

August 24, 2006

Mr. William Levis
Senior Vice President & Chief Nuclear Officer
PSEG Nuclear LLC-N09
Post Office Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION RELATED TO AMENDMENT REQUEST TO RELOCATE
OVERCURRENT PROTECTIVE DEVICES (TAC NO. MC8602)

Dear Mr. Levis:

By letter dated October 11, 2005, PSEG Nuclear LLC requested an amendment to the Facility Operating License for the Hope Creek Generating Station (Hope Creek). The amendment would relocate the Technical Specification requirements for the overcurrent protective devices to the Hope Creek Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has determined that responses to the enclosed questions are necessary in order for the staff to complete its review. These questions, in draft form, were sent by e-mail to Mr. James Mallon of your staff on June 14, 2006. Your staff has not requested a conference call to discuss the questions.

In order to complete our timely review of your amendment request, we require your response within 30 days from the date of this letter. If you cannot respond within 30 days, please inform us in writing why you cannot respond and provide an alternate response date. This alternate response date must be no later than 45 days from the date of this letter.

Please note that if you do not respond to this letter within 30 days or provide an acceptable alternate date in writing, we may reject your application for amendment under the provisions of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.108. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (301) 415-1321.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Stewart N. Bailey, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-354

cc w/encl: See next page

August 24, 2006

Mr. William Levis
Senior Vice President & Chief Nuclear Officer
PSEG Nuclear LLC-N09
Post Office Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION RELATED TO AMENDMENT REQUEST TO RELOCATE
OVERCURRENT PROTECTIVE DEVICES (TAC NO. MC8602)

Dear Mr. Levis:

By letter dated October 11, 2005, PSEG Nuclear LLC requested an amendment to the Facility Operating License for the Hope Creek Generating Station (Hope Creek). The amendment would relocate the Technical Specification requirements for the overcurrent protective devices to the Hope Creek Updated Final Safety Analysis Report.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has determined that responses to the enclosed questions are necessary in order for the staff to complete its review. These questions, in draft form, were sent by e-mail to Mr. James Mallon of your staff on June 14, 2006. Your staff has not requested a conference call to discuss the questions.

In order to complete our timely review of your amendment request, we require your response within 30 days from the date of this letter. If you cannot respond within 30 days, please inform us in writing why you cannot respond and provide an alternate response date. This alternate response date must be no later than 45 days from the date of this letter.

Please note that if you do not respond to this letter within 30 days or provide an acceptable alternate date in writing, we may reject your application for amendment under the provisions of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 2.108. If you have any questions, I can be reached at (301) 415-1321.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Stewart N. Bailey, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-354

cc w/encl: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	LPL1-2 R/F	RidsNrrDorLp11-2
RidsNrrLACRaynor	RidsNrrDlpmDpr	RidsNrrPMSBailey
RidsOgcRp	RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	RidsRgnIMailCenter
RidsNrrDeEeeb	APal	

ADAMS Accession Number: **ML062070460**

OFFICE	LPL1-2/PM	LPL1-2/LA	EEEE/BC	LPL1-2/BC (A)
NAME	SBailey:rsa	CRaynor	GWilson	BPoole
DATE	8/24/06	8/24/06	8/16/2006	8/24/06

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Hope Creek Generating Station

cc:

Mr. Dennis Winchester
Vice President - Nuclear Assessments
PSEG Nuclear
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. George P. Barnes
Site Vice President - Hope Creek
PSEG Nuclear
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. George H. Gellrich
Plant Support Manager
PSEG Nuclear
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Michael J. Massaro
Plant Manager - Hope Creek
PSEG Nuclear
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Darin Benyak
Director - Regulatory Assurance
PSEG Nuclear - N21
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. James Mallon
Manager - Licensing
200 Exelon Way - KSA 3-E
Kennett Square, PA 19348

Jeffrie J. Keenan, Esquire
PSEG Nuclear - N21
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Michael Jesse
Manager - Regulatory Assurance
P.O. Box 236
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Township Clerk
Lower Alloways Creek Township
Municipal Building, P.O. Box 157
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

Mr. Paul Bauldauf, P.E., Asst. Director
Radiation Protection Programs
NJ Department of Environmental
Protection and Energy
CN 415
Trenton, NJ 08625-0415

Mr. Brian Beam
Board of Public Utilities
2 Gateway Center, Tenth Floor
Newark, NJ 07102

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

Senior Resident Inspector
Hope Creek Generating Station
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Drawer 0509
Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

AMENDMENT REQUEST TO REVISE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

RELOCATION OF OVERCURRENT PROTECTIVE DEVICES

HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION

DOCKET NO. 50-354

By letter dated October 11, 2005, PSEG Nuclear LLC (PSEG) requested an amendment to the Hope Creek Generating Station (Hope Creek) Technical Specifications (TSs). The amendment would relocate the TS requirements for the overcurrent protective devices to the Hope Creek Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR). PSEG requested this change on the basis that the overcurrent protective devices do not meet the criteria in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 50.36, for inclusion in the TSs.

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission staff has determined that additional information, as requested below, is necessary in order for the staff to complete its review.

1. The primary containment penetration conductors are used for both safety-related and non-safety-related power, control and instrumentation circuits. Some of these circuits may be susceptible to fault during a design-basis accident (DBA). Of particular concern would be 4160-volt and 480-volt non-safety-related power circuits with equipment that is not qualified for the post-accident containment environment. It is recognized that some of the non-safety-related circuits are de-energized during a DBA, while other circuits may be de-energized after some time delay. However, for those circuits that are energized, actuation of the protective devices may be necessary to protect the electrical penetrations from fault current levels that could damage them and compromise the integrity of the containment fission product barrier. Based on the above, provide a discussion why the TS requirements for the primary containment penetration conductor overcurrent protective devices defined in TS 3/4.8.4.1 do not meet Criterion 3 of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii) and, therefore, can be relocated to the UFSAR.

2. Class 1E isolation breaker overcurrent protective devices are used whenever non-safety-related (NSR) circuits are fed from the safety-related (SR) distribution system. Some of these circuits may be susceptible to faults during a DBA (such as a high-energy-line break). Actuation of the Class 1E isolation breaker overcurrent protective devices may be necessary in order to prevent degradation of the SR distribution system from electrical faults of NSR circuits. The electrical design basis is to prevent common-mode failures that originate from the failure of NSR circuits. These failures have a potential to affect redundant trains, which in turn has the potential to compromise emergency core cooling systems. Based on the above, provide a discussion why the TS requirements for the Class 1E isolation breaker overcurrent protective devices defined in TS 3/4.8.4.5 do not meet Criterion 3 of 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2)(ii) and, therefore, can be relocated to the UFSAR.

Enclosure