

From: Fuller, Brad A [brfuller@state.pa.us]
Sent: Monday, March 09, 2009 2:14 PM
To: Bhalchandra Vaidya
Subject: RE: State Consultation - Susquehanna Amendment Application, NRC TAC Nos. MD9572 and MD9573

Mr. Vaidya,

Per our telephone conversation earlier today, your email response was sufficient in answering my questions pertaining to the amendment request regarding primary containment isolation for SSES Units 1 & 2.

Thank you for following up with me on my questions.

Brad Fuller | Nuclear Safety Specialist
Department of Environmental Protection
Rachel Carson State Office Building
400 Market Street | Harrisburg, PA 17101
Phone: 717.783.8549 | Fax: 717.783.8965
www.depweb.state.pa.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Bhalchandra Vaidya [mailto:Bhalchandra.Vaidya@nrc.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, March 03, 2009 8:43 AM
To: Fuller, Brad A
Cc: Mark Kowal
Subject: RE: State Consultation - Susquehanna Amendment Application, NRC TAC Nos. MD9572 and MD9573

Mr. Fuller,

Referring to our telephone conversation on February 23, 2008, in conjunction with your comments, following explanations are offered:

1) "Is the requested change consistent with what other BWRs are doing?"

Yes it is. For Columbia Generating Station, on November 27, 2006, the NRC approved the Amendments No.: 199, (ADAMS Accession Nos. ML062610440 & ML063280053), to increase the allowable limit for secondary containment bypass leakage to less than or equal to 0.04 percent primary containment volume/day. This is substantially more compared to the Susquehanna request to increase it to 15 scfh (0.0223 %).

However, please note that for the purpose of safety evaluation of the amendment request, the NRC staff considers every amendment as a stand-alone request, irrespective of the precedences or economic/financial reasons.

2) "They're requesting almost double the leakage for acceptance testing, why such of a change? Will it save them money, time etc... What's the reason for the request?"

While the NRC staff does not evaluate the financial/economic reasons for changes, it does evaluate the safety impact of the requested changes. The licensee in its application, ADAMS Accession No. ML082421142, (Enclosure, Sections 2.0, 3.0, 4.0 and 5.2), provides its reasons for the request and the basis for the proposed change, as well as provides its analysis of No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, which is presented in the FR Notice, dated November 18, 2008 (73 FR 68455). Basically, the amendment will preclude unnecessary valve repairs and to reduce radiation dose to maintenance personnel.

The safety impact of the changes for the specific request from Susquehanna will be addressed in detail, in the safety evaluation.

We hope that the above explanations adequately address your comments.

Thanks,

Bhalchandra K. Vaidya
Licensing Project Manager
U. S. NRC, NRR/DORL
301-415-3308 (Office)
301-415-1222 (Fax)
Bhalchandra.Vaidya@nrc.gov

From: Fuller, Brad A [mailto:brfuller@state.pa.us]
Sent: Monday, February 23, 2009 8:58 AM
To: Bhalchandra Vaidya
Subject: RE: State Consultation - Susquehanna Amendment Application, NRC TAC Nos. MD9572 and MD9573

Mr. Vaidya,
The Commonwealth of PA has a few comments regarding the requested amendment to change the bypass leakage rate during surveillance testing. That is: Is the requested change consistent with what other BWRs are doing? They're requesting almost double the leakage for acceptance testing, why such of a change? Will it save them money, time etc... What's the reason for the request?

Brad Fuller | Nuclear Safety Specialist
Department of Environmental Protection
Rachel Carson State Office Building
400 Market Street | Harrisburg, PA 17101
Phone: 717.783.8549 | Fax: 717.783.8965
www.depweb.state.pa.us

-----Original Message-----

From: Bhalchandra Vaidya [mailto:Bhalchandra.Vaidya@nrc.gov]

Sent: Thursday, February 19, 2009 9:45 AM
To: Fuller, Brad A
Subject: State Consultation - Susquehanna Amendment Application, NRC
TAC Nos. MD9572 and MD9573

Mr. Fuller,

I am the Licensing Project Manager in the Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Nuclear Reactor Regulations, U.S. NRC.

I am contacting you regarding the State Consultation with respect to the amendment Requests from PPL Susquehanna. The NRC is ready to issue the amendments in the near future.

The pertaining information is provided below:

1) Application Date: July 31, 2008.
Licensee Application Reference No. PLA-6392, TAC Nos. MD9572 and MD9573.

Federal Register Notice for No Significant Hazards Determination
Consideration: November 18, 2008 (73 FR 68455).

Subject: Changes to PPL Susquehanna Technical Specifications for Units 1 and 2, TS3.6.1.3 "Primary Containment Isolation Valves" to revise Secondary Containment Bypass Leakage Limit in Surveillance Requirement 3.6.1.3.11 from 9 scfh to 15 scfh.

Please let me know, if the State of Pennsylvania has any comments regarding these amendment requests.

Thanks,

Bhalchandra K. Vaidya
Licensing Project Manager
U. S. NRC, NRR/DORL
301-415-3308 (Office)
301-415-1222 (Fax)
Bhalchandra.Vaidya@nrc.gov

E-mail Properties

Mail Envelope Properties (603E3F5E4028BA4490D8E2B20D39A54347364B288F)

Subject: RE: State Consultation - Susquehanna Amendment Application, NRC

TAC Nos. MD9572 and MD9573

Sent Date: 03/09/2009 2:14:13 PM

Received Date: 03/09/2009 2:14:13 PM

From: Fuller, Brad A

Created By: brfuller@state.pa.us

Recipients:

Bhalchandra.Vaidya@nrc.gov (Bhalchandra Vaidya)

Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

ENHBGMBX09.PA.LCL

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	30248	03/09/2009

Options

Expiration Date:

Priority: olImportanceNormal

ReplyRequested: False

Return Notification: False

Sensitivity: olNormal

Recipients received: