

From: Vaidya, Bhalchandra
Sent: Monday, June 20, 2016 2:18 PM
To: Lentz, Thomas A. (Licensing) (talentz@firstenergycorp.com); Lashley, Phil H. (plashley@firstenergycorp.com)
Cc: Miller, Ed; Purnell, Blake; Lamb, Taylor; Green, Kimberly; Bedi, Gurjendra; Alley, David; Tilton, Caroline; 'Huang, Tai'; Klein, Alex
Subject: FENOC- BV 1 & 2, DBNPS, PNPS - Acceptance of Requested Licensing Action - Request an Alternative to the ASME Code Case OMN-20, CAC Nos. MF7780, MF7781, MF7782, MF7783

**Subject: Acceptance of Requested Licensing Action:
Application Dated May 24, 2016, to Request an Alternative to the ASME Code Case OMN-20,
CAC Nos. MF7780, MF7781, MF7782, MF7783**

By letter dated May 24, 2016 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16148A047), FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company (FENOC), Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(z), and consistent with TSTF-545, Revision 3, submitted the application proposed an alternative to the testing frequencies in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Operation and Maintenance (OM) Code, by adoption of approved Code Case OMN-20, "Inservice Test Frequency," for the current 10 year inservice testing interval..

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.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(a)(3)(i) and 50.55a(a)(3)(ii) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or that compliance with the specified requirements of Section 50.55a would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality or safety.

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) 415-3308.

Bhalchandra K. Vaidya
Licensing Project Manager
NRC/NRR/DORL/LPL1-1
(301)-415-3308 (O)
bhalchandra.vaidya@nrc.gov