

**From:** [Thadani, Mohan](#)  
**To:** [Harding Jr, Thomas](#)  
**Cc:** [Lingam, Siva](#); [Widrevitz, Dan](#)  
**Subject:** Ginna Nuclear Power Plant Fifth ISI Program-Relief Request ISI-06  
**Date:** Monday, June 04, 2012 8:57:00 AM

---

Mr. Harding:

The NRC staff has reviewed the subject license relief request for acceptance for a detailed technical review. The NRC staff concludes that the request for relief is acceptable for detailed review. Our acceptance review is documented below.

Thanks.

Mohan

---

Mr. Joseph E. Pacher  
Vice President R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant  
R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC  
1503 Lake Road  
Ontario, NY 14519

**SUBJECT: R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT – ACCEPTANCE REVIEW FOR RELIEF REQUEST NUMBER ISI-06 FOR FIFTH INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM, REGARDING THE EXAMINATION OF BOTTOM MOUNTED INSTRUMENTATION PENETRATIONS. (TAC NO. ME8720)**

Dear Mr. Pacher:

By letter dated April 24, 2012,(ADAMS Accession No. ML12111704812), Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC (the licensee) requested the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff approval of proposed alternative to American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Code Section XI, paragraph IWB-2420 of performing successive ultrasonic examination each period on Reactor Pressure Vessel bottom mounted instrumentation (BMI) penetrations. The licensee proposes an alternative to perform successive examination, two periods following the initial detection of the original fabrication flaw in BMI penetrations Nozzle A86 and maintain detailed examination of leakage every refueling outage.

The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this relief 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.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the staff to proceed with its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed alternative in terms of regulatory requirements and the protection of public health and safety and the environment. If additional information is needed for the staff to complete its technical review, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

*Mohan C Thadani*  
Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch IV  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

(301) 415-1476 [Mohan.Thadani@nrc.gov](mailto:Mohan.Thadani@nrc.gov)