

From: Sanders, Carleen
Sent: Tuesday, January 12, 2010 11:41 AM
To: William D Bartron
Subject: Acceptance Review: License Amendment Request Regarding SG One-Time Alternate Repair Criteria

Dear Mr. Bartron

By letter dated November 23, 2009, Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. submitted a license amendment request for Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 3 (MPS3). The proposed license amendment request would revise the MPS3 Technical Specification (TS) 6.8.4.g, "Steam Generator Program," to exclude a portion of the tubes below the top of the steam generator tubesheet from periodic steam generator tube inspections. This request would also remove reference to the previous Cycle 13 interim alternate repair criteria and revise the reporting requirements. The purpose of this email is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this license amendment request. The acceptance review was performed to determine if there is sufficient technical information in scope and depth to allow the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review. The acceptance review is also intended to identify whether the application has any readily apparent information insufficiencies in its characterization of the regulatory requirements or the licensing basis of the plant.

Consistent with Section 50.90 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), an amendment to the license (including the technical specifications) must fully describe the changes requested, and following as far as applicable, the form prescribed for original applications. Section 50.34 of 10 CFR addresses the content of technical information required. This section stipulates that the submittal address the design and operating characteristics, unusual or novel design features, and principal safety considerations.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed amendment in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. Given the lesser scope and depth of the acceptance review as compared to the detailed technical review, there may be instances in which issues that impact the NRC staff's ability to complete the detailed technical review are identified despite completion of an adequate acceptance review. You will be advised of any further information needed to support the NRC staff's detailed technical review by separate correspondence.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1603.

Sincerely,

Carleen Sanders, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-423

