

August 18, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO: Harold K. Chernoff, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: G. Edward Miller, Project Manager */ra/*
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION - ELECTRONIC
TRANSMISSION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
REGARDING LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST TO RELOCATE
SURVEILLANCE FREQUENCIES TO A LICENSEE CONTROLLED
DOCUMENT (TAC NO. ME2494)

The attached draft request for additional information (RAI) was transmitted by electronic transmission on August 18, 2010 to Mr. Glenn Stewart, at Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon, the licensee). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and to support a conference call with Exelon in order to clarify the licensee's amendment request dated October 30, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML093060126), to relocate selected Surveillance Requirement frequencies to a licensee controlled document. The draft questions were sent to ensure that they were understandable, the regulatory basis was clear, and to determine if the information was previously docketed. Additionally, review of the draft RAI would allow Exelon to evaluate and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-219

Enclosure: As stated

August 18, 2010

MEMORANDUM TO: Harold K. Chernoff, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: G. Edward Miller, Project Manager */ra/*
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION - ELECTRONIC
TRANSMISSION, DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
REGARDING LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST TO RELOCATE
SURVEILLANCE FREQUENCIES TO A LICENSEE CONTROLLED
DOCUMENT (TAC NO. ME2494)

The attached draft request for additional information (RAI) was transmitted by electronic transmission on August 18, 2010 to Mr. Glenn Stewart, at Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon, the licensee). This draft RAI was transmitted to facilitate the technical review being conducted by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff and to support a conference call with Exelon in order to clarify the licensee's amendment request dated October 30, 2009 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML093060126), to relocate selected Surveillance Requirement frequencies to a licensee controlled document. The draft questions were sent to ensure that they were understandable, the regulatory basis was clear, and to determine if the information was previously docketed. Additionally, review of the draft RAI would allow Exelon to evaluate and agree upon a schedule to respond to the RAI. This memorandum and the attachment do not represent an NRC staff position.

Docket Nos. 50-219

Enclosure: As stated

DISTRIBUTION:

Public

RidsNrrPMGMiller

LPL1-2 R/F

ADAMS Accession No.: ML10

	LPLI-2/PM
NAME	GEMiller
DATE	8/18/2010

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DRAFT REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

OYSTER CREEK NUCLEAR GENERATING STATION

LICENSE AMENDMENT REQUEST

RELOCATION OF SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENT FREQUENCIES

DOCKET NO. 50-219

By letter dated October 30, 2009 (Agencywide Document Access and Management System Accession No. ML093060126), Exelon Generation Company (Exelon or the licensee) requested an amendment to the Technical Specifications (TSs) for the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station (Oyster Creek). Specifically, the requested amendment would relocate selected Surveillance Requirement (SR) frequencies to a licensee controlled document. To complete its review, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff requests responses to the following request for additional information.

1. In a number of locations, the proposed wording would require that a SR be performed “in accordance with the Surveillance Frequency Control Program.” Provide additional justification that this wording will not allow aspects of performing the SR other than the frequency of performance from being governed by the Surveillance Frequency Control Program. Alternately, propose revised wording that limits the control of the Surveillance Frequency Control Program to the only the frequency of performing an SR.

Enclosure