

**From:** Ennis, Rick  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 21, 2014 8:05 AM  
**To:** Richard.Gropp@exeloncorp.com  
**Cc:** David Helker; Stephanie.Hanson@exeloncorp.com  
**Subject:** Acceptance Review for TACs MF4423 & MF4424 - Peach Bottom Units 2 and 3 - Revise Technical Specification Definition for Recently Irradiated Fuel

Richard,

By letter dated July 25, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14211A017), Exelon Generation Company, LLC submitted a license amendment request for Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Units 2 and 3. The proposed amendment would change the definition in the Technical Specifications for RECENTLY IRRADIATED FUEL. Specifically, the amendment would revise requirements pertaining to secondary containment hatches in order to facilitate activities performed during refueling outages.

The purpose of this e-mail is to provide the results of the 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 TSs) 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 and concluded that it does provide technical information in sufficient detail to enable the staff to proceed with its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed amendment request 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) 415-1420.

Richard B. Ennis, Senior Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch I-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation