

## Whited, Jeffrey

---

**From:** Whited, Jeffrey  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 28, 2014 3:49 PM  
**To:** phlashley@firstenergycorp.com  
**Subject:** BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2 ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTED LICENSING ACTION RE: RELIEF REQUEST BV3-N-789 (TAC NOS. MF4563 AND MF4564)

SUBJECT: BEAVER VALLEY POWER STATION UNITS 1 AND 2 ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTED LICENSING ACTION RE: RELIEF REQUEST BV3-N-789 (TAC NOS. MF4563 AND MF4564)

Dear Mr. Lashley,

By letter dated August 5, 2014, (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML14217A471) FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company, submitted a relief request for the Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2. The request was for Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approval to use American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code) Case N-789, "Alternative Requirements for Pad Reinforcement of Class 2 and 3 Moderate-Energy Carbon Steel Piping for Raw Water Service, Section XI, Division 1." The purpose of this e-mail is to provide the results of the NRC staff's acceptance review of this relief 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.

Pursuant to Sections 50.55a(a)(3)(i) and 50.55a(a)(3)(ii) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), the applicant shall demonstrate that the proposed alternatives would provide an acceptable level of quality and safety, or that compliance with the specified requirements of Section 50.55a would result in hardship or unusual difficulty without a compensating increase in the level of quality or safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed your application 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. If additional information is needed, you will be advised by separate correspondence.

If you have any questions, please contact me.

*Jeffrey Whited*

Project Manager-Beaver Valley  
and Susquehanna  
Plant Licensing Branch I-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation  
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
(301)415-4090  
[jeffrey.whited@nrc.gov](mailto:jeffrey.whited@nrc.gov)