UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

February 6, 1979

Docket No. 50-289

Mr. J. G. Herbein
Vice President
Metropolitan Edison Company
P. O. Box 542
Reading, Pennsylvania 19640

Dear Mr. Herbein:

By letter dated December 26, 1978 you responded to our November 13, 1978 request for additional information concerning the calibration of out-of-core detectors (OCDs) at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1. Upon reviewing this response we find that it has provided very little of the information requested. Specific deficiencies are listed in the enclosure. You are requested to provide the information necessary to correct these deficiencies within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Robert W. Reid

Robert W. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #4
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosure:
Request for Additional
Information

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

7903160085

cc:
G. F. Trowbridge, Esquire
Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge
1800 M Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

GPU Service Corporation
Richard W. Heward, Project Manager
Mr. E. G. Wallace, Licensing Manager
260 Cherry Hill Road
Parsippany, New Jersey 07054

Pennsylvania Electric Company
Mr. R. W. Conrad
Vice President, Generation
1001 Broad Street
Johnstown, Pennsylvania 15907

Miss Mary V. Southard, Chairman
Citizens for a Safe Environment
P. O. Box 405
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17108

Mr. Robert B. Borsum
Babcock & Wilcox
Nuclear Power Generation Division
Suite 420, 7735 Old Georgetown Road
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Government Publications Section
State Library of Pennsylvania
Box 1601 (Education Building)
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17126

Enclosure

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION NEEDED TO RESPOND TO

NRC INFORMATION REQUEST OF NOVEMBER 13, 1978

POWER RANGE NUCLEAR INSTRUMENTATION CALIBRATION

THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-289

Question 1. Provide an analysis which shows how the power indicated by the nuclear instruments will differ from the actual reactor thermal power as a function of time after various typical and limiting power transients.

Deficiencies: Your response did not provide analyses as requested. As a result we have no basis for knowing how much the reactor high power trip will be out of calibration. Without this quantitative information there is also no basis for knowing if the miscalibration significantly affects the consequences of accidents. You have stated it does not have a significant effect for limiting accidents, but you have not provided any quantitative analyses to support this conclusion. We reiterate our request that you provide the time-dependent quantitative information specified by this question.

Question 2. Based on the above analysis, describe rational criteria for performing heat balance checks and calibrating the nuclear instrumentation such that the consequences of possible accidents remain within the bounds calculated in the TMI-1 FSAR.

Deficiencies: Because the analyses requested by Question 1 were not provided, you have no quantitative bases for defining rational criteria for the frequency or conditions under which nuclear instrument calibration is needed. Instead, you merely state that Met Ed "feels" the schedule suggested by Babcock & Wilcox is satisfactory.

Question 3. If the criteria presented in Item 2, above, are more restrictive than the criteria you have already proposed (heat balance once per shift) revise your March 13, 1978 submittal to reflect these more restrictive criteria.

Deficiencies: In as much as you have not provided a technical answer to Question 2, you have no technical basis for answering Question 3, and have not provided a technically-based answer.

Question 4. In LER 78-01/01T you committed to make certain changes in the overpower trip bistable settings following certain changes in power level. Discuss why these changes were needed, why they are adequate to assure safety of operations and why they were not included as part of the proposed change in the technical specifications.

Deficiencies: Your response is not based on a quantitative analysis as requested by Questions 1 and 2. Revise your response to reflect the results of the analyses performed to answer Questions 1 and 2.