



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

January 23, 2014

LICENSEE: Exelon Generation Company, LLC

FACILITY: Byron Station, Units 1 and 2
Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON OCTOBER 31, 2013, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC, CONCERNING DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE BYRON STATION AND BRAIDWOOD STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION, SET 5 (TAC NOS. MF1879, MF1880, MF1881, MF1882)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon or the applicant), held a telephone conference call on October 31, 2013, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft requests for additional information (D-RAIs), Set 5, concerning the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, and the Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's D-RAIs.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the D-RAIs discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Lindsay Robinson", is positioned above the typed name.

Lindsay Robinson, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-454, 50-455, 50-456, and 50-457

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. List of Draft Requests for
Additional Information

cc w/encls: Listserv

January 23, 2014

LICENSEE: Exelon Generation Company, LLC

FACILITY: Byron Station, Units 1 and 2
Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON OCTOBER 31, 2013, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC, CONCERNING DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE BYRON STATION AND BRAIDWOOD STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION, SET 5 (TAC NOS. MF1879, MF1880, MF1881, MF1882)

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon or the applicant), held a telephone conference call on October 31, 2013, to discuss and clarify the staff's draft requests for additional information (D-RAIs), Set 5, concerning the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, and the Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, license renewal application. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the staff's D-RAIs.

Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants and Enclosure 2 contains a listing of the D-RAIs discussed with the applicant, including a brief description on the status of the items.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

/RA/

Lindsay Robinson, Project Manager
Projects Branch 1
Division of License Renewal
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-454, 50-455, 50-456, and 50-457

Enclosures:

1. List of Participants
2. List of Draft Requests for Additional Information

cc w/encls: Listserv

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML13309A932

*concurred via email

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR	BC:RPB1:DLR	PM:RPB1:DLR
NAME	YEdmonds	LRobinson	JDaily	YDiaz-Sanabria	LRobinson
DATE	1/08/14	1/13/14	1/13/14	1/22/14	1/23/14

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON OCTOBER 31, 2013, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND EXELON GENERATION COMPANY, LLC, CONCERNING DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE BYRON STATION AND BRAIDWOOD STATION, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION, SET 5 (TAC NOS. MF1879, MF1880, MF1881, MF1882)

DISTRIBUTION

EMAIL:

PUBLIC

RidsNrrDir Resource

RidsNrrDirRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDirRasb Resource

RidsOgcMailCenter

LRobinson

JDaily

DMcIntyre, OPA

JWiebe, DORL

EDuncan, RIII

JBenjamin, RIII

AGarmoe, RIII

SR1, Byron Station, RIII

JRobbins, RIII

VMitlyng, RIII

PChandrathil, RIII

TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL
BYRON STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2, AND BRAIDWOOD STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

LIST OF PARTICIPANTS
October 31, 2013

PARTICIPANTS

Lindsay Robinson
Billy Rogers
Angela Buford
John Hufnagel
Al Fulvio
Donald Warfel
Casey Muggleston
Don Brindle
Ralph Wolen
Albert Piha

AFFILIATIONS

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
NRC
NRC
Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon)
Exelon
Exelon
Exelon
Exelon
Exelon
Exelon

DRAFT REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
BYRON STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2, AND BRAIDWOOD STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

October 31, 2013

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon or the applicant), held a telephone conference call on October 31, 2013, to discuss and clarify the following draft requests for additional information (D-RAIs), Set 5, concerning the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, and the Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, license renewal application (LRA).

D-RAI 2.1-1

The staff requests that the applicant provide a basis for not including components identified as safety-related within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a)(1). Indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of systems, structures, and components (SSCs) that should have included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). Describe any additional scoping evaluations performed to address the 10 CFR 54.4(a) criteria. List any additional SSCs included within the scope of license renewal as a result of the review, and any structures and components (SCs) for which aging management reviews (AMR) are performed.

Discussion: The applicant noted a minor grammatical error in the second sentence. The staff agreed to revise the sentence as follows: Indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs that should have been included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). The revised question will be sent as a formal RAI titled "RAI 2.1-1".

D-RAI 2.1-2

The staff requests that the applicant provide a basis for not including safety-related SSCs, located in the turbine building within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a)(1) and for not including nonsafety-related SSCs with the potential for spatial interaction within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2). Indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs that should have been included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). Describe any additional scoping evaluations performed to address the 10 CFR 54.4(a) criteria. List any additional SSCs included within the scope of license renewal as a result of the review and any SCs for which AMRs are performed.

Discussion: The applicant stated that a similar question was formally requested in a previous RAI and did not warrant an additional request. The staff agreed and withdrew the question. This question will not be sent as a formal RAI.

ENCLOSURE 2

D-RAI 2.1-3

The staff requests that the applicant provide a basis for not including abandoned equipment within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). Indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs that should have included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). Describe any additional scoping evaluations performed to address the 10 CFR 54.4(a) criteria. List any additional SSCs included within the scope of license renewal as a result of the review, and any SCs for which AMRs are performed.

Discussion: The applicant noted a minor grammatical error in the second sentence. The staff agreed to revise the sentence as follows: Indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs that should have been included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). The revised question will be sent as a formal RAI titled "RAI 2.1-2".

D-RAI 2.1-4

The staff requests that the applicant provide a basis for not including portions of nonsafety-related piping and equipment to a point no longer in proximity to equipment performing a safety-related function. Indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs which should have been included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). Indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs that should have been included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). Describe any additional scoping evaluations performed to address the 10 CFR 54.4(a) criteria. List any additional SSCs included within the scope of license renewal as a result of the review and any SCs for which AMRs are performed.

Discussion: The applicant stated that the requested information was identified in the LRA. After further review of the LRA, the staff agreed and withdrew this question. A formal RAI will not be sent.

D-RAI 2.1-5

The staff requests that the applicant provide a basis for not including the containment access facility hallway structure, which is located adjacent to containment extension structure (within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a)(1)), within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2). The staff requests that the applicant perform a review of this issue and indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs that should have included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). Describe any additional scoping evaluations performed to address the 10 CFR 54.4(a) criteria. List any additional SSCs included within the scope of license renewal as a result of the review and SCs for which AMRs are performed.

Discussion: The applicant noted a minor grammatical error in the second sentence. The staff agreed to revise the sentence as follows: The staff requests that the applicant perform a review of this issue and indicate if the review concludes that use of the scoping methodology precluded the identification of SSCs that should have been included within the scope of license renewal in accordance with 10 CFR 54.4(a). The revised question will be sent as a formal RAI titled "RAI 2.1-3".