October 1, 2007

Mr. John T. Carlin
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 - AMENDMENT RE: SPENT FUEL POOL STORAGE CAPACITY (TAC NO. MD3295)

Dear Mr. Carlin:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 103 to Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-18 for the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. This amendment is in response to your application dated October 12, 2006.

The amendment revises the number of fuel assemblies that are allowed to be stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP) from 1879 to 1321 in Technical Specification (TS) 4.3.3 and removes the reference to Type 4 SFP storage racks in TS limiting condition for operation 3.7.13.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly *Federal Register* notice.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Douglas V. Pickett, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-244

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 103 to Renewed License No. DPR-18
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

October 1, 2007

Mr. John T. Carlin
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 - AMENDMENT RE: SPENT FUEL POOL STORAGE CAPACITY (TAC NO. MD3295)

Dear Mr. Carlin:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 103 to Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-18 for the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant. This amendment is in response to your application dated October 12, 2006.

The amendment revises the number of fuel assemblies that are allowed to be stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP) from 1879 to 1321 in Technical Specification (TS) 4.3.3 and removes the reference to Type 4 SFP storage racks in TS limiting condition for operation 3.7.13.

A copy of the related Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. A Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly *Federal Register* notice.

Sincerely,
/RA/
Douglas V. Pickett, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-244

Enclosures:
1. Amendment No. 103 to Renewed License No. DPR-18
2. Safety Evaluation

cc w/encls: See next page

Package No.: ML072770221
Amendment No.: ML072480282
Tech Spec No.: ML

OFFICE	LPLI-1/PM	LPLI-1/LA	SRXB/BC	SBPB/BC	ITSB/BC	OGC	LPLI-1/BC
NAME	DPickett	SLittle	GCranston*	DHarrison*	TKobetz	SUttal	MKowal
DATE	09/25/07	09 /17 /07	07 /18 /07	08 / 23 /07	09/26/07	09/ 25 /07	09/26/07

* SE input provided by memo on date shown

Official Record Copy

DATED: October 1, 2007

AMENDMENT NO. 103 TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18
R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

PUBLIC
LPLI-1 R/F

MKowal	RidsNrrDorlLpl1-1
S. Little	RidsNrrLASLittle
D. Pickett	RidsNrrPMDPickett
G. Hill (2)	
OGC	RidsOgcMailCenter
ACRS	RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter
J. Trapp, RI	
G. Cranston	
D. Harrison	

cc: Plant Service list

R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant

cc:

Mr. Michael J. Wallace, President
Constellation Generation Group
750 East Pratt Street
Baltimore, MD 21202

Mr. John M. Heffley
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Constellation Generation Group
1997 Annapolis Exchange Parkway
Suite 310
Annapolis, MD 21401

Kenneth Kolaczyk, Sr. Resident Inspector
R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
1503 Lake Road
Ontario, NY 14519

Regional Administrator, Region I
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
475 Allendale Road
King of Prussia, PA 19406

Mr. John P. Spath
New York State Energy, Research,
and Development Authority
17 Columbia Circle
Albany, NY 12203-6399

Mr. Michael Balboni
Deputy Secretary for Public Safety
State Capitol, Room 229
Albany, NY 12224

Mr. Carey W. Fleming, Esquire
Senior Counsel - Nuclear Generation
Constellation Generation Group, LLC
750 East Pratt Street, 17th Floor
Baltimore, MD 21202

Mr. Charles Donaldson, Esquire
Assistant Attorney General
New York Department of Law
120 Broadway
New York, NY 10271

Ms. Thelma Wideman, Director
Wayne County Emergency Management
Office
Wayne County Emergency Operations
Center
7336 Route 31
Lyons, NY 14489

Ms. Mary Louise Meisenzahl
Administrator, Monroe County
Office of Emergency Preparedness
1190 Scottsville Road, Suite 200
Rochester, NY 14624

Mr. Paul Eddy
New York State Department of
Public Service
3 Empire State Plaza, 10th Floor
Albany, NY 12223

R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, LLC

DOCKET NO. 50-244

R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

AMENDMENT TO RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 103
Renewed License No. DPR-18

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or the NRC) has found that:

   A. The application for amendment filed by the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC (the licensee) dated October 12, 2006, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;

   B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;

   C. There is reasonable assurance: (I) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;

   D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and

   E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, the license is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and paragraph 2.C.(2) of Renewed Facility Operating License No. DPR-18 is hereby amended to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendix A, as revised through Amendment No. 103, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Mark G. Kowal, Chief
Plant Licensing Branch I-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the License and Technical Specifications

Date of Issuance: October 1, 2007

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 103

RENEWED FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18

DOCKET NO. 50-244

Replace the following page of the Facility Operating License with the attached revised page. The revised page is identified by amendment number and contains marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove	Insert
3	3

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached revised pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the areas of change.

Remove	Insert
3.7.13-1	3.7.13-1
3.7.13-2	3.7.13-2
3.7.13-3	3.7.13-3
3.7.13-4	3.7.13-4
3.7.13-5	3.7.13-5
3.7.13-6	3.7.13-6
3.7.13-7	3.7.13-7
3.7.13-8	3.7.13-8
3.7.13-9	3.7.13-9
3.7.13-10	3.7.13-10
3.7.13-11	3.7.13-11
3.7.13-12	3.7.13-12
4.3-1	4.3-1
4.3-2	4.3-2

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 103 TO RENEWED FACILITY

OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-18

R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, INC.

R.E. GINNA NUCLEAR POWER PLANT

DOCKET NO. 50-244

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 12, 2006 (Reference 1, Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML062910132), the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, Inc. (Ginna, the licensee) submitted a request for changes to the R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant Technical Specifications (TSs). The requested license amendment would revise the number of fuel assemblies that are allowed to be stored in the spent fuel pool (SFP) from 1879 to 1321 in TS 4.3.3 and removes the reference to Type 4 SFP storage racks in TS limiting condition for operation (LCO) 3.7.13.

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

2.1 Applicable Regulations

General Design Criteria (GDC) Criterion 44, "Cooling water," requires that "A system to transfer heat from structures, systems, and components important to safety, to an ultimate heat sink shall be provided. The system safety function shall be to transfer the combined heat load of these structures, systems, and components under normal operating and accident conditions."

GDC Criterion 61, "Fuel storage and handling and radioactivity control," (4) requires that these systems shall be designed with a residual heat removal capability having reliability and testability that reflects the importance to safety of decay heat and other residual heat removal, and (5) to prevent significant reduction in fuel storage coolant inventory under accident conditions.

GDC Criterion 62, "Prevention of criticality in fuel storage and handling," requires that "Criticality in the fuel storage and handling system shall be prevented by physical systems or processes, preferably by use of geometrically safe configurations." This requirement is met by conforming to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) acceptance criterion for criticality which states that if credit is taken for soluble boron, the k-effective of the spent fuel storage racks loaded with fuel of the maximum fuel assembly reactivity must not exceed 0.95, at a 95 percent

probability, 95 percent confidence level, if flooded with borated water, and the k-effective must remain below 1.0 (subcritical), at a 95 percent probability, 95 percent confidence level, if flooded with unborated water (10 CFR 50.68).

2.2 Background

The original spent fuel storage racks at Ginna provided capacity for the storage of 210 fuel assemblies. In 1976, the NRC approved the replacement of the original racks with higher density flux trap type racks, which expanded the storage capability to 595 fuel assemblies.

In 1984, the NRC approved the conversion of six flux trap type racks to high-density fixed poison type racks (Reference 2). This further expanded the storage capacity from 595 to 1016 fuel assemblies. At this point, the SFP was divided into two regions. Region 1 comprised three flux trap type racks to accommodate a full core off-load. Region 2 consisted of six high-density fixed poison (Boraflex) type racks for the storage of 840 fuel assemblies that satisfied minimum burnup criteria and had cooled for a minimum of 60 days.

In 1998, the NRC approved re-racking of the SFP (Reference 3). With the completion of Phase 1 of the re-racking project, the SFP has three types of racks in two regions. Region 1 contains new high-density flux trap design borated stainless steel (BSS) racks designated as Type 3 for fresh and spent fuel with 294 cells. Region 2 contains the existing Boraflex racks designated as Type 1 with a capacity of 840 storage cells. Region 2 also contains high density BSS racks designated as Type 2 with 187 storage cells. With the completion of Phase 1, the pool contains 1321 storage locations.

The 1369 storage locations currently specified in TS 4.3.3 is based on future completion of the Phase 2 modification which would allow Ginna to install wall mounted rack modules, designated as Type 4, at a later time, providing 48 additional storage locations.

In addition to intact fuel assemblies, consolidated fuel canisters can also be stored in Region 1 and Region 2 of the pool. In 1985, the NRC approved the storage of consolidated fuel in the SFP (Reference 4). This process involves placing spent fuel containing, at most, all the rods from two standard spent fuel assemblies, which have decayed at least 5 years, into one canister. The canisters are designed to hold 358 fuel rods and can be placed in either Region 1 or Region 2 rack locations. The canisters are fabricated from stainless steel. The number of fuel rods contained in the intact fuel assemblies and/or consolidated rod storage canisters is limited to no more than the number of rods contained in 1879 fuel assemblies (179 fuel rods per assembly x 1879 assemblies = 336,341 fuel rods). The TSs limits storage at this time to 1879 fuel assemblies.

As part of the extended power uprate (EPU) submittal (Reference 5), the licensee evaluated the capability of spent fuel pool cooling system (SFPCS) to remove the decay heat produced from normal and full core offloads. The licensee evaluated the capability of the SFPCS to accommodate the worst case decay heat following the last full core offload at the end of plant life, with the last and most recent offloads occupying the 1321 fuel storage positions that are available in the SFP and the oldest core offloads relocated to the dry storage casks.

Current TS 4.3.3 states that the SFP is designed and shall be maintained with a storage capacity limited to no more than 1879 fuel assemblies and 1369 storage locations. This change is inconsistent with the licensee's EPU evaluation which is based upon the worst-case decay heat load that is generated from 1321 fuel assemblies, assuming that on-site dry cask storage will be used for the remaining (older) fuel assemblies. In its letter dated March 24, 2006 (Reference 6), the licensee committed to submit a proposed change to TS 4.3.3 that would revise the number of fuel assemblies that are allowed to be stored in the SFP to 1321 prior to startup for EPU operation. The NRC staff finds this acceptable because the number of fuel assemblies will be administratively controlled by the licensee and the current SFP loading is below this limit.

The NRC staff agreed with the SFPCS evaluation, with the commitment to revise TS 4.3.3 to limit the number of fuel assemblies stored in the SFP to 1321, in the "Safety Evaluation Related to Extended Power Uprate at R. E. Ginna," issued July 11, 2006 (Reference 10).

2.3 Evaluation

The SFPCS consists of one primary SFP cooling loop and two backup SFP cooling loops. Each of the backup SFP cooling loops are able to accommodate about 50 percent of the heat load that can be accommodated by the primary SFP cooling loop. The safety function of the SFPCS is to cool the spent fuel assemblies and keep the spent fuel assemblies covered with water during all storage conditions. The NRC staff's review for proposed power uprate focused on the capability of the SFPCS to accommodate the additional heat load that will result from EPU operation in accordance with the SFPCS licensing basis. The GDC that are most applicable to the NRC staff's review of the SFPCS for the Ginna EPU are GDC 44, "Cooling Water," insofar as it specifies that a system with the capability to transfer heat loads from safety-related structures, systems, and components to a heat sink under both normal operating and accident conditions be provided; and GDC 61, "Fuel Storage and Handling and Radioactivity Control," insofar as it specifies that fuel storage systems be designed with residual heat removal capability that is commensurate with the safety function being performed. The staff's review of the SFPCS was performed in accordance with the guidance provided in Section 2.1 of RS-001, Matrix 5 (Reference 8) and acceptability of the SFPCS for EPU operation is judged based upon conformance with existing licensing-basis considerations as discussed primarily in Section 9.1.3 of the Ginna Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) (Reference 9) except where proposed changes are found to be acceptable based upon the specified review criteria.

Based on the analysis, the NRC staff concludes that the SFP cooling system and storage capability will continue to meet the Ginna current licensing requirements of GDC 44, 61, and 62 following the implementation of the EPU.

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

3.1 Introduction

The safety function of the SFP and storage racks is to maintain the spent fuel assemblies in a safe and subcritical configuration during all credible storage conditions and to provide a safe means of loading the assemblies into shipping casks. TS 4.3.3 currently states that the SFP is designed and shall be maintained with a storage capacity limited to no more than 1879 fuel

assemblies and 1369 storage locations. The specification for storage of 1879 fuel assemblies was based on the analysis performed in Reference 3 for the Ginna re-rack modification that was approved by the NRC in a safety evaluation report dated July 30, 1998. The analysis performed for the re-rack assumed that all Ginna fuel assemblies off-loaded from initial criticality in 1969 up through a plant shutdown in 2029 would be stored in the SFP. The resulting number of fuel assemblies was estimated to be 1879. Storage of 1879 spent fuel assemblies in the existing SFP was approved by the NRC (Reference 4). NRC approval (Reference 3) permitted Ginna to store 1879 fuel assemblies in 1369 locations in consolidated rod canisters in some spent fuel locations. Consolidation of fuel assemblies was achieved by storing fuel rods from two fuel assemblies in one consolidated canister. The proposed change would limit the number of fuel assemblies allowed to be stored in the SFP to no more than 1321 fuel assemblies. This proposed change is consistent with Ginna's evaluation of the SFP Cooling and Cleanup System and Spent Fuel Storage System to support the EPU.

