FEB 10 1973

R. C. DeYoung, Assistant Director for Pressurized Water Reactors, L
Thru: A. Schwencer, Chief, Pressurized Water Reactors Branch #4, L

MEETING WITH METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY AND GENERAL PUBLIC UTILITIES CORPORATION CONCERNING THE OPERATING LICENSE APPLICATION FOR THREE MILE ISLAND UNIT 1, DOCKET NO. 50-289

Enclosed is a summary of a meeting held in Bethesda, Maryland, on January 18, 1973, with General Public Utilities Corporation. An attendance list is also enclosed.

H. J. Faulkner, Project Manager
Pressurized Water Reactors Branch #4
Directorate of Licensing

Enclosures:
1. Meeting Summary of 1/18/73
2. Attendance List

cc: RSBoyd
DSkovholt
DKnuth
RMaccary
RTedesco
HDenton
PWR Branch Chiefs
RWKlecker
MRosen
RO (3)
AEC participants
AEC PDR
Local PDR

DISTRIBUTION
Docket File
RP Reading
PWR-4 Reading
HJFaulkner
EIGoulbourne

CRESS #01 OFFICE ▶	L:PWR-4	L:SSB	L:PWR-4			
MC# 224117	HFaulkner:jk	WBIving	ASchwencer			
2/5/73 SURNAME ▶	2/5/73	2/13/73	2/ /73			
DATE ▶						

Form AEC-318 (Rev. 9-53) AECM 0240 ☆ U.S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE 1971—446—124

7910171 040 A

ENCLOSURE 1

METROPOLITAN EDISON COMPANY - THREE MILE ISLAND UNIT 1

DOCKET NO. 50-289

SUMMARY OF MEETING - JANUARY 18, 1973

SUMMARY

At the request of the applicant a meeting was held to discuss the flooding potential of the Three Mile Island site due to failure of the Stony Creek pump storage facility. The meeting was held in Bethesda on January 18, 1973. The consequences of the failure of this storage facility as analyzed by the applicant appear acceptable. The applicant was informed to fully document the analysis and results in a formal amendment. Additionally, the review schedule and a few outstanding technical issues were discussed briefly with the applicant.

DISCUSSION

The following items relating to the flooding potential of the Three Mile Island reactor site because of a postulated failure of a Stony Creek pump storage facility were discussed:

1. The applicant's analysis of the potential failure of the Stony Creek dams is based on the following assumptions: (a) 10,000 acre-feet of flood control storage water in the lower reservoir, (b) the use of peak discharges in lieu of average discharges subsequent to the assumed failure, (c) the use of valley storage effects in routing without credit for frictional effects and (d) the use of valley storage reaches about 1 mile in length.

2. The following assumptions were used in establishing the critical failure mode: (a) upper reservoir full (about 12,800 acre-feet), (b) lower reservoir contains dead storage plus run-off from one-half the Stony Creek probable maximum flood (PMF) (about 28,000 acre-feet), (c) the upper dam is assumed to fail inducing a 300 feet breach in the lower dam, and (d) at the time of breach the combined flow is about 1.1 million cfs.

3. The peak discharge at the mouth of Stony Creek is 455,000 cfs. The flood was routed to about 6.5 miles above Harrisburg where the peak discharge due to the failure would attenuate to about 224,000 cfs plus one-half the Susquehanna River PMF. From this point the flood peak was translated without attenuation to the plant site at a peak discharge of less than the design basis flood of 1.1 million cfs.

The results of the applicant's analysis based upon the above conditions appear satisfactory. The applicant intends to fully document the analysis and results in a formal amendment. Also, it was stated that a shutdown technical specification based on water level will be required which includes adequate warning time to implement the shutdown.

Additional items discussed at the meeting are presented below:

Review Schedule. The present review schedule calls for ACRS review in April with the prospective decision date on 11/9/73. Fuel loading is presently projected for 9/30/73. The applicant was informed that maintaining its present schedule for responding to outstanding information will probably cause a further delay in the schedule. For instance, a 3/15 submittal date for the steamline break information would probably result in a postponement for the ACRS meeting.

Technical Specifications. We informed GPU that a preliminary review of the technical specifications had been conducted and that we anticipate a meeting on this subject in mid February.

Industrial Security. Five open items still remain in regard to the industrial security plan. GPU stated their intent to comply with all of our requirements in this area. They will formally submit these changes in an amendment.

Testing of Valves. Since only applicants with B&W reactors have received letters in regard to in-situ testing of valves, GPU inquired as to whether there is some particular valve problem with B&W reactor plants. We informed them that such was not the case and that all plants will be receiving similar letters in the near future. Upon completion of their initial review and when they have formulated plans for implementation, they would like to discuss these with us.

ENCLOSURE 2

ATTENDANCE LIST

AEC-Licensing

R. Faulkner
L. Hulman*
W. Sivins*
A. Schwencer*
E. Schierling*

GPU

R. Heppert

Gilbert Associates

W. Johnson*

*Part-time Attendees

OFFICE ▸
SURNAME ▸
DATE ▸
Form AEC 318 Rev 9-53) AECM 0240