From:	Ennis, Rick
Sent:	Thursday, July 18, 2013 2:36 PM
To:	Tom Loomis
Cc:	Kevin Borton (kevin.borton@exeloncorp.com); David Neff
Subject:	Acceptance Review for TACs MF1970 and MF1971 - Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3 - License Amendment Request to Increase the Safety Relief Valve/Safety Valve Setpoint Tolerance

Tom,

By letter dated June 10, 2013 (ADAMS Accession No. ML131750144), Exelon Generation Company, LLC submitted a license amendment request for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3. The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to: (1) increase the allowable as-found safety relief valve (SRV) and safety valve (SV) lift setpoint tolerance from ± 1% to ± 3%; (2) increase the required number of operable SRVs and SVs from 11 to 12; and (3) increase the Standby Liquid Control System pump discharge pressure from 1255 pounds per square inch gauge (psig) to 1275 psig.

The purpose of this e-mail is to provide the results of the NRC staff's acceptance review of this 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 TSs) 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 staff to proceed with its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed amendment request 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) 415-1420.

Richard B. Ennis, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation