#### UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION SUPPORTING

# AMENDMENT NO. 123 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-44

# PHILADELPHIA ELECTRIC COMPANY PUBLIC SERVICE ELECTRIC AND GAS COMPANY DELMARVA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY ATLANTIC CITY ELECTRIC COMPANY

# PEACH BOTTOM ATOMIC POWER STATION, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-277

# 1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated January 9, 1987, as supplemented by letters dated February 6, March 24, and May 13, 1987, Philadelphia Electric Company (licensee or PECO) requested an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-44 for the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit No. 2. The proposed amendment would revise the Technical Specifications (TSs) to: (1) incorporate the operating limits for all fuel types for Cycle 8 operation, (2) incorporate a change in slope of the flow biased Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) scram and rod block setpoints for extended power-flow operating regions, (3) correct five typographical errors, (4) ciarify a definition of Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (5) clarify several notes in the TSs and (6) make various changes to the Bases discussing core reloads. TS changes were proposed for the operation of Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit No. 2 for Cycle 8 (PB2C8) with a reload using General Electric (GE) manufactured fuel assemblies and GE analyses and methodologies. Enclosed were the requested TS changes and reports (including Reference 2 through 5) discussing the reload and analyses done to support and justify Cycle 8 operation and extended power-flow operating regions. Subsequent discussions between the staff, PECO and GE resulted in References 6 through 8, providing additional information and revisions to the initially proposed TS relating to the new GE fuel for the reload.

The reload for Cycle 8 is generally a normal reload with no unusual core features or characteristics. TS changes are few and primarily related to Maximum Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (MAPLHGR) and Linear Heat Generation Rate (LHGR) limits for the new fuel and Minimum Core Power Ratio (MCPR) limits for all of the fuel using Cycle 8 core and transient parameters. The new fuel is one of the first extensive uses of the GE extended burnup fuel in a reload, and particular attention has been paid to special aspects of the TS for this fuel.

8709210055 870911 PDR ADDCK 05000277 PDR PDR The submittal also proposes extensions of the standard allowed operating regions on the reactor temperature and power-flow map. The extended load line limit analysis (ELLLA), increased core flow (ICF), and the final feedwater temperature reduction (FFWTR) proposed modes of extended operation are similar to those approved on a number of other terms in recent years. Except for changes to the flow biased neutron flux scram and rod block setpoints necessary for ELLLA and some additional MCPR limits for ICF, they require no other changes to Cycle 8 TS.

In the initial January 9, 1987 submittal, the licensee - on behalf of G2 requested that one of the enclosed documents, the Losc-of-Coolant Accident Analysis, be treated as proprietary. Following discussions between the NRC staff, GE and PECO, the licensee advised us in the February 6, 1987 letter that the document had been reclassified as nonproprietary. There were no other changes to the initial submittal.

As noted above, the supporting analysis were performed by GE for PECO rsing NRC approved methods and codes. In the subject Peach Bottom, Unit 2 submittai, as well as in another recent submittal by another licensee for which GE had performed the analysis (the cycle 8 reload for Fitz Patrick submitted by New York Power Authority's letter of December 23, 1986), GE had proposed a new approach of only including the curves for the most limiting and least limiting Maximum Average Placar Linear Heat Generation Rate (MAPLHGR) versus planar average exposure values for each fuel type in the TSs. During power operation, the process computer would check that the APLHGR for each type of fuel as a function of axial location and average planar exposure was within the limits based on the applicable APLHGR limit values which had been approved for the respective fuel and lattice types. The purpose of this arrangement is to permit future reloads to be performed in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59 as long as the calculated limits for the new reload stay within the bounding most limiting and least limiting curves. While the staff was in agreement with this approach, we had concerns over what would be done when the process computer was not available (when hand calculations are required) and what "intermediate" curves would be available to the reactor engineers. As a result of discussions between the staff and GE, agreement was reached on the format of the TS and actions to be taken when hand calculations are required. (Letter from J. S. Charnley, GE to M. W. Hodges, NRC dated March 4, 1987, Subject: "Recommended MAPLHGR Technical Specifications for Multiple Lattice Fuel Designs"). In a telephone conference call to PECO on March 10, 1987, the staff requested that the above resolution with GE be included on the Peach Bottom 2 docket. By letter date March 24, 1987, PECO submitted 1) the MAPLHGR curves in the staff proposed format, (i.e., removing a note which referenced a proprietary GE document) 2) committed to the provision that when the process computer is not available and hand calculations are required, the most limiting lattice APLHGR limits for each fuel type will apply to every lattice of that fuel type, 3) provided a proprietary document which PECO stated would be available to the Reactor Engineers to identify the MAPLHGR values, 4) confirmed that all of the cycle 8 fuel

