

**From:** Vaidya, Bhalchandra  
**Sent:** Monday, November 28, 2016 1:38 PM  
**To:** 'lisa.simpson@exeloncorp.com'; 'david.gullott@exeloncorp.com'  
**Cc:** Alley, David; Bedi, Gurjendra; Miller, Ed; Farnan, Michael  
**Subject:** Acceptance of Requested Licensing Action - Relief Requests Associated with the Fourth Interval Inservice Testing Program, RP-01 (MF8492, MF8493), RP-04 (MF8498, MF8499), RV-01 (MF8500, MF8501)

**Subject: Acceptance of Requested Licensing Action:**  
**Application Dated October 17, 2016, to re:** Relief Requests Associated with the Fourth Interval Inservice Testing Program, **RP-01, RP-04, and RV-01**  
**CAC Nos. MF8492, MF8493, MF8498, MF8499, MF8500, MF8501**

By letter dated October 17, 2016 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16292A488), Exelon Generation Company, LLC (EGC), Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.55a(z)(1) and z(2), requests NRC approval of the attached relief requests associated with the fourth 10-year interval Inservice Testing (IST) Program for LaSalle County Station (LSCS), Units 1 and 2., for the LSCS fourth 10-year IST interval inservice testing interval as follows:

- Relief Request RP-01, Water Leg Pump Flow Test — Proposed Alternative In Accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(z)(2)
- Relief Request RP-04, Utilization of ASME Code Case OMN-19, "Alternative Upper Limit for the Comprehensive Pump Test" — Proposed Alternative In Accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(z)(1).
- Relief Request RV-01, Utilization of ASME Code Case OMN-1, "Alternative Rules for Preservice and Inservice Testing of Active Electric Motor-Operated Valve Assemblies in Light-Water Reactor Power Plants" — Proposed Alternative In Accordance with 10 CFR 50.55a(z)(1).

The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (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 10 CFR 50.55a(z)(1) and z(2), 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. 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) 415-3308

Bhalchandra K. Vaidya  
Licensing Project Manager  
NRC/NRR/DORL/LPL3-2  
(301)-415-3308 (O)

[bhalchandra.vaidya@nrc.gov](mailto:bhalchandra.vaidya@nrc.gov)