



BEFORE THE
UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

In the Matter of:

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY
JERSEY CENTRAL POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION,
UNIT NO. 2

Docket No. 50-320

SUPPLEMENT TO
SUMMARY DESCRIPTION OF APPLICATION
FOR REACTOR CONSTRUCTION PERMIT
AND OPERATING LICENSE

DATE: October 1, 1969.

79042106/2

63-C54

INTRODUCTION

This Supplement to Summary Description of Application for Reactor Construction Permit and Operating License is submitted in response to questions asked by members of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board at the Pre-Hearing Conference held on September 19, 1969, in Washington, D. C.

This Supplement constitutes a portion of the Applicant's prepared testimony for the public hearing on the Application for a construction permit and is sponsored collectively by the sponsors of the Applicant's Summary Description of the Application for Reactor Construction Permit and Operating License, dated September 3, 1969.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Pre-Hearing Conference Transcript Reference</u>
I	Alternatives to Containment Purging to Relieve Hydrogen Generation Problem	1	p. 47
II	Discussion of Status of Iodine Removal Research and Development Program	1	pp. 47-48
	Discussion of Protection to be Afforded Against the Probable Maximum Flood	3	pp. 48, 53
IV	Summary of Applicant's Discussions with the Pennsylvania Department of Health	5	p. 49
V	Discussion of Effluent Releases and Cumulative Effects of Tritium and Krypton Discharges from a Number of Reactor Plants Including Three Mile Island Unit 2	5	pp. 49-50; 51-52; 59
VI	Quality Assurance During Construction	7	p. 50
VII	Comment on the Fish and Wildlife Letter Dated June 17, 1969	8	p. 50
VIII	Discussion on how Three Mile Island Units 1 and 2 will be Operated with Regard to the Release of Effluents	9	p. 51
IX	Discussion on how the Effluent Releases will be made Batch or Continuous Release	10	p. 51
X	Discussion of Control over Water Bodies Intersecting the Exclusion Area	11	p. 52
XI	Discussion of Adequacy of Grouted Tendons	11	p. 52
XII	Discussion of the Positive Moderator Coefficient	14	pp. 59-60

TABLE OF CONTENTS (Contd.)

	<u>Subject</u>	<u>Page</u>	<u>Pre-Hearing Conference Transcript Reference</u>
XIII	The Validity of Assumptions Underlying the Accident Analyses	15	p. 60
XIV	Report on the Present On-Site Monitoring Program	15	p. 60

I

1 Subject: Alternatives to Containment Purging to Relieve Hydrogen
2 Generation Problem

3 B&W has reviewed various potential methods of assuring that the
4 hydrogen concentrations do not exceed safe levels. Included in this
5 review were a study of the effects allowing hydrogen to accumulate to
6 various concentrations, the use of flame and catalytic recombiners,
7 hot surface combustion, and the use of chemical additives to the spray
8 solution for scavenging hydrogen.

9 B&W concluded from this review that purging is a safe, depend-
10 able means of preventing excessive hydrogen buildup.

11 With purging, the active equipment required for a purge system
12 is located outside of the reactor building, thus being separated from
13 the LOCA environment. Also, the purging system equipment is simple,
14 consisting of standard components whose satisfactory performance has
15 been demonstrated by extensive operating experience. Following the
16 initial study, our efforts are being devoted to a more detailed evalua-
17 tion and design of the purging system.

II

18 Subject: Discussion of the Status of Iodine Removal Research and
19 Development Program

20 The B&W research and development program on alkaline sodium
21 thiosulfate research and development has been completed. This work is
22 reported in proprietary Topical Report BAW-10017, "Research and Develop-
23 ment Report on the Stability and Compatibility of Sodium Thiosulfate Spray
24 Solutions," which was submitted to the Staff on August 6, 1969. This
25 report includes test data on storage, radiation and thermal stability;
26 iodine retention capability; and materials compatibility.

1 The test data substantiates that:

2 a. The solution is stable under long term storage.

3 b. Under accident conditions the alkaline sodium thiosulfate has
4 sufficient stability to perform its iodine removal and retention
5 function.

