



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

October 18, 2016

Mr. Bryan C. Hanson
Senior Vice President
Exelon Generation Company, LLC
President and Chief Nuclear Officer (CNO)
Exelon Nuclear
4300 Winfield Road
Warrenville, IL 60555

SUBJECT: BRAIDWOOD STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; BYRON STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2; CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2; CLINTON POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1; DRESDEN NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3; LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3; QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT; AND THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1 – ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTED LICENSING ACTION TO REVISE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSERVICE TESTING PROGRAM (CAC NOS. MF8238–MF8256)

Dear Mr. Hanson:

By application dated July 26, 2016 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML16209A218), as supplemented by letter dated October 6, 2016 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16280A402), Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon, the licensee) submitted a license amendment request for Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2; Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2; Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1; Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Units 2 and 3; LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2; Nine Mile Point Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2; Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3; Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2; R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant; and Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1. The proposed amendment would revise the technical specification requirements for the inservice testing program for each of these facilities.

The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (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 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.

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, as supplemented, 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.

Based on the information provided in your submittals the NRC staff has estimated that the review of this licensing request will take approximately 400 hours to complete. The NRC staff expects to complete this review by July 26, 2017, as you requested in the application. If there are emergent complexities or challenges in our review that would cause changes to the initial forecasted completion date or significant changes in the forecasted hours, the reasons for the changes, along with the new estimates, will be communicated during the routine interactions with the assigned project manager.

These estimates are based on the NRC staff's initial review of the application, as supplemented, and they could change due to several factors, including requests for additional information, unanticipated addition of scope to the review, and review by NRC advisory committees or hearing-related activities. Additional delay may occur if the submittal is provided to the NRC in advance or in parallel with industry program initiatives or pilot applications.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1380 or Blake.Purnell@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,



Blake Purnell, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. STN 50-456, STN 50-457,
STN 50-454, STN 50-455, 50-317,
50-318, 50-461, 50-237, 50-249,
50-373, 50-374, 50-220, 50-410,
50-277, 50-278, 50-254, 50-265,
50-244, and 50-289

cc: Distribution via Listserv

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, as supplemented, 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.

Based on the information provided in your submittals the NRC staff has estimated that the review of this licensing request will take approximately 400 hours to complete. The NRC staff expects to complete this review by July 26, 2017, as you requested in the application. If there are emergent complexities or challenges in our review that would cause changes to the initial forecasted completion date or significant changes in the forecasted hours, the reasons for the changes, along with the new estimates, will be communicated during the routine interactions with the assigned project manager.

These estimates are based on the NRC staff's initial review of the application, as supplemented, and they could change due to several factors, including requests for additional information, unanticipated addition of scope to the review, and review by NRC advisory committees or hearing-related activities. Additional delay may occur if the submittal is provided to the NRC in advance or in parallel with industry program initiatives or pilot applications.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1380 or Blake.Purnell@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Blake Purnell, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. STN 50-456, STN 50-457,
STN 50-454, STN 50-455, 50-317,
50-318, 50-461, 50-237, 50-249,
50-373, 50-374, 50-220, 50-410,
50-277, 50-278, 50-254, 50-265,
50-244, and 50-289

cc: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML16292A449

*by email

OFFICE	DORL/LPL3-2/PM	DORL/LPL3-2	DSS/STSB/BC	DORL/LPL3-2/BC(A)	DORL/LPL3-2/PM
NAME	BPurnell	SRohrer (LRonewicz for)	AKlein	GEMiller	BPurnell
DATE	10/18/16	10/18/16	10/17/16	10/18/2016	10/18/2016

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Letter to Bryan C. Hanson from Blake Purnell dated October 18, 2016

SUBJECT: BRAIDWOOD STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; BYRON STATION, UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2; CALVERT CLIFFS NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2; CLINTON POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 1; DRESDEN NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3; LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; NINE MILE POINT NUCLEAR STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNITS 2 AND 3; QUAD CITIES NUCLEAR POWER STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2; R. E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT; AND THREE MILE ISLAND NUCLEAR STATION, UNIT 1 – ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTED LICENSING ACTION TO REVISE TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR THE INSERVICE TESTING PROGRAM (CAC NOS. MF8238–MF8256)

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	LPL3-2 R/F	LPL1-2 R/F
LPL1-1 R/F	RidsNrrPMExelon Resource	RidsNrrDssStsb Resource
RidsNrrDorLpl1-1 Resource	RidsNrrDorLpl1-2 Resource	RidsNrrDorLpl3-2 Resource
RidsNrrDorLpl4-2 Resource	RidsNrrLAKGoldstein Resource	RidsNrrLALRonewicz Resource
RidsNrrLASRohrer Resource	RidsACRS_MailCTR Resource	RidsRgn3MailCenter Resource
RidsRgn1MailCenter Resource	RidsNrrPMBraidwood Resource	RidsNrrPMByron Resource
RidsNrrPMClinton Resource	RidsNrrPMLaSalle Resource	RidsNrrDeEpnB Resource
RidsNrrPMCalvertCliffsResource	RidsNrrPMDresden Resource	RidsNrrPMQuadCities Resource
RidsNrrPMPeachBottom Resource	RidsNrrPMNineMilePoint Resource	RidsNrrPMREGinna Resource
RidsNrrPMThreeMileIsland Resource		