

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

October 8, 1992

Docket

Docket No. 50-289

Mr. T. Gary Broughton, Vice President and Director - TMI-1 GPU Nuclear Corporation Post Office Box 480 Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Dear Mr. Broughton:

SUBJECT: THREE MILE ISLAND UNIT 1 - SAFETY EVALUATION ON SECOND 10-YEAR INTERVAL INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM PLAN (TAC NO. M80197)

By letter dated April 19, 1991, GPU Nuclear Corporation (GPUN) submitted the Second 10-Year Interval Inservice Inspection (ISI) Program Plan, Revision 0 and associated requests for relief from the ASME Code. Section XI requirements that were determined to be impractical to be performed at Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 (TMI-1). Additional information was provided by GPUN in a ster dated December 12, 1991, regarding its commitment to the volumetric examination of 7.5% of the non-exempt Class 2 piping relds.

The staff, with technical assistance from its contractor, the Idaho National Engineering Laboratory (INEL), has reviewed and evaluated the proposed ISI Program, the relief requests, and supporting information. This evaluation is documented in INEL Technical Evaluation Report (TER) EGG-MS-10169. This report is enclosed. The staff concurred with the findings and recommendations contained in the subject report with one exception as discussed below.

The staff concludes that the TMI-1, Second 10-Year Interval Inservice Inspection Program Plan, Revision 0, with the additional information provided and the specific written relief, constitutes the basis for compliance with 10 CFR 50.55a(g) and Technical Specification 4.2 and is therefore acceptable. We have determined that Section XI Code requirements for examination of some components cited by GPUN are impractical to perform at TMI-1 and we have granted relief from those requirements. The NRC staff has determined that granting relief, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i), (a)(3)(ii) or (g)(6)(i), is authorized by law and will not endanger life, property, or the common defense and security and is otherwise in the public interest giving due consideration to the burden upon GPUN that could result if the ASME Code requirements were imposed on the facility.

The staff's evaluation and conclusions are contained in the enclosed Safety Evaluation. The staff concurs with the findings and recommendations contained in the INEL TER with the exception of the recommendation regarding reliaf request No. 13. The staff concluded that for relief request Nos. 10, 14 (in part), and 15 (in part), GPUN has not provided adequate technical justification to support their position that the Code requirements are impractical. Therefore, relief for request Nos. 10, 14 (in part) and 15 (in part) is denied.

9210210249 921008 PDR ADDCK 05000289 P PDR

Mr. T. Gary Broughton

Because of a similar situation at another plant, the staff reevaluated its position on relief request No. 13 subsequent to receipt of EGG-MS-10169. The subject of this relief request was additional examinations of Class 1, 2, and 3 systems. GPUN had proposed, as alternative requirements, the approach taken in the 1991 Addenda to the ASME Code. The staff had considered not granting this request because we had not reviewed this addenda. However, GPUN had not invoked the 1991 . denda, and accordingly, the staff should have evaluated the proposed alternation requirements under 10 CFR 50.55a(a)(3)(i). The staff's reevaluation and conclusion that relief request No. 13 should be authorized are contained in e enclosed Safety Evaluation. Table 1 of the Safety Evaluation present a summary of the reliefs requested and the status of the requests as determined by the staff. Our contractor's Technical Evaluation Report is also enclosed for your information.

-2-

Sincerely,

			e crimer e r g g		
			Driginal signed by John F. Stolz, D Project Director Division of Reac	Director	
	ires: ety Evaluation L Report No. E				
cc w/en See nex	closures: t page				
PD I-4	File OPA ocal PDRs OC/ Plant ARB /FMiraglia RLo ACR GHi man EJo OGC RHe	LFMB Nough, RI bbel, EDO S (10) NI (4) ordan		per clipped pag	2.
OFFICE	LA: PDI-4	PM: PDI-4	D:PDI-4	OGC ATT	
NAME	SNorris	RHernan: cm/cg+	JStolz WOH Loz	JILII	
TE	9/10/92	9 /10/92	9 1/0/92 20	9 125/92	: / }
OrrICIA Documen	L RECORD COPY t Name:		Fielder		

Mr. T. Gary Broughton GPU Nuclear Corporation

CC:

4 1

1.1

Michael ¹ ss O&M Director, TMI-1 GPU Nuclear Corporation Post Office Eox 480 Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Michael Laggart Manager, Licensing GPU Nuclear Corporation 100 Interpace Parkway Parsippany, New Jersey 07054

Robert E. Rogan TMI Licensing Director GPU Nuclear Corporation Post Office Box 480 Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Fsquire Shaw, Pittman, Potts & Trowbridge 2300 N Street, NW. Washington, DC 20037

Chairman Board of County Commissioners of Dauphin County Dauphin County Courthouse Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Chairman Board of Supervisors of Londonderry Township R.D. #1, Geyers Church Road Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057 Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1

Francis I. Young Senior Resident Inspector (TMI-1) U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Post Office Box 311 Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Regional Administrator, Regior I U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 475 Allendale Road King of Prussia, Pennsylvania 19406

Robert B. Borsum B&W Nuclear Technologies Suite 525 1700 Rockville Pike Rockviile, Maryland 20852

William Dore, Acting Director Bureau of i. .ion Protection Pennsylvania partment of Environmental Resources Post Office Box 2063 Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120