6 c. The solution is compatible with the materials and functions of
7 the containment and safeguards systems.

8 In the past two years, a large number of spray tests (more than 25) have
9 been conducted in the Nuclear Safety Pilot Plant (NSPP) by Oak Ridge
10 National Laboratory and in the Containment Systems Experiment (CSE)
11 by Battelle Northwest Laboratory. These tests have demonstrated that
12 radioactive iodine is effectively removed by alkaline thiosulfate chemi-
13 cal sprays.

14 Using an NSPP run made at accident conditions closely approximating
15 those predicted by Three Mile Island Unit 2, the measured iodine half-life
16 was 31 sec; that is, half of the radioactive iodine was removed from the
17 steam-air atmosphere in 31 seconds after starting the sprays. These data
18 have been scaled to the Three Mile Island Unit 2 design. They result in
19 an iodine half-life of 36 seconds with the full spray installed capacity
20 operating and a half life of 72 seconds at half capacity. The iodine half-
21 life reported in the PSAR is 103 seconds at full capacity and 206 seconds
22 at half capacity.

23 On the basis of calculations presented in Chapter 14 of the PSAR, the
24 iodine removal half-life required to reduce the 2-hour thyroid dose at the
25 exclusion distance to the 300 rem limits of 10 CFR 100 is 905 seconds. Thus,
26 only about 1/8 of the available spray effectiveness reported in the PSAR
27 and only 1/25 of the available effectiveness as indicated by NSPP tests is
28 required to meet the 10 CFR 100 site acceptability requirements.

III

1 Subject: Discussion of Protection to be Afforded Against the Probable
2 Maximum Flood

3 The site as developed for Generating Unit 1 was designed to be
4 safe from a flood of 1,100,000 cfs including wave run-up. This is a flood,
5 which, conservatively, has a probability of occurrence in any one year of
6 approximately 1 chance in 30,000, and is slightly in excess of the then current
7 Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) as calculated by the Corps of Engineers. On this
8 basis the plant could continue operation at the peak of the flood.

9 A revised PMF study has since been completed by the Corps of
10 Engineers and, subject to review and approval, will indicate a calculated
11 PMF discharge of 1,750,000 cfs at Three Mile Island assuming natural river
12 conditions and 1,600,000 cfs considering flood control projects operative
13 in 1969. The rainfall intensities and areal extent of the storm necessary
14 to cause this revised PMF are known and are published by Hydrometeorological
15 Report No. 40 by the U. S. Weather Bureau. Rainfall records are constantly
16 available from Weather Bureau gaging stations. Based on preliminary hydro-
17 graphs of the proposed new PMF furnished by the Corps of Engineers, the
18 river level would exceed the design river level for a period of approximately
19 18 hours to 24 hours. Warning of such a flood would be available for about
20 four days prior to the occurrence of the peak.

21 Complete protection of the plant against this flood could be
22 provided by raising the elevation of the $3\frac{1}{2}$ miles of dike system and sand-
23 bagging a short section where the access road and railroad cross the dike.
24 Considering the extreme improbability of such a flood occurring and the
25 assurance of adequate advance warning of its occurrence, it was decided
26 to protect the plant so that it could remain in operation through the design
27 flood of 1,100,000 cfs, but, for a flood of greater magnitude, to maintain
28 the plant in a safe shutdown condition.

63-060

1 The specific provisions for protection to be applied to each
2 system and each item of equipment required for maintaining the plant in a
3 safe shut-down condition will be developed during detailed design. Wherever
4 feasible, the equipment and systems will be elevated above flood level.
5 Where this approach is not feasible, other approaches will be used, such
6 as the furnishing in the original plant construction, of bulkheads and
7 prepared slots to seal off to above flood level, buildings or portions of
8 buildings enclosing equipment and systems required for decay heat removal.

9 Access ways including roof hatches, ladders and walkways as
10 required will be included in the original plant construction to permit
11 operating personnel travel above flood level between all protected enclos-
12 ures. Access to the plant can be maintained by helicopters or boats.

13 The integrity of the existing dikes will be preserved during
14 the flood by opening the plant drainage gates, after providing interior
15 protection, and allowing the water to rise to the elevation of the river
16 so that the dikes will be gradually submerged, rather than overtopped.
17 Any damage to the dikes would thus be restricted to local conditions
18 susceptible to immediate repair following the passage of the flood.

19 All structures enclosing systems that are essential to a safe
20 shut-down of the plant are supported on bedrock and are designed to with-
21 stand the hypothetical aircraft impact or tornado borne missiles and thus
22 are inherently protected against structural damage as a result of flood
23 c flood borne missiles.

IV

1 Subject: Summary of Applicant's Discussions with the Pennsylvania
2 Department of Health

3 In January of 1968 there was a meeting with the Pennsylvania
4 Department of Health regarding the proposed environmental program for
5 Three Mile Island Unit 1. There were comments on the program and a
6 mutual agreement was reached regarding how to proceed. This included
7 an agreement to provide the Department of Health with water samples taken
8 from the Susquehanna River simultaneously with the samples analyzed by
9 Met Ed so the Department of Health could perform an independent analysis.
10 There was a subsequent visit by the Department of Health and representatives
11 of U.S.P.H.S. to the site to further discuss the program.

12 In July of 1969 there was a meeting with the Pennsylvania
13 Department of Health to discuss the draft of the Three Mile Island Emer-
14 gency Plan. Comments were generated which resulted in mutually agreed
15 upon provisions to the Plan.

16 To the best of our knowledge, the Pennsylvania Department of
17 Health has not formalized these meetings with written minutes.

V

19 Subject: Discussion of Effluent Releases and Cumulative Effects of
20 Tritium and Krypton Discharges from a Number of Reactor
21 Plants Including Three Mile Island Unit 2

22 Tritium concentration in the river attributable to the operation
23 of two units at the Three Mile Island site is expected to average less than
24 $1/100$ of MPC⁽¹⁾ at the point of discharge to the river and less than $1/50,000$
25 of MPC after being mixed with the river several miles below the site. This
26 estimate of expected average concentrations is based on average annual river
27 flows at Three Mile Island of $3\frac{1}{4},000$ cfs and expected releases of about 1%
28 of fission product tritium through the fuel cladding and 100% of all other

(1) MPC means Maximum Permissible Concentration as defined in 10CFR20

1 tritium totalling about 1,300 curies per year for both units taken together.

2 Even if all tritium generated by both units at Three Mile Island
3 including 100% of the fission product tritium (most of which would be
4 expected to stay inside the fuel cladding) were released, average tritium
5 concentration, at the point of discharge to the river would be less than
6 one-third MPC and would be less than 1/200 of MPC after being mixed with
7 the average river flow several miles downstream from the site. This esti-
8 mate is based on the assumption that each unit produces a total of about
9 11,500 curies of tritium per year.

10 A discussion of tritium generation and control is given starting
11 at Page 12.6-A-1 of Supplement 3 of the PSAR.

12 From the above estimates one can conclude (even without account-
13 ing for further dilution beyond a point several miles downstream from
14 Three Mile Island) that the average fraction of MPC contributed by Three
15 Mile Island to the river is very small. Therefore, it would seem that
16 a number of downstream plants could be accommodated without approaching
17 even small fractions of MPC in the Susquehanna River or the Chesapeake
18 Bay.

19 Krypton 85 concentrations in the air, attributable to the opera-
20 tion of both units at Three Mile Island, is expected to average less than
21 1/200 of MPC at the point of maximum exposure at the site boundary.⁽¹⁾ Within
22 two miles the average concentration is expected to be less than 1/2,000
23 of MPC and within twenty-five miles to be less than 1/100,000 of MPC. This
24 estimate is based on the assumption that each unit would release 8,500 curies
25 of krypton 85 per year, which is a conservative estimate of K-85 release
26 assuming one percent of the fuel is leaking.

(1) For these purposes this means the boundary of uncontrolled land area: i.e., the eastern edge of the Susquehanna River or the edge of any island other than Three Mile Island.