bundles would comply with the peak cladding temperature and oxidation fraction limits of 10 CFR 50.46. The specific MAPLHGR curves in the January 9, 1987 submittal were not changed by the March 24, 1987 submittal. The only changes to TS pages in the March 24, 1987 submittal was to remove a reference to a proprietary GE report, which could not be placed in the public domain with the technical specifications. The information submitted by the March 24, 1987 letter was confirmatory or administrative in nature and did not change the substance of the initial submittal. The staff concluded that renoticing was not required.

As will be discussed subsequently in Section 2.6, the analysis provided in the January 9, 1987 submittal to support increased core flow were based on the stated assumption that the rod block monitor (RBM) is clamped at 107%. FECO stated that an operating restriction was being imposed by procedure to ensure that reactor operation would be within the bounds of the analyses. The staff's position was that this was a sufficiently important limit that it should be in the TSs and not just in a procedure. Accordingly, PECO submitted the requested addition to the TSs by a May 13, 1987 letter. This submittal simply included in the TSs a limit that was discussed and was implicit in the January 9, 1987 submittal; consequently, the staff concluded that renoticing was not required.

# 2.0 EVALUATION

.

# 2.1 Reload Description

The PB2C8 reload will retain 200 PCx8R and 202 BP8x8R GE fuel assemblies from the previous cycle and add 258 new GE8x8EB fuel assemblies and 4 lead test assemblies (LTA). The reload is based on a previous cycle core nominal average exposure of 17.6 GWD/ST and Cycle 8 end of cycle exposure of 19.2 GWD/ST. The loading will be a conventional scatter pattern with low reactivity fuel on the periphery.

### 2.2 Fuel Dasign

The new fuel for Cycle 8 is primarily the GE extended burnup fuel GE8x8EB. The fuel designations are BD319A and BD321A. This fuel type has been approved in the Safety Evaluation Report for Amendment 10 to GESTAR II (Ref. 9 and 10<sup>\</sup>. The specific descriptions of this fuel have been submitted in Amendment 18 to GESTAR II, but since this amendment has not as yet been accepted, the fuel description has also been presented for PB2C8 in Reference 6. The LTA fuel has also been described in Reference 6, and in a submittal (Ref. 11) which also provides information concerning the methods and criteria for the nuclear, thermal and mechanical design and the surveillance program. These fuel descriptions are acceptable.

In operation the GE8x8EB and LTA fuel will be assigned a number of axial lattice regions and appropriate MAPLHGR limits, which have been determined by approved thermal-mechanical and loss of coolant analyses (LOCA) calculations, will be applied to each of these regions. There was extensive interaction between the staff, GE and the utility in deciding on an acceptable format for presentation of this information, suitable for plant use and staff requirements for TS. References 6, 7 and 8 provide

questions, responses and conclusions from these interactions. The process computer contains, and acts on, full details of the MAPLHGR information. The agreed upon TSs present the least and most limiting lattice MAPLHGR as a function of burnup. When hand calculations of MAPLHGR are required (process computer inoperative) the most limiting values are used for all limits. These TSs are acceptable. A proprietary report, reviewed by the staff, available to the Peach Bottom engineering staff provides complete details of the lattice definitions and MAPLHGR limits.

The proposed LHGR limit for the GE8x8EB and LTA fuel is 14.4 kW/ft (rather than the 13.4 for other GE fuel). This LHGR has been reviewed and accepted for this fuel in the GE extended burnup fuel review (Ref. 9). (See the referrals in Reference 9 to References 18 and 19. These references are responses to questions and presentations relating to the GE8x8EB fuel which provide information on the 14.4 kW/ft LHGR.) This LHGR is acceptable for the fuel in PB2C8.

The presentation of the LTA fuel design, design methods and criteria (Ref. 11), along with the response to questions (Ref. 7) about application of the GEXL correlation (experimental data for the fuel have been applied conservatively) have been reviewed and found acceptable. There is reasonable assurance that the LTA will not be the limiting fuel in the core and will be in conformance with applicable General Design Criteria. The proposed TS limits for MAPLHGR and LHGR for this fuel in PB2C8 are acceptable.

### 2.3 Nuclear Design

.

.

The nuclear design for PB2C8 has been performed by GE with the approved methodology described in GESTAR II (Ref. 10). The results of these analyses are given in the GE reload report (Ref. 2) in standard GESTAR II format. The results are within the range of those usually encountered for BWR reloads. In particular, the shutdown margin is 2.0% and 1.1% delta k at BOL and at the exposure of minimum shutdown margin, respectively, thus fully meeting the required 0.38% delta k. The Standby Liquid Control System also meets shutdown requirements with a shutdown margin of 4.1% delta k. Since these and other PB2C8 nuclear design parameters have been obtained with previously approved methods and fall within expected ranges, the nuclear design is acceptable.

# 2.4 Thermal-Hydraulic Design

The thermal-hydraulic design for PB2C8 has been performed by GE with the approved methodology described in GESTAR II (Ref. 10) and the results are given in the GE reload report (Ref. 2). The parameters used for the analyses are those approved in Reference 10 for the Peach Bottom class BWR 4. The GEMINI system of methods (approved in Ref. 12) was used for relevant transient analyses.

The Operating Limit MCPR (OLMCPR) values are determined by the limiting transients, which are usually Rod Withdrawal Error (RWE), Feedwater Controller Failure (FWCF) and Load Rejection Without Bypass (LRWBP). The analyses of these events for PB2C8, using the ODYN Option A and B approach for pressurization transients provide new Cycle 8 TS values of OLMCPR as a operating regions.

For PB2C8 PECO has elected, following standard practice, to have exposure dependent OLMCPR. Two exposure regions from beginning of cycle (BOC) to end of cycle (EOC) were analyzed, (1) BOC to EOC - 2 GWD/ST and (2) EOC - 2 GWD/ST to EOC. For standard operating conditions LRWBP is controlling at both option A and B limits except at BOC option B where RWE is controlling. (A rod block setting of 107 was selected.) These OLMCPR results are reflected in TS changes. Approved methods (Ref. 10) were used to analyze these events (and others which could be limiting) and the analyses and results are acceptable and fall within expected ranges.

The Peach Bottom 2 TS will have staff approved provisions (similar to the existing Peach Bottom 3 TS) for incore neutron detector monitoring of thermal-hydraulic stability according to the recommendations of GE SIL-380. These have been submitted and are expected to be approved for Cycle 8 operation. Thus cycle specific stability calculations are not required, either for standard conditions or the extended temperature and power-flow conditions proposed for Cycle 8 operation (see Section 2.6).

# 2.5 Transient and Accident Analyses

.

.

The transient and accident analysis methodologies used for PB2C8 are described and NRC approval indicated in GESTAR II (Ref. 10). The GEMINI system of methods (Ref. 12) option was used for transient analyses. The limiting MCPR events for PB2C8 are indicated in Sections 2.4 and 2.6. The core wide transient analysis methodologies and results are acceptable and fall within expected ranges.

The RWE was analyzed on a plant and cycle specific tasis (as opposed to the statistical approach) and a rod block setpoint of 107 was selected to provide an OLMCPR of 1.24 for all fuel types. The mislocated assembly event is not analyzed for reload cores on the basis of (NRC approved, see Reference S.2-59 of Ref. 10) studies indicating the small probability of an event exceeding MCPR limits. The misorientation event was analyzed with standard methods of the PB2C8 D lattice fuel, giving a nonlimiting MCPR of 1.17. The LOCA transient event analyses are thus acceptable.

The limiting pressurization event, the main steam isolation value closure with flux scram, analyzed with standard GESTAR II methods gave results for peak steam dome and vessel pressures well under required limits. These are acceptable methodologies and results. LOCA analyses, using approved methodologies (SAFE/REFLOOD/CHASTE) and parameters were performed to provide MAPLHGR values for the new reload fuel assemblies (GE8x8EB and LTA). These analyses and results are acceptable.

Since some parameters of the generic rod drop accident (RDA) were not bounding for PB2C8, cycle specific RDA analyses were done for cold and hot conditions. These were done with standard, approved GE methods. The results were well within the required 280 cal/gm limit. The analyses and results are acceptable.

#### 2.6 Changes to APRM Scram and Rod Block Setpoints

1

.

.

The PB2C8 reload submittal proposes extensions to standard operating regions in the GESTAR II standard category of "Operating Flexibility Options". The selected options are ELLLA, ICF and FFWTR. These have become commonly selected and approved options for a number of reactors in recent years. These options are described and discussed in Appendices A and B of the GE reload report (Ref. 2) and in GE topical reports for Peach Bottom (Ref. 3 and 4) accompanying the reload submittal. These appendices provide the results of transient analyses for setting MCPR limits for Cycle 8 and the topical reports provide generic analyses of transients and accidents, applicable for follow-on cycles as well.

The proposed ELLLA changes the Average Power Range Monitor (APRM) rod block and scram lines on the power-flow map, and permits operation up to the new APRM rod block line (0.58W + 50%) up to the intersection with the 100 percent power line occurring at a flow of 87 percent. These are standard changes for ELLLA. For ICF the proposed flow increase is to 105 percent core flow at 100 percent power and (along the constant pump speed line) to 110 percent core flow at 70 percent power. The increased flow would be allowed throughout the cycle and after normal end-of-cycle (with or without FFWTR) with reactivity coast down to 70 percent power. The proposed FFWTR involves valving out last stage feedwater heaters (going to about 328° F) and is proposed only for operation after normal end-of-cycle (for Cycle 8).

For the ELLLA extension, the topical report (Ref. 3) discusses a full range of transient and accident events relevant to the region extension, and presents results of calculations or previously approved conclusions. In addition, Appendix B of the GE PB2C8 reload report (Ref. 2) presents additional calculations of limiting MCPR transients specifically for PB2C8. The transient analyses demonstrate that for reactors such as Peach Bottom 2 which do not have Recirculation Pump Trip for pressurization transient scram response assistance, the licensing basis results (e.g., 100 percent flow, 100 percent power for pressurization transients) bound the ELLLA region results (e.g., 87 percent flow, 100 percent power). These conclusions apply to all relevant MCPR events such as pressurization, rod withdrawal and flow runout events. Changes to MCPR TSs are not required because of ELLLA adoption. Other relevant areas such as over pressure protection, LOCA and containment analysis have also been examined, and the analyses indicate that results are within allowable design limits. Thermal-hydraulic stability will be provided for by appropriate surveillance. The analyses have been done with approved methodologies and the results are similar to previously approved ELLLA extensions. Thus operation within the ELLLA region is acceptable for PB2C8.

For the ICF and FFWTR extensions, similar to the ELLLA presentation, the topical report (Ref. 4) discusses a full range of relevant transient and accident events and other potential problem areas, and Appendix A of the GE reload report (Ref. 2) provides analyses of limiting MCPR events for PB2C8.

Unlike the situation for ELLLA, the analysis of MCPR events leads, in some situations, to more restrictive MCPR limits, which are cycle dependent. Appendix A presents the results of calculations, using standard methodology, for the most limiting event at the most limiting combination of ICF and/or FFWTR conditions for PB2C8. These are presented for option A and B and for both exposure ranges considered for standard operating conditions. (FFWTR is allowed only for "EOC".) The results are reflected in the TSs which are changed to provide a new MCPR limit for EOC-2000 to EOC operation with ICF. FFWTR operation, within the bounds to be used, is not limiting, either with or without ICF, compared to standard operating conditions. The RWE results for the standard operation region are not affected with the Rod Block Monitor clipped at 107 in the ICF region. It is concluded that the MCPR analyses for ICF/FFWTR extension use standard methods and follow previously approved patterns and are acceptable.

GE has also examined other events and affected system components related to these extensions. These include the over pressurization, loading error, rod drop accident and LOCA events, none of which are significantly altered by the extensions. As is the case for ELLLA the thermal-hydraulic stability will be appropriately monitored via GE SIL-380 surveillance, and will thus present no new problem. GE has analyzed the effects of ICF induced increased pressure differentials and vibration response on reactor internals, fuel channels and fuel bundles, and has shown that design limits will not be exceeded. The containment LOCA response was analyzed and the results show no significant impact of ICF/FFWTR. The feedwater nozzle and sparger fatigue usage factors were examined for the effects of extreme programs of FFWTR and EOC power coast down. The analysis leads to the conclusion that there is no significant impact beyond a slightly increased nozzle refurbishment schedule (based on monitored seal leakage). The review of these various GE examinations has concluded that suitable analyses were performed and the results are compatible with other reviews and are acceptable for Peach Bottom 2.

The rod block monitor (RBM) clipped value of 107 in the ICF region is part of the Peach Bottom procedures. Since it is part of the protection system, necessary to prevent exceeding fuel design limits, it is required that this clipping function be indicated in the Peach Bottom TS, as it is, for example, in the PECO Limerick TS. At the NRC staff's request, PECO

.

.

submitted a revision to Table 3.2.C (Ref. 13) specifying the maximum flow biased RBM setpoint of  $\leq 107\%$ . With incorporation of this limit, the TSs are acceptable.

# 2.7 Technical Specifications

2.7.1

The TS changes for PB2C8 associated with the reload and operating flexibility options are primarily to provide for:

- (a) The new ELLLA APRM scram and rod block flow dependent setpoints. The changes are to TS 2.1.A.1 and 2.1.B, Figure 1.1-1, Tables 3.1.1 and 3.2.C and are acceptable.
- (b) The new MCPR limits for Cycle 8 and for ICF operation. The changes are to TS 3/4.5.K, Tables 3.5.K.2 and .3 and Figures 3.5.K.1 to 3 and 3.5.K.2-1 to 3, and are acceptable.
- (c) The 14.4 KW/ft LHGR limit for the new (GE 8x8EB and LTA) fuel. The changes are to TS 2.1.A and B, 3.5.J and Tables 3.1.1 and 3.2.C, and are acceptable.
- (d) MAPLHGR limits for the new fuel. The changes, which were revised in Reference 7 from those in the original submittal, are to TS 3.5.1 and Figures 3.5.1.M to 0 and are acceptable.

Each of the above changes has been previously discussed and approved in this review. There is also a change to the listed constants in TS 4.5.K used to calculate the mean scram time. These constants were approved in the review of Amendment 11 to GESTAR II, and are acceptable.

# 2.7.2

Six typographical errors or omissions are being corrected by this amendment as follows:

- (a) In section 2.1.B on Page 11, a period was missing at the end of the sentence (after the word "design") defining "W" (loop recirculation flow rate).
- (b) In the bases for Section 1.1.C on Page 15, the word "annunciation" in the second line of the second paragraph was misspelled.
- (c) In note 12 for Table 3.1.1 on Page 40, a delta sign was missing in the last line.
- (d) In note 2 for Table 3.2.C on Page 74, a delta sign was missing in front of "W" in the last line.

- (e) In the bases for Section 3.5.L on Page 140c (which in the amendment becomes Page 140b), the word "alterations" in the second paragraph was misspelled.
- (f) The references cited in the bases for Section 3.5 are listed on Page 140d (which in the amendment becomes Page 140c); in reference 5, the word "letter" was misspelled.

The above changes are administrative corrections that have no safety significance.

# 2.7.3

.

Pages iv and iva of the list of figures in the table of contents are being revised to reflect the MCPR and MAPLHGR figures changed by this amendment.

#### 2.7.4

In "Section 1.0-Definitions", a paragraph is being added to define "Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate". This is a desirable addition, since the term is not defined in the present TSs.

# 2.7.5

A statement is being added to the Bases for Section 1.1 on Page 13 describing how the safety limit MCPR is determined for single-loop as well as two-loop operation. The Bases are not TSs but provide justification for the TS limits as requirements. In this case, the Bases need to be augmented because of the changes in the TS on single loop operation.

# 2.7.6

A reference to the GE document analyzing single loop operation for Peach Bottom 2 and 3 is being added as reference "4" on Page 15.

# 2.7.7

A sentence is being added in two places to the Bases for Section 2.1 on Pages 17 and 18 that states that abnormal operational transients were analyzed at or above the maximum power level required by Regulatory Guide 1.49 to determine operating limit MCPRs. Reference to a specific power level (i.e., 3440 Mwt) is being deleted. The change reflects the analyses performed for the core reload.

## 2.7.8

The Bases for the core thermal-hydraulic and physics analyses reference the GE topical report "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor

- 9 -

Fuel", NEDE-24011-P-A, in a number of sections. This topical report is subject to periodic revision by GE. Changes to the topical report have to be approved by NRC. Wherever this is referenced in the bases, the words "as amended" are being added to reflect that the most recent approved version is being used. (e.g., pages 15, 17, 33, 140b and 140c). There are also changes to the Bases in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 to eliminate information that is redundant to the topical report. These changes will eliminate the need to change the date on the references if the referenced topical report is revised. This approach has been adopted by most licensees and is endorsed by the staff.

#### 3.0 SUMMARY

We have reviewed the reports submitted for the Cycle 8 operation of Peach Bottom 2 with extended operating regions. Based on this review we conclude that appropriate material was submitted and that the fuel design, nuclear design, thermal-hydraulic design and transient and accident analyses are acceptable. The Technical Specification changes submitted for this reload suitably reflect the necessary modifications for operation in this cycle.

# 4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

This amendment involves changes to requirements with respect to the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes to the surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement nor environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

## 5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission made a proposed determination that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration which was published in the Federal Register (52 FR 7693) on March 12, 1987 and consulted with the State of Pennsylvania. No public comments were received and the State of Pennsylvania did not have any comments.

The Technical Specification changes proposed by the licensee are acceptable because they are consistent with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.62(c)(4). The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: H. Richings R. Clark

Dated: September 11, 1987

1

.

6.0 REFERENCES

. .

- 1. Letter from E. J. Bradley, PECO, to H. Denton, NRC, dated January 9, 1987, "Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Unit 2", Cycle 8.
- 2. GE Report 23A4837, dated November 1986, "Supplemental Reload Licensing Submittal for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 2, Reload 7".
- NEDC-31298, May 1986, "GE BWR Extended Load Line Limit Analysis for Peach Bottom 2".
- 4. NEDC-30639, June 1984, "Safety Review of Peach Bottom 2 at Core Flow Conditions Above Rated Flow", and Errata Sheet No. 1.
- 5. NEDE-24081-P, Supplement 1 (and Errata Sheet No. 11), November 1986, "Loss-of-Coolant Accident Analysis for Peach Bottom 2".
- 6. Revision 1 to Reference 5, March 1987.
- Letter (and attachments) from J. Gallagher, PECO, to D. Muller, NRC, dated March 24, 1987, "Peach Bottom 2 Reload 7".
- Letter from J. Charnley, GE, to W. Hodges, NRC, dated March 4, 1987, "Recommended MAPLHGR Technical Specifications for Multiple Lattice Fuel Designs".
- Letter (and attachment) from C. Thomas, NRC, to J. Charnley, GE, dated May 28, 1985, "Acceptance for Referencing of Licensing Topical Report NEDE-24011-P-A-6, Amendment 10".
- GESTAR II, NEDE-24011, Revision 8, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel".
- Letter from S. Daltroff, PECo, to D. Muller, NRC, dated November 12, 1986, "Peach Bottom 2 Lead Test Assemblies".
- Letter (and attachment) from G. Lainas, NRC, to J. Charnley, GE, dated March 22, 1986, "Acceptance for Referencing of Licensing Topical Report NEDE-24011-P-A, 'GE Generic Licensing Reload Report', Supplement to Amendment 11".
- Letter from J. W. Gallagher, PECO to W. R. Butler, NRC, dated May 13, 1987, "Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit 2, Reload 7 License Amendment Application".

- 9 -