSAR to correct typographical errors and inaccuracies, to re-format the table to improve clarity and to eliminate excessive detail. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-324, ‘Editorial Update to FSAR Section 9.6’**

This evaluation reviewed minor editorial changes made to Section 9.6 of the UFSAR to improve clarity. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document : SE-945100-326, “PFU to Delete Appendix 14E of the TMI-1 FSAR”**

This evaluation reviewed the deletion of table 14E from the UFSAR to eliminate excessive detail information that is not related to the current design and licensing basis of the plant regarding offsite dose from analyzed accidents. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-31, Biennial Review of FSAR Update 14 Section 9.6**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 9.6 of the UFSAR to improve clarity, correct inaccuracies and to add references. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically the changes made do not modify the manner in which any plant structure, system or component is controlled or monitored.

**Document: SE-945100-333, “PFU 2000-T1-184”**

This evaluation reviewed the change made to TMI-1 Administrative Procedure 1001A to change the title of the Director, System Engineering to Director, Plant Engineering. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-334, “PECO/Unicom Merger”**

This evaluation reviewed proposed changes to the TMI-1 Facility Operating License No DPR-50 as described in License Amendment Request 293 to make changes to reflect the merger of PECO Energy Company with Unicom Corporation. The evaluation concluded that NRC approval of the changes is required prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-945100-341, “FSAR”**

This evaluation reviewed the re-assignment of the responsibility for training for Security personnel from the Training Department to the Security Department. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the

consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document SE-945100-342, FSAR Section 11.5.8.6**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to Section 11.5.8.6 of the UFSAR to revise the description of the policy for limiting internal exposure to radioactive materials to be consistent with the total dose equivalent exposure/As Low As Reasonably Achievable concepts. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-343, “TMI-1 UFSAR Section 12.1 Involving Deletion of Manager, Shift Engineering Position”**

This evaluation reviewed the revision of UFSAR Sections 12.1.2.1.1 and 12.1.2.3.1 to delete the Manager, Shift Engineering position described in Section 12 and add a new position, Operations Support Manager. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes were administrative in nature and did not impact the status, control or monitoring of any plant structure, system or component.

**Document: SE-945100-346, “TMI-1 UFSAR Section 12.1 Involving Deletion of Manager, Environmental Affairs and Manager, Occupational Safety Positions”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to UFSAR Sections 12.1.2.1.2 , 12.1.2.1.3, 12.1.2.5.4 and Figure 12.1-2 that deleted references to the positions of Manager, Environmental Affairs and Manager, Occupational Safety. The changes are administrative in nature and did not impact the status, control or monitoring of any plant structure, system or component. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-349, “TMI FSAR”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the TMI UFSAR to reflect changes made in the transfer of Radwaste Operations to Radiological and Industrial Safety Department. The changes are administrative in nature and did not impact the status, control or monitoring of any plant structure, system or component. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-350, “TSCR No. 283 – Supplement 1: “Degraded Grid Actions Following Receipt of A Post-Contingency Alarm from the Grid Operator””**

This evaluation reviewed a proposed change to TMI-1 Technical Specifications Section 3.7. The evaluation concluded the change required NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-945100-352, “TSCR 298, IOSRG/Review & Audit”**

This evaluation reviewed a proposed change to TMI-1 Technical Specifications Chapter 6 regarding the Independent On-Site Review Group (IOSRG). The evaluation concluded that the changes require NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-945100-354, “Figure 2.1-3 Correction”**

This evaluation reviewed a change to Figure 2.1-3 of the UFSAR to correct an error in the plot plan for the facility. The change made the plot plan consistent with information regarding the offsite electrical transmission lines that is contained in Section 8.2.1 of the UFSAR. The changes are editorial in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-355, “UFSAR”**

This evaluation reviewed revisions made to Sections 12.2.2.4.3, 12.2.4 and 12.7.1 of the UFSAR to reflect the transfer of the Emergency Preparedness training from the Training Department to the Emergency Preparedness group. This change was administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-363, “TMI-1 UFSAR Section 12.1 Reflecting Closure of the Environmental Rad. Lab.”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 12.1.2.1.2 and Figure 12.1-2 of the UFSAR to delete the position of Manager, Environmental Radiological

Laboratory. These changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-364, “TMI-1 UFSAR Section 12.1 Reflect Reorganization of Work Management Division”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Sections 12.1.2.2, 12.1.2.9 and to Figure 12.1-2 that reflect organizational changes made in the Work Management Division. These changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-366, “FSAR Section 11.5.2 and 11.5.8.1 PFU 2002-T1-025”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Sections 11.5.2 and 11.5.8.1 of the TMI-1 UFSAR to the description of dosimetry devices used at TMI-1. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the new dosimetry devices will continue to be qualified to the requirements and locations as required by 10 CFR 20.

