

July 7, 1971

Docket No. 50-289

Dr. Spencer Bush
Chairman, Advisory Committee
on Reactor Safeguards
U. S. Atomic Energy Commission
Washington, D. C. 20545

Dear Dr. Bush:

We have received the Committee's opinion, in a letter from R. F. Fraley, dated June 23, 1971, that the Committee wishes to defer its review of the application submitted by Metropolitan Edison Company for an operating license for Three Mile Island Unit No. 1 until a time closer to fuel loading (presently scheduled for late 1972). A reconsideration of the Committee's decision is requested for the following reasons.

1. We have nearly completed our review of the facility design as described in the FSAR. We have concluded that the design is in substantial compliance with the appropriate criteria. The Compliance Division will continue to perform its function of certifying, at the appropriate time, that the plant was constructed according to the design bases.
2. We will send you a report on TMI-1 in July 1971, describing our conclusions and bases. This report will be substantially complete.
3. There are several issues that remain unresolved at this time; they will be highlighted in our July 1971 report. It is our intention to resolve these issues, and provide our conclusions to the Committee in a supplemental report in time for the October 1971 meeting.
4. Technical Specifications were filed in Amendment No. 20 (May 26, 1971) as Chapter 15 to the FSAR and have been supplied to the Committee. Since these specifications were patterned after a late Ocone draft, significant changes will not be necessary.
5. In general, it is our intent to have a final review of a project by the ACRS about six to nine months prior to fuel loading, especially for those projects for which a contested public hearing is anticipated. The proposed TMI-1 schedule is not significantly out of line with this practice.

1454 233

OFFICE ▶					
SURNAME ▶					
DATE ▶					

Dr. Spencer Bush

2

July 7, 1971

6. Our final position on a project can be revised at any time prior to issuance of the license. If new concerns develop in the interim between the review by the Committee and the planned licensing date, action can be taken to resolve these with or without Committee assistance. We would of course, as has been done for other cases, advise the Committee of such concerns, invite its participation in the review, and, in any event, inform it of our conclusions prior to initiating our final licensing action.
7. If this project is deferred by the Committee, significant DRL and DRS effort will need to be duplicated. We do not believe that this deferral measure is appropriate for this plant.

We would like to discuss this with the Committee during the July 1971 meeting.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
Peter A. Morris ✓

Peter A. Morris, Director
Division of Reactor Licensing

DISTRIBUTION:
 Docket file
 PWR-2 Reading
 FSchroeder
 RCDeYoung
 DRL Reading
 PWR Branch Chiefs
 DRoss
 FWKaras

1454 234

OFFICE ▶	DRL:PWR-2	DRL:PWR-2	DRL:AD/PWRs	DRL	DRL
SURNAME ▶	<i>Do</i> DRoss:ng	<i>CG</i> CGLong	<i>RC</i> RCDeYoung	FSchroeder	PAMorris
DATE ▶	7/7/71	7/7/71	7/7/71	7/ /71	7/ /71