3.2 Technical Analysis

As part of its analysis for operation at EPU levels, the licensee reviewed its ability to store both the new and spent fuel at Ginna. As part of its EPU application, Ginna is transitioning to the Westinghouse 422V+ fuel assembly design. Differences between the current fuel assemblies employed at Ginna and this new fuel design necessitated a review of the criticality aspects governing its safe storage both prior to and following irradiation in the reactor. During its review, the licensee determined that conservative assumptions for fuel design parameters such as fuel pellet diameter and stack height were used in performing the criticality analyses for spent fuel assemblies. The licensee compared these conservative assumptions to the nominal design parameters and associated manufacturing tolerances for the new Westinghouse 422V+ fuel assemblies to be used in subsequent EPU reloads. The licensee confirmed that the design parameter assumptions used in the licensing basis criticality analyses bound those of the new Westinghouse 422V+ fuel assemblies. Therefore, the licensee concluded, and the NRC staff agreed, that the current criticality analyses for spent fuel storage in the Ginna SFP will remain bounding for future fuel assemblies irradiated under EPU operating conditions.

Ginna's EPU Licensing Report (Reference 7) Section 2.5.4.1, Spent Fuel Pool Cooling and Cleanup System, addresses the proposed EPU effects on the capability of the SFP cooling and cleanup system to provide adequate cooling to the spent fuel during all operating and accident conditions. The safety function of the SFPCS is to cool the spent fuel assemblies and keep the spent fuel assemblies covered with water during storage conditions. The heat removal criteria of the SFP cooling system should be capable of maintaining the SFP temperature less than or equal to 120 ^{o}F during normal refueling operations and less than or equal to 150 ^{o}F during full core discharge situations. Since the 120 ^{o}F is not a safety requirement but a limit set for operator comfort during refueling operations, it is possible that the 120 ^{o}F administrative limit may be exceeded for a short period of time at the beginning of a normal refueling off-load. For structural integrity reasons, the pool water temperature is not to exceed 180 ^{o}F. In order to provide sufficient time to take corrective action in the event of SFPCS cooling system failure, the pool temperature limit is not to exceed 150 °F for all modes of operation including a full core discharge. Normal refueling operations are conducted every 18 months. For the licensee's evaluation for partial offload, approximately one-third of the core (approximately 44 fuel assemblies) is removed from the core and placed in the SFP. Full core offloads may occur once every 10 years for in-service inspection and on other occasions when it is deemed necessary to support planned refueling operations.

As noted in Section 2.5.4.1.2.2 Cooling Capacity – Normal Refueling and Full Core Off-Load, of the EPU Licensing Report, storing 1879 fuel assemblies in the existing pool would require performing fuel rod consolidation so that the fuel rods from two fuel assemblies could be stored in a single canister. Fuel consolidation to store up to 1879 assemblies in the existing SFP is no longer believed to be credible for assessing maximum SFP heat loads as Ginna plans to use dry cask storage beginning around 2009 to store old spent fuel assemblies onsite. To maximize the pool residual heat load from the existing 1321 storage positions, a bounding full core off-load in 2029 was assumed. The licensee evaluated the capability of the SFPCS to accommodate the total amount of decay heat following the last full core offload at the plant life, with the last and most recent offloads occupying the 1321 fuel storage positions that are available in the SFP and the oldest core offloads relocated to the dry storage casks. Based on these assumptions, the resident SFP heat load in 2029 prior to an offload was calculated to be 3.9 MBTU/Hr for the 1200 fuel assemblies previously discharged to the pool. As stated in Ginna UFSAR Section 9.1.3.4.1.8, when performing full core off-load, each scenario is conservatively evaluated on a case-by-case basis to identify minimum required time after shutdown when fuel off-load can commence in order to maintain the SFP bulk temperature at or below 150 ^{o}F. The licensee has committed to perform this cycle specific analysis prior to each full core off-load, and the requirement to have two SFP cooling systems operational, each commensurate with the SFP cooling heat load, will be maintained consistent with Ginna's current Technical Requirements Manual.

Based upon a review of the information that was provided by the licensee, the NRC staff agrees that operation of the plant with the proposed amendment will not adversely impact the capability to: a) remove decay heat from the SFP following normal and full core offloads, and b) establish alternate SFP cooling that is sufficient to maintain the SFP temperature below its structural temperature limit of 180 ^{o}F in the event that the operating SFPCS train should become inoperable.

The specification for 1369 storage locations is based on allowing Ginna to install the additional wall mounted Type 4 module racks at a later time. The licensee no longer believes that installing these additional wall mounted racks is a storage option that will be implemented. Therefore, the maximum number of fuel assemblies that would be stored in the existing Ginna SFP after the EPU will be limited to the 1321 existing storage locations and the reference to Type 4 racks will be removed from TS LCO 3.7.13. This change is acceptable to the staff.

The licensee presented the results of an evaluation of the SFPCS capability under EPU conditions in Attachment 5 of the licensee's letter dated July 7, 2005, "Licensing Amendment Request Regarding Extended Power Uprate," (Reference 5). The evaluation was based on accommodating the total amount of decay heat following the last full core offload at the end of plant life, with the last and most recent offloads occupying the 1321 fuel storage positions that are available and the oldest core offloads relocated to the dry storage casks. The NRC staff agreed with the SFPCS evaluation, with the commitment to revise TS 4.3.3 contained in this application in the "Safety Evaluation Related to Extended Power Uprate at R. E. Ginna," issued July 11, 2006 (Reference 10). Based on the prior staff agreement with the evaluation of the SFPCS, the staff finds that the proposed change to TS 4.3.3 to limit the number of fuel assemblies permitted to be stored in the SFP to 1321 meets GDC 61 and the acceptance criteria of SRP 9.1.3.

4.0 STATE CONSULTATION

In accordance with the Commission's regulations, the New York State official was notified of the proposed issuance of the amendment. The State official had no comments.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

The amendment changes a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes surveillance requirements. The NRC 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 the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration, and there has been no public comment on such finding (71 FR 65145). Accordingly, the 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 or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The NRC staff has reviewed the proposed changes to TS 4.3.3 and TS LCO 3.7.13 and the evaluation of the SFPCS evaluation performed by the staff as part of the R. E. Ginna EPU application review. The staff concludes that the proposed revisions to TS 4.3.3 and TS LCO 3.7.13 limiting the number of fuel assemblies that can be stored in the SFP and the removal of the reference to Type 4 storage racks are acceptable.

The Commission 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, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

7.0 REFERENCES

1. Letter from Mary G. Korsnick, R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant, LLC to US NRC, “R.E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant License Amendment Request: Spent Fuel Pool Storage Capacity,” October 12, 2006 (TAC No. MD3295, ADAMS No. ML062910132).

2. Letter from J. A. Zwolinski, US NRC to R. W. Kober, RG&E, “Increase of the Spent Fuel Storage Capacity,” November 14, 1984 (ADAMS No. ML010580023).

3. Letter from G. S. Vissing, US NRC to R. C. Mecredy, RG&E, “Issuance of Amendment No. 72 to Facility Operating License N. DPR-18, R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant (TAC No. M95759), July 30, 1998 (ADAMS No. ML010590200).

4. Letter from G. E. Lear, US NRC, to R. W. Kober, RG&E, “Storage of Consolidated Fuel,” December 16, 1985 (ADAMS No. ML010570317).

5. Letter from M. G. Korsnick, Constellation Energy, to US NRC, “License Amendment Request Regarding Extended Power Uprate,” July 7, 2005 (ADAMS No. ML051950123).

6. Letter from M. G. Korsnick, Constellation Energy, “R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant Docket No 50-244, response to BOP Systems Question Discussed on March 2, 2006 Conference Call,” March 24, 2006 (ADAMS No. ML060940312).

7. WCAP-16461-P, "Ginna Station Extended PowerUprate Supplemental Information" (Proprietary), July 2005 (ADAMS Accession No. ML051960047).

8. RS-001, Revision 0, “Review Standard for Extended Power Uprate,” Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, December 2003.

9. Ginna Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, Revision 20, April 2007.

10. Safety Evaluation Related to Extended Power Uprate at R. E. Ginna Nuclear Power Plant,” July 11, 2006 (ADAMS Accession Number ML061380249).

Principal Contributors: M. M. Panicker, Edward Smith

Date: October 1, 2007