

Distribution:
 Docket File 50-320
 L-Rdg
 SEB RF

100 0 5 1074

EC

Docket No. 50-320

Y. A. Moore, Assistant Director
 for Light Water Reactors, Group 2
 Directorate of Licensing

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY - THREE MILE ISLAND STATION, UNIT #2
 PRELIMINARY REVIEW OF THE FSAR

Plant Name: Three Mile Island, Unit #2
 Licensing State: Preliminary Review of FSAR - OL
 Docket No.: 50-320
 Responsible Branch and Project Manager: LWR Branch 2-2; B. Washburn
 Requested Completion Date: March 5, 1974
 Applicant's Response Date Necessary for Completion of Next
 Action Planned on Project: Unknown
 Description of Response: N/A
 Review Status: Preliminary Review Complete

The preliminary FSAR submitted by the applicant has been reviewed by the Structural Engineering Branch to evaluate its acceptability. The enclosure, Preliminary Review Notes, presents details on the review of the applicant's preliminary FSAR.

At OL Review Stage Structural Engineering Branch Document (B) is applicable.

The overall assessment indicates that in the reviewed sections of assigned responsibility about 5% of the information currently required is considered missing. It is, nevertheless, recommended that the application be accepted and that the deficiencies be discussed with the applicant during the technical meetings.

Twenty-four (24) man hours were required for the review.

LS
 R. R. Maccary, Assistant Director
 for Engineering
 Directorate of Licensing

Enclosures:
 (1) Preliminary Review Notes
 (2) Document (B)

88 107

OFFICE	L:SEB	L:SEB	L:SEB	L:ADP
CC: (Next Page)	x7341		De J for	<i>[Signature]</i>
SURNAM	AGLuckmann:mb	KKapur	LGShao	RRMaccary
DATE	3/4/74	3/-/74	3/4/74	3/5/74

7904300029

A

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY
THREE MILE ISLAND STATION, UNIT 2
STRUCTURAL ENGINEERING BRANCH
FSAR PRELIMINARY REVIEW NOTES

A. AREAS OF REVIEW

The following sections, for which the Structural Engineering Branch has the primary review responsibility, were reviewed for completeness:

Sections: 3.3; 3.4; 3.5; 3.7; 3.8; Appendices: 2A; 3B; 3C; 3D.

B. IDENTIFICATION OF MAJOR DEFICIENCY AREAS

To permit a complete and detailed technical review of the subject application, the following information should be requested from the applicant.

3.7 Seismic Design

3.7.4 Seismic Instrumentation

It is a Regulatory Staff position that in the seismic instrumentation program, multi-element seismoscopes should be utilized for a rapid determination of the ground input response spectra during an earthquake. Revise your program accordingly.

3.8 Structural Design

1. Discuss the degree of conformance with the pertinent Regulatory Safety Guides:

- 1.13 Fuel Storage Facility Design Basis.
- 1.18 Structural Acceptance Test for Concrete Primary Reactor Containments.
- 1.19 Nondestructive Examination of Primary Containment Liner Welds.
- 1.45 Protection Against Pipe Whip Inside Containment.
- 1.65 Concrete Placement in Category I Structures.

Deviations from the Regulatory Guides should be justified.

V. A. Moore

-2-

cc w/o encl:
A. Giambusso, L
W. G. McDonald, L

cc w/encl:
S. Hanauer, DRTA
J. Hendrie, L
K. Kniel, L
L. Shao, L
B. Washburn, L
S. Varga, L
K. Kapur, L
A. Gluckmann, L

88 109

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

2. If local building codes are utilized, provide sufficient supporting information to allow an evaluation as to the applicability of the document and its degree of conservatism.
3. The structural criteria for evaluating the design of Seismic Category I structures inside or outside of containment are not complete. An acceptable set of criteria is contained in the attached Document (B). Sufficient information should be provided to establish the extent of compliance with these design criteria. Where inconsistencies or deviations from these criteria are proposed, justification should be provided to demonstrate that your criteria are equivalent with respect to the applicable safety margins.