



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

October 19, 2012

Mr. Timothy S. Rausch  
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer  
PPL Susquehanna, LLC  
769 Salem Boulevard  
Berwick, PA 18603-0467

SUBJECT: SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2 –  
ACCEPTANCE OF REQUESTED LICENSING ACTION RE: CHANGE TO  
TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION SURVEILLANCE REQUIREMENTS TO  
INCREASE DIESEL GENERATOR MINIMUM STEADY STATE VOLTAGE (TAC  
NOS. ME9607 AND ME9608)

Dear Mr. Rausch:

By letter dated September 18, 2012,<sup>1</sup> PPL Susquehanna, LLC, (PPL) submitted a license amendment request for Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Units 1 and 2. The proposed amendments would change Technical Specification Surveillance Requirements 3.8.1.9, 3.8.1.11, 3.8.1.12 and 3.8.1.19 in TS 3.8.1, "AC Source- Operating." Specifically, the proposed amendments will increase Diesel Generator acceptable minimum steady state voltage when operating in emergency/isochronous mode. The purpose of this letter is to provide the results of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's acceptance review of this license 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 technical specifications) 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 NRC staff to complete its detailed technical review and make an independent assessment regarding the acceptability of the proposed license 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.

---

<sup>1</sup> Agencywide Documents Access and Management System Accession No. ML12262A322.

T. Rausch

- 2 -

In your September 18, 2012, letter you requested that the NRC review be completed by April 12, 2013. The NRC staff did not find adequate justification for an expedited review, and cannot guarantee that the review will be completed by April 12, 2013. The NRC staff considers any review that is requested to be completed in less than 12 months to be an expedited review. This was conveyed to Mr. John Tripoli, of your staff, on October 3, 2012.

If you have any questions, please contact me, at (301) 415-4090.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "J. A. Whited". The signature is fluid and cursive, with the first letters of the first and last names being capitalized and prominent.

Jeffrey A. Whited, Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch I-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388

cc: Distribution via Listserv

T. Rausch

- 2 -

In your September 18, 2012, letter you requested that the NRC review be completed by April 12, 2013. The NRC staff did not find adequate justification for an expedited review and cannot guarantee that the review will be completed by April 12, 2013. The NRC staff considers any review that is requested to be completed in less than 12 months to be an expedited review. This was conveyed to Mr. John Tripoli, of your staff, on October 3, 2012.

If you have any questions, please contact me, at (301) 415-4090.

Sincerely,

*/ra/*

Jeffrey A. Whited, Project Manager  
Plant Licensing Branch I-2  
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-387 and 50-388

cc: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC

Branch Reading File

RidsAcrcsAcnw\_MailCTR Resource

RidsNrrDorl Resource

RidsNrrDorlDpr Resource

RidsNrrDorlLplI-2 Resource

RidsNrrLAABaxter Resource

RidsNrrPMSusquehanna Resource

RidsOgcRp Resource

RidsRgn1MailCenter Resource

**ADAMS Accession No. ML12291A499**

**\*via email**

OFFICE	DORL/LPLI-2/ PM	DORL/LPL1-2/LAit	DORL/LPLI-2/ LA	DE/EEEE/BC	DORL/LPLI-2/BC	DORL/LPLI-2/PM
NAME	JWhited	SLent	ABaxter*	JAndersen	MKhanna (PBamford for)	JWhited
DATE	10/18/2012	10/18/2012	10/18/2012	10/19/2012	10/19/2012	10/19/2012

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**