1 is expected such samples taken by these conventional
2 methods, if measurable, will be erratic. However, the
3 Applicant is aware of studies now in progress to develop
4 an underwater gamma probe capable of assaying radio-
5 activity in place. Should this device prove to be satis-
6 factory, it will be used in the environmental monitoring
7 program to measure the radioactivity of sediment at loca-
8 tions where sediment is most likely to be deposited.

- 9 2.(b) Beta and gamma radioactivity analyses of selected
10 organisms located near the reactor effluent outfall will
11 be taken insofar as appropriate organisms can be located.
- 12 3. A report of the pre-operational radiological surveys will
13 be provided to the Atomic Energy Commission in sufficient
14 numbers so that five copies can be made available to the
15 Secretary of the Interior.
- 16 4. Reports of post-operational radiological surveys will be
17 submitted to the Atomic Energy Commission in sufficient
18 numbers so that five copies can be provided to the Secre-
19 tary of the Interior.

20 VIII

21 Subject: Discussion on how Three Mile Island Units 1 and 2 will be
22 Operated with Regard to the Release of Effluents

23 The combined releases of radioactivity from both units at the
24 Three Mile Island site will be in conformance with 10 CFR 20 just as though
25 there were only one unit at the site.

26 More specifically, the long-term (i.e., annual) average radio-
27 activity concentration in liquids as released to the river from Unit 1
28 outfall will not exceed those specified by Table 2 of 10 CFR 20. Likewise,

1 such concentrations as released from the Unit 2 outfall will not exceed
2 those specified by Table 2 of 10 CFR 20.

3 Release rate limits for gases from Units 1 and 2 will be proposed
4 taking account of atmospheric dispersion between the release points and
5 the boundary of uncontrolled land area, so that considering releases from
6 both units taken together, the long-term (i.e., annual) average concen-
7 tration anywhere at this boundary will not exceed that specified for gases
8 in Table 2 of 10 CFR 20.

9 The shorter term average concentrations will be treated in the
10 same way such that the average concentration in liquids or the average
11 release rates of gases will not exceed about ten times the long-term
12 average release rate or concentration limits discussed above.

13 IX

14 Subject: Discussion on how the Effluent Releases will be made
15 Batch or Continuous Release

16 Liquid and gaseous plant wastes will be released in batches.
17 Radioactive liquid wastes from each unit will be diluted in the services
18 cooling water which is discharged to the river. Radioactive gaseous
19 wastes will be dispersed in the atmosphere through separate vents for
20 each unit.

21 All releases of radioactive liquid wastes from either unit will
22 be made from an evaporator condensate tank in an average batch size of
23 10,000 gallons. Prior to release each tank will be mixed, sampled for
24 radioactive content and certified for release. Each release will be moni-
25 tored as it is discharged. It is expected that there will be an average
26 of one batch release per week.

27 All releases of radioactive gaseous waste will be made from a
28 gas decay tank after it has been sampled and certified for release. Each

1 release will be monitored as it is discharged to the vent. It is expected
2 that a number of small batches would be released every year.

3 In any event, both liquid and gaseous releases will be controlled
4 within limits discussed in answer to question VIII (pre-hearing trans-
5 cript, Page 5, Line 12.)

6 X

7 Subject: Three Mile Island Exclusion Area

8 The Susquehanna River passes through the exclusion area on both
9 sides of the site, but is sufficiently far away that any expected use of
10 the river would not interfere with normal operations.

11 Responsibility for exercising exclusion requirements, should
12 they become necessary, on the river within the exclusion area, lies with
13 the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania. The Three Mile Island emergency pro-
14 cedure provides for a unique signal to be sounded, along with announce-
15 ments heard within the exclusion boundary, and notification of appro-
16 priate governmental authorities which are designated by the Commonwealth.
17 The appropriate governmental authorities will effect the necessary exclu-
18 sion or evacuation.

19 XI

20 Subject: Discussion of Adequacy of Grouted Tendons

21 There are ample precedents for both grouted and ungrouted ten-
22 dons. In bridge and building construction, grouted tendons have been
23 used for over twenty years, ungrouted for over fifteen years. In nuclear
24 applications, French practice has been to grout as at Chinon, St-Laurent-
25 des-Eaux, Bugey, Brennilis. Ungrouted tendons have been used in the United
26 Kingdom at Oldbury and Wylfa. The Canadian structure at Gentilly is grouted.
27 Post tensioned nuclear containment structures previously planned or under
28 construction in the United States are to be ungrouted with the exceptions

1 of the vertical tendons at Robinson and the tendons providing rock anchor-
2 age at Ginna.

3 The selection of grouted tendons for this structural applica-
4 tion over the alternative of unbonded greased tendons was made primarily
5 to provide corrosion protection through the passivating environment
6 characteristic of the alkalinity of portland cement grout, not available
7 with the alternative, plus the permanent exclusion of corrosive agents.
8 Secondary structural benefits in resisting the design loadings result
9 from the use of bonded tendons. The basis for some prior reservation
10 concerning the use of grouted tendons in similar structures in this
11 country had been the question as to whether the continuous curvature
12 required of the tendons in the shell structure and the consequent unavoid-
13 able packing of the tendon elements at the inside radius of the duct would
14 preclude the injection of grout into intimate contact with all elements
15 of the tendon. This question has been satisfactorily answered for strand
16 tendons by the grouted tendon test program undertaken for this project,
17 hence there is no further technical reservation concerning the use of
18 grout.

19 1. Corrosion Protection

20 Continuity of coverage with grout is desirable to provide corro-
21 sion protection. This feature was the principal objective of the grouted
22 tendon test program, and was achieved with strand tendons. The work with
23 wire tendons in the test program demonstrated that normal grouting pro-
24 cedures would not yield continuous coverage, hence in all probability the
25 grouted curved wire tendons which have performed satisfactorily in other
26 applications for many years do not have continuous grout coverage. Thus,
27 it may be concluded that the passivating environment of grout is effective
28 in inhibiting corrosion even without continuity of coverage. The continuity

1 demonstrate to be obtainable with strand tendons will provide greater
2 assurance of protection.

3 2. Exclusion of Corrosive Agents

4 Corrosive agents; principally chloride, nitrate and sulphate
5 ions; will be excluded by a series of barriers between the tendon and
6 the environment and by the filling of the closed metal duct system, includ-
7 ing end caps, with portland cement grout from which corrosive agents have
8 been excluded.

9 3. Bond

10 The use of portland cement grout allows the development of bond
11 between the tendon and the concrete structure through the grout and ducts.
12 In Phases I and II of the grouted tendon test program, it was apparent
13 during the cutting out of intermediate test specimens that the steel
14 remained stressed after having been separated from the anchorages despite
15 the packed condition of the tendon elements.

16 Tests designed to provide a quantitative measure of bond develop-
17 ment, included in Phase III of the program, demonstrated transfer of the
18 usual assigned prestress force of 60% of ultimate strength from tendons to
19 the concrete in a length of 7 to 10 feet.

20 a. Anchorage

21 Development of bond at the anchorages is further
22 assured by the separation of the strands at the anchor
23 in those prestress systems employing wedge type anchor-
24 age. Bond will not be relied upon as a means of stress
25 transfer in this application; the anchorages will be
26 required to pass static and dynamic tests similar to grout-
27 ing, more severe than could occur in a structure. The
28 demonstrated bond length of 7 to 10 feet is less than the

1 planned dimensions of the buttresses, foundation mat
2 and ring girder, where the tendons are to be anchored,
3 thus, the anchorage developed by bond provides redund-
4 ancy.

5 b. Crack Control

6 Flexural tension and stress concentrations such
7 as will occur at discontinuities and structure pene-
8 trations can be resisted by the bonded prestressing steel
9 at the point of discontinuity or concentration thus limit-
10 ing the size of cracks in the concrete.

11 c. Ruptured Tendon

12 Before the effectiveness of grouting of strand
13 tendons had been demonstrated, there existed a reason-
14 able question as to whether stress transfer other than
15 at anchorages could be achieved. Now it can be con-
16 cluded that a ruptured grouted tendon will be fully
17 effective at 7 to 10 feet from the point of rupture.

18 XII

19 Subject: Discussion of the Positive Moderator Coefficient

20 The core for Three Mile Island Unit 2 is expected to have a
21 positive moderator coefficient not in excess of $+1.0 \times 10^{-4} (\Delta k/k)/^{\circ}\text{F}$
22 over the first part of the initial fuel cycle. The positive reactivity
23 associated with this coefficient was used in the evaluation of accidents
24 analyzed in the PSAR. Even with the inclusion of the reactivity effect,
25 the accident analyses resulted in acceptable condition.

26 Analyses are proceeding to determine the effect of a positive
27 moderator coefficient on the stability of the reactor core with respect
28 to potential for xenon oscillations. If the conclusion of the analyses

1 is that the $+1.0 \times 10^{-4} (\Delta k/k)/^{\circ}F$ coefficient is not desirable, then
2 it will be reduced by the use of fixed shims - such as burnable poison
3 rods. These fixed shims would allow a reduction in the soluble poison
4 concentration and thus a reduction in the positive moderator coefficient.

5 XIII

6 Subject: The Validity of Assumptions Underlying the Accident Analyses
7 Environmental doses resulting from the rod ejection, loss of
8 coolant and maximum hypothetical accidents were calculated assuming that
9 fifty percent of the iodine released plated out on equipment and structures
10 located within the reactor building. This assumption of fifty percent
11 plate out is suggested by the Atomic Energy Commission in its guide line
12 document TID-14844. Review of experimental data generated in experiments
13 in which iodine was released indicate that the assumption of fifty per-
14 cent plate out is conservative. For example, tests conducted in the
15 Containment Research Installation and reported in ORNL-4071,⁽¹⁾ demon-
16 strated that more than 95 percent of the released iodine was deposited
17 on the tank wall. More than 70 percent of the iodine plate out occurred
18 in less than 30 seconds.

19 XIV

20 Subject: Report on the Present On-Site Monitoring Program
21 The attached tables summarize the radioactivity measurements
22 of various kinds of samples in addition to those reported in the PSAR
23 measured from January 1, 1969 to August 1, 1969, by Met-Ed and the Common-
24 wealth of Pennsylvania.

- 15 -

(1) Nuclear Safety Program Annual Progress Report for the period ending
December 31, 1966, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, W. B. Cottrell,
Program Director.

TABLE I

Commonwealth of Pennsylvania Environmental
Data of the Susquehanna River at Three Mile Island⁽¹⁾

<u>Month 1968</u>	<u>Gross Beta</u>	<u>Gross Alpha</u>
February	3 pc/l	<1 pc/l
March	- - -	- - -
April	9 pc/l	1 pc/l
May	3 pc/l	<1 pc/l
June	4 pc/l	<1 pc/l
July	6 pc/l	1 pc/l
August	6 pc/l	<1 pc/l
September	4 pc/l	<1 pc/l
October	5 pc/l	<1 pc/l
November	8 pc/l	2 pc/l
December	3 pc/l	1 pc/l

(1) Data reported by M. A. Reilly,
Radiation Health Physicist,
Commonwealth of Pennsylvania

TABLE II

ENVIRONMENTAL DATA FROM THE SUSQUEHANNA RIVER AND
THREE MILE ISLAND

Analysis Performed by Isotopes, Inc.,
Westwood, New Jersey

July 8, 1968 - Susquehanna River Water at Three Mile Island

K-40	500 pc/l
Zn-65	< 5.6 pc/l
Cs-137	6.1 pc/l
I-131	< 4.0 pc/l
Co-60	< 7.0 pc/l
Co-58	< 5.0 pc/l

September 5, 1968 - Vegetation at Three Mile Island

K-40	8.9 pc/gr
Cs-137	.05 pc/gr
I-131	<.002 pc/gr
Co-60	<.003 pc/gr
Co-58	<.003 pc/gr

June, 1969 - Fish

Cs-137	.11 pc/gr
Co-60	1.39 pc/gr
Co-58	.13 pc/gr
Zn-65	.38 pc/gr
Sr-90	.05 pc/gr
I-131	.07 pc/gr