**Document: SE-945100-368, “UFSAR”**

This evaluation reviewed the changes made to the UFSAR to reflect the transfer of the responsibility for radiological controls and chemistry training from the Support Training Group to the Technical Training Group. These changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-371, “FSAR Chapter 11.5.8.3”**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to UFSAR Section 11.5.8.3 to delete a description of a monthly report that contains information that is now reported on a daily basis via the corrective action process. This change removed excessive detail from the UFSAR. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-945100-373, “FSAR Chapter 12 Conduct of Operations”**

This evaluation reviewed a change made to Chapter 12 of the UFSAR to reflect the organizational change that revised the reporting relationship for Procurement Engineering from the Design Engineering group to Supply Chain Management. This change is administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-946700-003, "TMI-1 UFSAR Section 12.1 Update for AmerGen Sale"**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 12.1 of the UFSAR to reflect the revised organizational structure that resulted from the sale of TMI-1 from GPU to AmerGen. The NRC approval of the sale of the plant was addressed via approval of a license amendment request. The changes made to Chapter 12.1 reflect the new management organization. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-946700-004, "Revision to UFSAR Description of Communications Division"**

This evaluation reviewed the changes made to the UFSAR to reflect a revised reporting relationship for Communications and Public Affairs personnel at TMI-1. These changes were administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-946700-005, "License Amendment Request No. 297 – Control Building Ventilation System Dampers"**

This evaluation reviewed a proposed revision to TMI-1 Technical Specifications section 4.12.1.3 to remove the specification of individual damper component tag numbers as unnecessary detail. The evaluation concluded that the change required NRC approval prior to implementation.

**Document: SE-946700-007, “License Amendment Request No. 301 – Use of “M5” Advanced Alloy”**

This evaluation reviewed the proposed revision of TMI-1 UFSR Section 3 and Technical Specification Sections 5.3.1.1 and a Bases statement for Section 2.1 to reflect the use of M5 alloy as cladding for reactor fuel rods and fuel assembly spacer grids. The evaluation concluded that NRC approval was required prior to implementation of the use of M5 Advanced Alloy.

**Document: SE-946700-008, “TMI Unit 1 UFSAR Chapter 12 Management and Technical Support Organizational Changes as a Result of the PECO/Unicom Merger and Restructuring”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to the TMI-1 UFSAR Chapter 12 to reflect organizational changes made as a result of the merger and restructuring of PECO and Unicom and the impact those changes had on the management and technical support for TMI-1. These changes are administrative in nature. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-946700-009, “License Amendment Request No. 249 – Containment Integrity During Refueling Operations”**

This evaluation reviewed proposed changes to TMI-1 Technical Specifications Sections 3.8.6, 3.8.7, 3.8.11 and UFSAR Section 14.22.2.1. The evaluation concluded that the proposed changes require NRC approval prior to implementation.

### **III. Modifications:**

A Safety Evaluation or 50.59 evaluation was prepared in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59 for each of the modifications listed below.

#### **Document: SE-000153-011, “Reactor Building Minimum Required Pre-stressing Forces”**

This safety evaluation determined that revising the minimum levels of containment pre-stressing tendon forces necessary to satisfy plant design criteria did not represent an unreviewed safety question because re-calculated containment pre-stressing tendon forces were determined utilizing the criteria of FSAR sections 5.2.1.2.3 and 5.2.3.2.5.a as acceptance criteria. The safety evaluation concluded that the change did not alter the ability of the Reactor Building to meet all required safety functions in the mitigation of the consequences of a design basis accident.

#### **Document: SE-000153-017, “Incorporation of 2090P-2 and 2090P-4 as Substitutes for 2090P as Tendon Casing Filler Grease and Associated Revision of FSAR Section 5.2.2.3.7”**

This safety evaluation determined that substitution of Visconorust 2090P-2 and 2090P-4 tendon grease as substitutes for Viconorust 2090P did not represent an unreviewed safety question because the substitute casing filler grease performed as well or better than the original grease in preventing corrosion of the Reactor Building tendons. Therefore, the change to the substitute casing filler greases did not increase the probability of occurrence of a malfunction of equipment important to safety or create the possibility of a different type of malfunction than any previously evaluated. The tendons are not accident initiators, therefore the change did not increase either the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated. For the same reason, the change in grease did not increase the probability of an accident of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR. The tendon casing grease is not addressed in TMI-1 Technical Specifications therefore the change did not require a change to Technical Specifications.

**Document: SE-000156-003, “Evaluation for Continued Operations – Intermediate Building to Fuel Handling Building Internal Flood Seal**

This safety evaluation determined that the discovery that a “watertight seal” had been removed from the intersection of the Fuel Handling Building wall and the Reactor Building exterior wall in the Upper Tendon Access Gallery of the Intermediate Building. The missing seal was a 1/8<sup>th</sup> inch EPDM sealing strip. Subsequent investigation found the seal had most likely been removed during the installation of a fire penetration seal. The evaluation determined that while the fire prevention seal, the amount of leakage from the Intermediate Building into the Fuel Handling Building would be sufficiently limited such that the installed sump pumps would be more than capable of handling the postulated leakage. Therefore, the evaluation concluded that the condition did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. In addition, the evaluation concluded that a Technical Specification change was not required because the condition was identified as a degraded, non-conforming condition that was restored to its original licensing basis in accordance with the guidance presented in NRC Generic Letter 91-18.

**Document: SE-000214-014, “Evaluation of Building Spray Orifice Plates BS-FE-1299/1300 Resizing”**

This safety evaluation reviewed the replacement of the existing Building Spray (BS) orifice plates with new plates that would limit the flow through the BS system to between 800 and 1180 gallons per minute. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, reducing the allowable BS flow rate to 800 gpm was found to not degrade the net positive suction head margin for the BS and low pressure injection pumps and that the environmental qualification profile for the Reactor Building would not be impacted. In addition, core temperature limits are not impacted by the modification. Peak post-accident RB pressure was found to

only be minimally impacted. Peak RB pressure is predicted to increase by 0.51 psi to 49.6 psig but remain below the exiting TMI-1 Technical Specification limit of 50.6 psig.

**Document: SE-000214-018, “Building Spray System Design Flow of 1350 GPM**

This safety evaluation reviewed a change of the design Reactor Building Spray System flow rate from 2500 gallons per minute to 2700 gallons per minute. The evaluation concluded the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the increase in the BS flow rate was found to have no impact on the ability of the Building Spray system to perform its design functions of limiting post-accident reactor building pressure to less than 50.6 psig and removing fission products from a post-accident RB atmosphere by spraying NaOH solution

**Document: SE-000421-003, “Main Condensate System Seismic Boundary CST “A””**

This evaluation reviewed the movement of the seismic Class 1 boundary to delete credit being taken for a valve that was secured to a non-seismic block wall. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation states that even assuming a seismic event damages the valve in question (CO-V-25A), operator actions evaluated in the safety analysis and described in the bases for TMI-1 Technical Specifications would compensate for the loss of the valve and inventory of Condensate Storage Tank 1A. In addition, the evaluation describes the numerous alternate sources of cooling water including the fully qualified Reactor Building Emergency Cooling System.

**Document: SE-000531-012, “Install Valves and Inspection Ports on Nuclear River Backwash Piping”**

This evaluation reviewed the installation of two 12 inch valves, two four inch inspection ports and the relocation of a two inch vent line in the Nuclear River Water System. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the modifications being made do not impact normal operation and are being installed to facilitate maintenance on the heat exchangers during component outages. The components installed are rated for system operating pressures and temperatures. In addition, stress on the piping system was analyzed and found to remain within code allowables.

**Document: SE-000531-015, “Nuclear Services River Water Leak”**

This evaluation reviewed the impact a known leak in the Nuclear Services River Water System (NSRW) system had on the design basis for the facility. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation noted that despite the leak of approximately 60 gallons per minute, the NSRW remained capable of providing adequate heat removal to the Nuclear Services Closed Cooling Water System while repairs to the leaking pipe were in progress. In addition, the evaluation noted that a loss of NSRW is addressed in the FSAR section 9.6.2.3 and in plant procedure 1202-38.

**Document: SE-000542-012, “IC Pump Trip Alarm”**

This evaluation addressed the addition of an alarm for a trip of an Intermediate Closed Cooling water pump to an alarm window in the control room. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, system operation in both normal and transient conditions is unaffected by the change. The addition of activation of an alarm window in the TMI-1 control room in the event of a trip of an intermediate closed cooling water system pump enhances operator cognizance of system conditions.

**Document : SE-00573-001, Rev. 1, “Auxiliary Building Sump Operation during RB Sump Recirculation Mode”**

This evaluation reviewed the change in the operation of the Auxiliary Building Sump that addresses use of a recirculation mode. Document: SE-000542-012, “IC Pump Trip Alarm” This evaluation addressed the addition of an alarm for a trip of an Intermediate Closed Cooling water pump to an alarm window in the control room. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concludes that the Auxiliary Building Sump will continue to be able to operate with leakage from a safeguards pump seal failure during long term recirculation.

**Document: SE-000700-008, “Degraded Voltage Relay Setpoint Tolerance Revision”**

The evaluation reviewed changes made to the degraded voltage relay as-left calibration tolerance, to the degraded voltage relay calibration interval, the degraded voltage relay pickup setting, to reduce the maximum turbine plant

loading limit, to reduce turbine plant loading to no more than the five Circulating water Pumps (CWPs) for single transformer operation and to reduce turbine plant loading for low grid voltage conditions. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that the changes made do not increase the probability of a loss of offsite power event.

**Document: SE-000723-002, “Separation of 1A Main Transformer”**

This evaluation reviewed the operation of the TMI-1 plant at less than 1000% power while the Main Transformer 1A is removed from service for maintenance and repair. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the operation of the plant on a single main transformer was found to result in not more than a minimal increase in the frequency of occurrence of any accident (reactor trip or loss of offsite power) and that the existing Chapter 14 accident analyses bound the plant operating at power levels below 100%.

**Document: SE-000730-005, “FSAR/Chapter 8 Update”**

This evaluation reviewed changes made to Section 8 of the UFSAR to correct a reference and make minor editorial changes. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

The changes made were made in accordance with the guidance provided in NEI 98-03.

**Document: SE-11302-937, “SF-V31/32 Hot Particle Bonnet Drain Provision”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of the SF-V-31 and SF-V-31 valve bonnets that installed a valved drain connection and a capped flush connection to facilitate internal decontamination. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the installed connections will be closed during normal system operation and will be able to maintain integrity against system operating temperatures and pressures.

**Document: SE-113202-941, “Decay Heat Pump Bearing Stiffener Modification”**

This evaluation reviewed the installation of an existing bearing housing stiffener bracket with a stiffer bracket to dampen pump vibrations, correct errors in the system design description and to improve clarity in the section. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation found that the installation of the stiffer bracket and the required reroute of a Decay Heat Closed Cooling Water supply line to the Decay heat pump bearing did not increase the likelihood of malfunction of the pump. This is because the rerouted line was to be equivalent in integrity and strength to the existing line and the installation of a stiffer bracket will enhance pump reliability by reducing vibration.

**Document: SE 113202-946, “MOV Open Torque Switch Bypass”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of motor operated valves CO-V-111A, CO-V-111B, CF-V-2A, CF-V-2B, EF-V-1A, EF-V-2B, RW-V-5A, FW-V-5B, FW-V-92A, FW-V-92B, MS-V-1A, MS-V-1B, MS-V-1C, MS-V-1D, MS-V-2A, MS-V-2B, MU-V-2A, MU-V-2B, MU-V-25, NS-V-4, NS-V-15, NS-V-35, RB-V-2A, RB-V-7, RC-V-2, RC-V-3, WDG-V-3 and WDL-V-303 to install a 90% open torque switch bypass. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that the modification of the valves to install the 90% open torque switch bypass did not increase the likelihood of malfunction of the components because it improves the reliability and capability of the motor operated valves.

**Document: SE-113202-964, “Repair Underground NR Piping West of Heat Exchanger Vault”**

This evaluation reviewed the repair methods and precautions and the resultant piping and system configuration after repair of the 30 inch underground prestressed concrete cylinder pipe for the Nuclear River Water System. The evaluation concludes that the repairs made to the concrete piping did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the piping was restored to its original design configuration and meets applicable industry code and seismic requirements. The repaired piping passed a post-repair leak test conducted in accordance with ASMT XI IWA-5000.

**Document: SE-120067-001, Rev. 1 “Control Building Habitability Mods”**

This evaluation reviewed the modifications made to eliminate single active failure modes in the Control Building Emergency Ventilation Dampers that contributed to unfiltered in-leakage. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the modifications made ensure that TMI-1 satisfies the requirements for Control Room Operator dose as stated in NRC General Design Criteria 19.

**Document: SE-410033-002, “Temporary Power for 1R14 Turbine Replacement”**

This evaluation reviewed a temporary modification of the plant electrical cable configuration as described in section 8.2.2.13.a. The modification was made to provide temporary power during the TMI-1 Turbine Replacement outage project that took place during the 1R14 outage. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the evaluation concluded that a UFSAR change was not necessary to accommodate the temporary installation in accordance with the guidance of NEI 98-03.

**Document: SE-410033-006, “Turbine Steam Path Replacement”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of the main turbine steam path as part of the TMI Turbine Replacement Project. and revision of UFSAR sections 5.4.3.2.4 and 10.2.2 to reflect revised heat balances, a decreased probability of generation of a turbine missile due to the design of the new Turbine and the use of mono block rotors. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of

occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: MD-H441-001, “Spare Reactor Coolant Pump Auxiliaries”**

This evaluation reviewed the installation of power to an electric heater and four oil pumps to be used on the spare TMI-1 reactor coolant pump motor stored in the TMI-1 Turbine Building. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the change does not impact TMI-1 since the power comes from the TMI-2 electrical distribution system.

**Document: SE-410079-001, “TMI-1 Control Building Reconfiguration”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of the 306’ elevation of the TMI-1 Control Building and a revision to the TMI-1 UFSAR section 5.1 and 5.4 to reflect changes made. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the changes made did not affect the structural integrity of the building because it relocated non-load bearing walls and non-safety related electrical equipment (lighting, etc.).

**Document: SE-410079-002, “MD-033942-002, TMI Unit 1: 306’ Control Building Reconfiguration, Addition of Door”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of elevation 306’ of the Control Building to install a door between the Control Building and the Auxiliary Building. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an

unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the modification did not impact Control Room Habitability in a post-accident environment because it was installed outside of the Control Building Emergency Envelope (CBEE) and therefore cannot impact unfiltered in-leakage into the CBEE during a design basis accident.

**Document: SE-410081-001, “MD-033335-001, Replacement of Auxiliary Transformers 1A & 1B”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of the plant Electrical Distribution System AC Voltage Regulation by the replacement of the existing station Auxiliary Transformers with new Auxiliary Transformers that have a slightly higher capacity, load tap changers and load tap control. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the modifications were found to only a minimal increase in the frequency of occurrence of accidents. The overall risk of loss of offsite power was qualitatively estimated to have been lowered due to the reduction in the probability of an initiating loss of power event and a reduction in the loss of power when other events cause a plant transient due to the design of the load tap changers installed.

**Document: SE-410086-002, “MD-034731-002, “Mechanical Draft Cooling Tower Mechanical Demolition”**

This evaluation reviewed the demolition of the TMI-1 Mechanical Draft Cooling Tower and the revision of the UFSAR to delete the statements that the Mechanical Draft Cooling Tower cools river water systems discharge water prior to discharge to the river. The elimination of the MDCT cooling of discharged water has been shown by a formal calculation to not impact the plant’s ability to comply with the requirements of the plants national Pollutant

Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit (PA 0009920) limits. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification.

**Document: SE-410094-001, “MD-033958-001, “ULD STAR Module”**

This evaluation reviewed the modification of the Integrated Control System Unit Load Demand circuit by replacement of the analog module with a digital control STAR module. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, quantitative estimates of the malfunction frequency of the STAR module found the failure frequency was consistent with the analog modules that were replaced. Therefore, the likelihood of occurrence of a malfunction of an SSC important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR was judged to not increase.

**Document: SE-412553-001, “T1-MM-412533-001, 9R Bailey BY Transmitter Replacement”**

This evaluation reviewed the replacement of eight (8) existing Bailey BY transmitters in the reactor coolant system with new Rosemount models, the deletion of two (2) Bailey BY level transmitters from the Steam Generators and re-route of the associated isolated signals. The evaluation concludes that the changes did not create an unreviewed safety question because they did not increase the probability of occurrence or the consequences of an accident or malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR, did not create the possibility of an accident or malfunction of a different type than any evaluated previously in the UFSAR and did not reduce the margin of safety as defined in the bases for any Technical Specification. Specifically, the safety functions of the Bailey BY transmitters replaced with Rosemount transmitters will continue to be performed. The accuracy of the

Rosemount transmitters is equal to or better than the Bailey transmitters and the loop response time is within the limit specified in the Safety Analysis for RC flow transients. The OTSG level transmitters removed from service were non-safety related.