



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

April 11, 2012

Mr. David A. Heacock
President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc.
Innsbrook Technical Center
5000 Dominion Boulevard
Glen Allen, VA 23060-6711

SUBJECT: MILLSTONE POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2 – WITHDRAWAL OF
REQUESTED LICENSING ACTION RE: LICENSE AMENDMENT REGARDING
RELOCATION OF SPECIFIC SURVEILLANCE FREQUENCY REQUIREMENTS
TO A LICENSEE-CONTROLLED PROGRAM - ADOPTION OF TECHNICAL
SPECIFICATION TASK FORCE 425, REVISION 3 (TAC NO. ME7976)

Dear Mr. Heacock:

By letter dated January 25, 2012,¹ Dominion Nuclear Connecticut, Inc. (DNC or the licensee) submitted a license amendment request (LAR) for Millstone Power Station, Unit No. 2 (MPS2). The proposed amendment would relocate certain technical specification (TS) surveillance frequencies to a licensee-controlled program by adopting Technical Specification Task Force (TSTF)-425, Revision 3,² "Relocate Surveillance Frequencies of Licensee Control – Risk-Informed Technical Specification Task Force Initiative 5b." The proposed change would also add a new program, the Surveillance Frequency Control Program (SFCP), to the TSs, in accordance with TSTF-425. TSTF-425 is approved for use by the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and was announced in the Federal Register on July 6, 2009 (74 FR 31996).

By letter dated April 2, 2012,³ DNC requested to withdraw the application from NRC review. The NRC acknowledges your request to withdraw the application. NRC staff activities on the review have ceased and the associated Technical Assignment Control (TAC) No. ME7976 will be closed.

Prior to the request to withdraw the LAR, the NRC staff completed its acceptance review. 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.

¹ Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML12032A224

² ADAMS Accession No. ML090850642

³ ADAMS Accession No. ML12097A066

This section stipulates that the submittal address the design and operating characteristics, unusual or novel design features, and principal safety considerations.

The NRC staff notes that its review to date has identified that your application did not provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to complete its detailed review. DNC's LAR indicates that a peer review was performed in 1999 and a self assessment was performed in 2007 for the MPS2 probabilistic risk assessment (PRA). The LAR also identifies that the PRA model has been revised periodically and it appears that the revision performed since 2007 included changes to the PRA model to address findings from the self assessment. It is unclear to the NRC staff if all of these changes were done in accordance with the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.200, Revision 1, "An Approach For Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Results For Risk-Informed Activities."⁴ Therefore, if you decide to re-submit the request, to help clarify the NRC's understanding of these changes, it must include the following information:

- Summarize the major changes made to the PRA model since the 2007 self assessment.
- Identify any changes made to the PRA that are consistent with the definition of a "PRA upgrade" in the American Society of Engineers/American Nuclear Society (ASME/ANS)-RA-Sa-2009, as endorsed by Regulatory Guide 1.200.
 - If any changes are characterized as a PRA upgrade, please identify if a focused-scope peer review was performed for these changes consistent with the guidance in ASME/ANS-RA-Sa-2009, as endorsed by Regulatory Guide 1.200, and describe the resolution of any findings from that focused-scope peer review.
 - If a focused-scope peer review has not been performed for changes characterized as a PRA upgrade, please describe and provide the results of a sensitivity study that bounds the potential impact of these changes on this application.

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

Sincerely,



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

Docket No. 50-336

cc: Distribution via Listserv

⁴ ADAMS Accession No. ML070240001

This section stipulates that the submittal address the design and operating characteristics, unusual or novel design features, and principal safety considerations.

The NRC staff notes that its review to date has identified that your application did not provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the NRC staff to complete its detailed review. DNC's LAR indicates that a peer review was performed in 1999 and a self assessment was performed in 2007 for the MPS2 probabilistic risk assessment (PRA). The LAR also identifies that the PRA model has been revised periodically and it appears that the revision performed since 2007 included changes to the PRA model to address findings from the self assessment. It is unclear to the NRC staff if all of these changes were done in accordance with the requirements of Regulatory Guide 1.200, Revision 1, "An Approach For Determining the Technical Adequacy of Probabilistic Risk Assessment Results For Risk-Informed Activities."⁴ Therefore, if you decide to re-submit the request, to help clarify the NRC's understanding of these changes, it must include the following information:

- Summarize the major changes made to the PRA model since the 2007 self assessment.
- Identify any changes made to the PRA that are consistent with the definition of a "PRA upgrade" in the American Society of Engineers/American Nuclear Society (ASME/ANS)-RA-Sa-2009, as endorsed by Regulatory Guide 1.200.
 - If any changes are characterized as a PRA upgrade, please identify if a focused-scope peer review was performed for these changes consistent with the guidance in ASME/ANS-RA-Sa-2009, as endorsed by Regulatory Guide 1.200, and describe the resolution of any findings from that focused-scope peer review.
 - If a focused-scope peer review has not been performed for changes characterized as a PRA upgrade, please describe and provide the results of a sensitivity study that bounds the potential impact of these changes on this application.

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

Sincerely,

/ra/

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

Docket No. 50-336

cc: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDraApla Resource

RidsNrrDorLp1-2 Resource

RidsOgcRp Resource

Branch Reading File

RidsNrrDorL Resource

RidsNrrLAABaxter Resource

RidsRgnXMailCenter Resource

RidsAcraAcnw_MailCTR Resource

RidsNrrDorLdpr Resource

RidsNrrPMMillstone Resource

RidsNrrDssStsb Resource

ADAMS Accession No. ML120950598

OFFICE	DORL/LPL1-2/PM	DORL/LPL1-2/LA	DRA/APLA/BC	DSS/STSB/BC	DORL/LPL1-2/BC	DORL/LPL1-2/PM
NAME	CSanders	ABaxter (SLittle for)	DHarrison	RElliot	MKhanna	CSanders
DATE	4/9/12	4/5/12	4/8/12	4/9/12	4/11/12	4/11/12

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

⁴ ADAMS Accession No. ML070240001