

March 22, 1993

Docket No. 50-320

Dr. Robert L. Long  
Director Corporate Services/  
Director, TMI-2  
GPU Nuclear Corporation  
P. O. Box 480  
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057-0191

Dear Dr. Long:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE TMI-2 REACTOR VESSEL FUEL  
SURVEY AND CRITICALITY REPORTS (TACS M85664 AND M71455)

During our continuing review of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 (TMI-2) reactor vessel special nuclear material accountability report, dated February 1, 1993, and your reactor vessel criticality safety analysis, dated December 18, 1992, we have determined that additional information or further clarification is required. We request that you respond to the questions contained in the enclosure. Since our review must be completed prior to issuance of the TMI-2 possession only license, we request that we receive the responses within 45 days of receipt of this letter. The NRC staff technical point of contact on this request is Mr. L. Thonus at the TMI site.

The reporting and/or recordkeeping requirements contained in this letter affect fewer than 10 respondents, therefore, OMB clearance is not required under P.L. 96-511.

Sincerely,  
original signed by:  
Michael T. Masnik, Senior Project Manager  
Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning  
Project Directorate  
Division of Operating Reactor Support  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page

DISTRIBUTION:[LONG.CS] [Masnik-1b diskette]

Docket File	SWeiss
PDRs	MMasnik
ONDD R/F	OGC
DORS R/F	ACRS (10)
BGrimes	Region I
EHylton	CHehl, RI

ONDD:EA	ONDD:PM/ATM
EHylton	MMasnik:1b
3/12/93	3/12/93

CHW  
ONDD:D  
SWeiss  
3/12/93

9303240302 930322  
PDR ADOCK 05000320  
P PDR

*Handwritten signature and date 3/11*



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

March 22, 1993

Docket No. 50-320

Dr. Robert L. Long  
Director Corporate Services/  
Director, TMI-2  
GPU Nuclear Corporation  
P. O. Box 480  
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057-0191

Dear Dr. Long:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE TMI-2 REACTOR VESSEL FUEL  
SURVEY AND CRITICALITY REPORTS (TACS M85664 AND M71455)

During our continuing review of the Three Mile Island Nuclear Station Unit 2 (TMI-2) reactor vessel special nuclear material accountability report, dated February 1, 1993, and your reactor vessel criticality safety analysis, dated December 18, 1992, we have determined that additional information or further clarification is required. We request that you respond to the questions contained in the enclosure. Since our review must be completed prior to issuance of the TMI-2 possession only license, we request that we receive the responses within 45 days of receipt of this letter. The NRC staff technical point of contact on this request is Mr. L. Thonus at the TMI site.

The reporting and/or recordkeeping requirements contained in this letter affect fewer than 10 respondents, therefore, OMB clearance is not required under P.L. 96-511.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Michael T. Masnik", is written over the typed name.

Michael T. Masnik, Senior Project Manager  
Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning  
Project Directorate  
Division of Operating Reactor Support  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc w/enclosure:  
See next page



Dr. R. L. Long  
GPU Nuclear Corporation Unit No. 2

cc:

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

Dr. Judith H. Johnsrud  
Environmental Coalition on Nuclear  
Power  
433 Orlando Avenue  
State College, Pennsylvania 16801

Ernest L. Blake, Jr., Esq.  
Shaw, Pittman, Potts, and Trowbridge  
2300 N Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20037

Secretary  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Mr. Russell Schaeffer, Chairperson  
Dauphin County Board of Commissioners  
Dauphin County Courthouse  
Front and Market Streets  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

William Dornsife, Acting Director  
Bureau of Radiation Protection  
Department of Environmental Resources  
P. O. Box 2063  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17120

Mr. Ad Crable  
Lancaster New Era  
8 West King Street  
Lancaster, Pennsylvania 17601

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

Mr. Frank F. Hooper  
4155 Clark Road  
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48104

Peter B. Bloch, Chairman  
Atomic Safety and Licensing  
Board Panel  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Three Mile Island Nuclear Station  
Docket No. 50-320

Mr. Robert Rogan  
GPU Nuclear Corporation  
P. O. Box 480  
Middletown, Pennsylvania 17057

Mr. David J. McGoff  
Office of LWR Safety and Technology  
NE-23  
U.S. Department of Energy  
Washington, D.C. 20545

Mr. Wythe Keever  
The Patriot  
812 Market Street  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17105

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

Mr. Marvin I. Lewis  
7801 Roosevelt Blvd. #62  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19152

Mr. Jane Lee  
183 Valley Road  
Etters, Pennsylvania 17319

Mr. Walter W. Cohen, Consumer  
Advocate  
Department of Justice  
Strawberry Square, 14th Floor  
Harrisburg, Pennsylvania 17127

U.S. Environmental Prot. Agency  
Region III Office  
ATTN: EIS Coordinator  
841 Chestnut Street  
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19107

Mr. Charles N. Kelber  
Atomic Safety and Licensing  
Board Panel  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Washington, D.C. 20555



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

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION OR CLARIFICATION  
CONCERNING THE TMI-2 REACTOR VESSEL CRITICALITY SAFETY ANALYSIS  
AND THE REACTOR VESSEL SNM ACCOUNTABILITY STUDY

1. Criticality Study Dated December 18, 1992:

a. The study stated that the fissile material used in the study included uranium with 2.67 weight percent U-235. Did the study also consider PU, since the fuel had experienced burnup?

b. The section of the study that dealt with an accidental criticality stated that the fuel available for such a criticality is loose fuel that can be relocated from each reactor vessel zone. The study listed the quantity that would be loose in each zone, but did not explain the methodology by which the value was determined. Additional information is required on how these quantities were determined. Our particular concern is Zone 9, the bottom head region where the criticality is most likely to occur. Only 59 Kg of fuel is assumed to be loose out of 95 kg assumed to be present in this zone. How was this value determined, and what is the justification for considering the remaining 36 Kg as "neutronically decoupled" from the postulated pile of relocated loose fuel?

2. Reactor Vessel PDSR Dated 1 February 1993:

a. In the review performed by the "Rasmussen Committee", several biases were ascribed to the passive neutron measurement study. Two of these biases, boron variations and  $UO_2$  particle size, were attributed to zones 1 through 5 only. The Committee reasoned that the biases were restricted to these five zones based on the nature of the fuel melting during the accident. A substantial amount of work has occurred inside the reactor since the accident possibly causing a considerable amount of fuel relocation. Provide a justification for the limitation of the biases to Zones 1 through 5 that is consistent with what is known about the distribution of fuel debris inside the reactor vessel.

b. The passive neutron study included computer calculations that modeled fuel at positions near the detector and farther from the detector, averaging the two values to arrive at a best estimate. How were the "close" and "far" positions chosen? Was the average of close and far taken as half the distance, or was a more likely "most probable" distance chosen for the averaging?

c. One of the identified biases was inscattering of neutrons (20 percent). If an inscattering effect occurred, it should be partially accounted for by measurement of neutrons emitted by the calibration source that was lowered near the detector. Explain the justification for assuming that this bias was not accounted for by the use of the neutron source.



d. In the passive neutron measurement study, was the contribution of neutrons that were emitted by fuel below the waterline considered by the analysis? If so how?

e. Provide additional detail concerning the nine fuel samples that were measured to determine the neutron emission rate (these samples are now stored at INEL). The masses of uranium in these samples are listed in Table 3 of Calculation Sheet 4249-3211-91-006, Rev No. 1 (sheet No. 17 of 30). Provide any available reports that document these fuel masses, and any other documentation available about the nature of these samples, especially the physical form (large lumps versus powder), and the inclusion of impurities such as steel or boron.