



Metropolitan Edison Company
Post Office Box 480
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Writer's Direct Dial Number

March 26, 1981
LIL 078

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attn: R. W. Reid, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch No. 4
Division of Licensing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555



Dear Sir:

Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1)
Operating License No. DPR-50
Docket No. 50-289
Asymmetric LOCA Loads

Enclosed please find our response to your letter of January 9, 1981 to all Babcock and Wilcox Licensees to your request for additional information relating to our submittal on Asymmetric LOCA Loads (ALL). GPU, in conjunction with the other members of the B&W Owners Group and with B&W, has formulated a plan for responding to your request in the most expeditious manner possible. We request a technical review meeting with your Staff on April 2 and 3 in your Bethesda offices. At this meeting we would hope to resolve approximately 60 questions by cross referencing docketed information. We anticipate that the meeting minutes will show that these questions are resolved. We also intend to describe our proposed responses to the remaining questions and to clarify any ambiguities that might exist while providing the Staff with sufficient information to develop a draft Safety Evaluation Report. The final half-day of meetings will be with the entire ALL Owners Group Subcommittee, at which time we will summarize the results of the technical meeting.

Due to the large effort involved in answering the questions we will not be able to provide written responses until late June, 1981. Our intent is to provide these draft responses to the Staff and meet with you the week of July 6. Following this meeting we will make a formal submittal incorporating any comments that develop from these discussions.

I would also like to inform you that GPU is initiating a program to evaluate the conservatisms remaining within the analyses of asymmetric LOCA loads. Our intent is to determine if hot leg restraints will indeed be required to demonstrate acceptability. As such we are modifying our commitment to you in our letter of September 11, 1980. At that time we committed to install the restraints at the first refueling outage following restart of the unit. We are instead committing to either install those restraints or to provide the Staff with justification for the adequacy of the existing plant design by the first refueling outage following restart. I would like to stress that the reason for the change in commitments is the evaluation work that

8103310601

P

A030
S10

could not be undertaken prior to completion of BAW 1621. The effort involved in preparing that submittal literally left no one available to do the additional evaluation work. In the intervening time we have been able to expend some effort to find conservatisms which, if removed, might demonstrate the acceptability of the existing plant design.

Sincerely,



H. D. Hukill
Director, TMI-1

HDH:LWH:lma

cc: B. H. Grier
D. DiIanni
H. Silver
L. Barrett