

Bryce L. Shriver
Senior Vice President and
Chief Nuclear Officer

PPL Susquehanna, LLC
769 Salem Boulevard
Berwick, PA 18603
Tel. 570.542.3120 Fax 570.542.1504
blshriver@pplweb.com



JUN 02 2003

Mr. Samuel J. Collins
Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

**SUSQUEHANNA STEAM ELECTRIC STATION
ANSWER IN RESPONSE TO APRIL 29, 2003, ORDER
REQUIRING COMPLIANCE WITH REVISED
DESIGN BASIS THREAT FOR OPERATING
POWER REACTORS (EA-03-086)
PLA-5631**

Dear Mr. Collins:

Section IV of the April 29, 2003, Order Requiring Compliance with Revised Design Basis Threat for Operating Power Reactors (EA-03-086) ("Order") states that, in accordance with 10 CFR §2.202, a licensee must submit an answer to the Order and may request a hearing on the Order within 35 days of the date of the Order. This letter constitutes the answer (pursuant to 10 CFR §2.202 and Section IV) and response (pursuant to 10 CFR 50.4 and Sections III A.1, B.1 and B.2) of PPL Susquehanna, LLC to the Order.

Section II of the Order states that "[i]n order to provide assurance that licensees are implementing prudent measures to protect against the revised DBT, all licenses identified in Attachment 1 to this Order shall be modified to require that the physical security plans, safeguards contingency plans, and the guard training and qualification plans required by 10 CFR §§ 50.34(c), 50.34(d), and 73.55(b)(4)(ii) be revised to provide protection against this revised DBT."

PPL Susquehanna, LLC consents to the Order, and does not request a hearing. PPL Susquehanna, LLC notes the request for clarification of five DBT issues provided in the safeguards attachment to the letter from Mr. Colvin, President and CEO of the Nuclear Energy Institute, to Chairman Diaz dated May 16, 2003. We encourage the Commission to respond to this request as soon as possible, as the Commission's clarifications may affect the manner of PPL Susquehanna, LLC's compliance with the Order.

Because the NRC has used force-on-force testing as a standard by which compliance with the DBT was evaluated, PPL Susquehanna, LLC also requests that the NRC provide a clear definition of the objectives and criteria for force-on-force exercises so that

appropriate revisions can be made to PPL Susquehanna, LLC's safeguards contingency plans, security plans and security officer training and qualification plans.

Specifically, PPL Susquehanna, LLC needs a clear explanation of the purpose of the force-on-force exercise (e.g., is the purpose of force-on-force exercises for security officer training, or to evaluate licensee compliance with the Design Basis Threat?). Similarly, the success criteria for the force-on-force exercise needs to be established (e.g., is the criterion on prevention of a large offsite release, which would be consistent with the basis for risk-informing NRC regulations, or some other criteria?). Finally, if a force-on-force exercise is going to be used as a performance test of the licensee's ability to protect against the Design Basis Threat, a clear definition of adversary rules of engagement and adversary tactics is needed to provide appropriate predictability and stability in the regulatory program. Absent these clarifications, the standard by which licensee performance will be measured will continue to be a constantly moving target which is counter to the Commission's Principles of Good Regulation.

To enable PPL Susquehanna, LLC to meet the compliance dates specified in the Order, the requested clarifications are needed as soon as possible. If the clarifications cannot be provided by October 1, 2003, we respectfully request that the Director, Nuclear Reactor Regulations extend the dates for submitting the revision to the security plan, safeguards contingency plan, training and qualification plan, and full implementation of the Order on a day-for-day basis until such clarifications are provided.

PPL Susquehanna, LLC also confirms its understanding that the Commission intends to exercise enforcement discretion to accommodate issues which may arise as licensees, in good faith, take reasonable actions to implement the specific requirements of this Order. We further understand that the Commission will exercise enforcement discretion for the period necessary to resolve such issues, and to integrate the requirements of this Order with the orders issued February 25, 2002, as well as with other pertinent regulatory requirements, and our safeguards contingency plans, security plans and security officer training and qualification plans.

Respectfully submitted,



Bryce L. Shriver
Sr. Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer

copy: NRC Region I
Mr. R. V. Guzman, NRC Project Manager
Mr. S. Hansell, NRC Sr. Resident Inspector
Mr. R. Janati, DEP/BRP