Mr. Michael J. Pacilio  
Senior Vice President  
Exelon Generation Company, LLC  
President and Chief Nuclear Officer (CNO)  
Exelon Nuclear  
4300 Winfield Road  
Warrenville, IL 60555

SUBJECT:  Braidwood Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Byron Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Clinton Power Station, Unit No. 1; Dresden Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2 and 3; LaSalle County Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Limerick Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station; Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station, Unit Nos. 1, 2, and 3; Quad Cities Nuclear Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; and Three Mile Island Nuclear Station, Unit 1 - Request for Additional Information Regarding Physical Security Plan, Training and Qualification Plan, and Safeguards Contingency Plan

Dear Mr. Pacilio:

By letters to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) dated July 12 (Limerick only) and July 13, 2012, Exelon Generation Company, LLC (Exelon) submitted Revision 13 to the Braidwood Station Security Plan; Revision 12 to the Byron Station Security Plan; Revision 11 to the Clinton Power Station Security Plan; Revision 11 to the Dresden Station Security Plan; Revision 13 to the LaSalle County Station Security Plan; Revision 9 to the Limerick Physical Security Plan; Revision 12 to the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station Security Plan; Revision 12 to the Peach Bottom Atomic Power Station Security Plan; Revision 9 to the Quad Cities Station Site Security Plan; and, Revision 14 to the Three Mile Island Security Plan. The revisions were submitted within 60 days of implementation in accordance with Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Section 50.54(p)(2).

The NRC staff is currently reviewing the submittals to ensure compliance with 10 CFR, Section 50.54(p)(2). By correspondence dated August 16 (Limerick, (Agencywide Documents and Management System (ADAMS)) Accession No. ML122290318); August 16 (Peach Bottom ADAMS Accession No. ML122290347); August 27 (Three Mile Island, ADAMS Accession No. ML122233A630); August 30, (Dresden, LaSalle, and Quad Cities, ADAMS Accession No. ML12243A337); September 6 (Braidwood, ADAMS Accession No. ML12242A356); September 6 (Oyster Creek, ADAMS Accession No. ML1229A433); September 13 (Byron, ADAMS Accession No. ML12243A472); and September 13 (Clinton, ADAMS Accession No. ML12241A342), 2012, the NRC staff requested additional information needed to complete its review.
By separate letters to the NRC dated September 14, 2012, Exelon submitted responses to the Peach Bottom and Limerick requests for additional information. Preliminary review of these responses showed that the specific questions for information and descriptions, likely to be safeguards information, were not answered and there was not enough information to determine if compliance with regulation 10 CFR Section 50.54(p)(2) was met.

During a discussion with your staff on September 18, 2012, the NRC staff confirmed that providing safeguards information, in response to the requests, is expected because it is similar to the information in the security plans that describe how the regulations are applied and allow a determination whether those regulations are being met. This letter supersedes the response dates that were requested in the NRC letters identified above. Your staff agreed to provide a response by November 19, 2012. The specific requests for information remains as stated above.

If circumstances result in the need to revise the requested response date, please contact me at (301) 415-6066.

Sincerely,

Joel S. Wiebe, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation


cc: Distribution via Listserv
By separate letters to the NRC dated September 14, 2012, Exelon submitted responses to the Peach Bottom and Limerick requests for additional information. Preliminary review of these responses showed that the specific questions for information and descriptions, likely to be safeguards information, were not answered and there was not enough information to determine if compliance with regulation 10 CFR Section 50.54(p)(2) was met.

During a discussion with your staff on September 18, 2012, the NRC staff confirmed that providing safeguards information, in response to the requests, is expected because it is similar to the requirement in the security plans that describe how the regulations are applied and determine if those regulations are being met. This letter supersedes the response dates that were requested for information identified above. Your staff agreed to provide a response by November 19, 2012. The specific requests for information remains as stated above.

If circumstances result in the need to revise the requested response date, please contact me at (301) 415-6066.

Sincerely,

/RA/
Joel S. Wiebe, Senior Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-2
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation


cc: Distribution via Listserv
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