REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

MA/4

ACCESSION NBR:8007250529 DOC.DATE: 80/07/18 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
FACIL:50-387 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 1, Pennsylva 05000387
50-388 Susquehanna Steam Electric Station, Unit 2, Pennsylva 05000388
AUTH.NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
CURTIS,N.W. Pennsylvania Power & Light Co.
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
EISENHUT,D.G. Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: Comments on 800714-16 meeting w/NRC in Bethesda,MD to resolve issues & answer questions on FSAR Sections 3.6-10. Open issues were resolved & meeting was productive.Licensing managers should have input in selecting meeting location.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: B001S COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL Ø SIZE: 2
TITLE: PSAR/FSAR AMDTS and Related Correspondence

NOTES:Send I&E 3 copies FSAR & all amends. 05000387
Send I&E 3 copies FSAR & all amends. 05000388

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR	COPIES ENCL
ACTION:	A/D LICENSNG	1	0	YOUNGBLOOD,B	1	0
	RUSHBROOK,M.	1	0	SERVICE,M.	1	0
	STARK,R. 05	1	1			
INTERNAL:	ACCID EVAL BR	1	1	AUX SYS BR 18	1	1
	CHEM ENG BR	1	1	CONT SYS BR	1	1
	CORE PERF BR 17	1	1	DIR,HUM FAC SFY	1	1
	DIR,SFTY TECH	1	1	EFF TR SYS BR	1	1
	EMERG PREP 22	1	0	EQUIP QUAL BR	1	1
	GEOSCIENCES	1	1	HYD/GEO BR 11	1	1
	I&C SYS BR 20	1	1	I&E 06	3	3
	MATL ENG BR	1	1	MECH ENG BR	1	1
	MPA	1	0	NRC PDR 02	1	1
	OELD	1	0	POWER SYS BR	1	1
	PROC/TST REV BR	1	1	QA BR 10	1	1
	RAD ASSESS BR12	1	1	REAC SYS BR	1	1
	REG FILE 01	1	1	SIT ANAL BR 27	1	1
	STRUCT ENG BR	1	1			
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	16	16	LPDR 03	1	1
	NSIC 04	1	1			

JUL 28 1980

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 52 ENCL ~~45~~ Ø

50-387
50-388

PP&L

TWO NORTH NINTH STREET, ALLENTOWN, PA. 18101 PHONE: (215) 821-5151

July 18, 1980

NORMAN W. CURTIS
Vice President-Engineering & Construction-Nuclear
821-5381

Mr. Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

SUSQUEHANNA SES
REVIEW OF FSAR SECTIONS 3.6-10
ER 100450 FILE 841-2
PLA 510

Dear Mr. Eisenhut:

In an NRC staff letter dated April 21, 1980, Pennsylvania Power and Light Company was requested to participate in a meeting to directly resolve issues and answer staff questions on FSAR Sections 3.6-10. The objective was to resolve each open issue so that staff would then be in a position to produce a final draft SER without further iterrations of written questions and answers.

The meeting was held in Bethesda on July 14-16, 1980. The purpose of this letter is to provide you with our assessment of the process used and the results.

This was an extremely productive session which resulted in resolution of all open issues. All staff questions were either answered during the meeting or will be answered shortly when we submit a small amount of additional information. I was particularly impressed by the level and quality of preparation demonstrated by both staff and licensee personnel. The preparation in advance of a draft SER was most helpful to us in this regard for it helped us to focus our efforts on issues known to be of concern to NRC.

While I cannot state at this time that face-to-face joint review of FSAR sections will ultimately result in a reduction in manpower requirements, it will certainly significantly reduce the time required to complete the review of our docket and will lead to a result that is of higher quality than is obtained with normal reviews.

B001 S/D

8007250529

I am enthusiastic about the results of this trial program and strongly urge NRC to extend its application to other sections of the FSAR. We are prepared to work with your Licensing Manager to develop a schedule for this purpose.

We have one suggestion for improvement. Depending upon the subject under review, our respective licensing managers should have the flexibility of selecting a location for review meetings which optimizes the availability of technical people and data. This can improve the exchange of information and reduce review time.

Very truly yours,

N W Curtis

N. W. Curtis

mike

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

July 11, 1980

50-387

TO ALL APPLICANTS FOR OPERATING LICENSES AND CONSTRUCTION PERMIT HOLDERS

In the process of establishing priorities for the licensing reviews of operating license applications, we rely principally on the best estimates of the construction completion date of utilities. In most cases, this date will be confirmed or modified by our Caseload Forecast Panel which usually visits a specific plant site no more than once a year. Because of a number of recent slippages in applicants' construction completion schedules, we believe it is appropriate at this time to request up-to-date schedules from all applicants. Accordingly, we are requesting you to advise us of your present best estimate of the construction completion date for your facility (facilities) and fuel load target date so that we may establish our licensing priorities based on the latest available data. For your information, I have enclosed a listing provided to the House Appropriations Subcommittee of target schedules for those plants seeking operating licenses in the next three years. Those applicants not listed in the enclosure should provide the date they plan to tender their Operating License Application (FSAR and ER) to the NRC.

Upon receipt of your response, we anticipate a potential revision to our present licensing review priorities. Note that the order of our priorities is somewhat influenced by a hearing which is required for some of the OL applications. Inasmuch as we are still limited in our casework by our manpower resources, we request that your response be as up-to-date as possible.

Please provide your response within thirty days of receipt of this letter.

Sincerely,

Darrell G. Eisenhut

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosure:
As Stated

ccs w/encl:
Service List

D

TABLE 1
TARGET DATES OF LICENSING STEPS FOR PLANTS SEEKING
OPERATING LICENSES IN THE NEXT THREE YEARS

Plant	FSAR Tendered	FSAR Docketed	ER Tendered	ER Docketed	SER	ACRS	SER * Suppl.	DES	FES*	Hearing** Start	Hearing** Comp.	Const. Comp.*** App.Est.	Const. Comp.*** NRC Est.	ASLB** Decision	OL Issued
EAST CENTRAL AREA RELIABILITY COORDINATION AGREEMENT															
Zimmer 1	5/75	9/75	6/75	9/75	1/79	3/79	10/80E	10/76	6/77	6/79	12/80E	8/80E	2/81E	2/81E	2/81E
Fermi 2	10/74	4/75	10/74	4/75	3/81E	4/81E	6/81E	12/80E	5/81E	7/81E 6/81E	9/81E 8/81E	6/81E	11/81E	11/81E	11/81E
Midland 2	8/77	11/77	3/78	4/78	10/82E	11/82E	1/83E	6/80E	11/80E	2/83E	8/83E	4/84E	4/84E	10/83E	4/84E (1)
Midland 1	8/77	11/77	3/78	4/78	10/82E	11/82E	1/83E	6/80E	11/80E	2/83E	8/83E	9/84E	9/84E	10/83E	9/84E (1)
Marble Hill	6/79	3/82E	6/79	4/83E	1/84E	2/84E	4/84E	11/83E	4/84E	8/84E	1/85E	4/82E	4/85E	3/85E	4/85E (2)
ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL OF TEXAS															
Comanche Peak 1	3/78	5/78	3/78	1/79	3/81E	4/81E	6/81E	9/80E	2/81E	9/81E	12/81E	3/81E	2/82E	2/82E	2/82E
South Texas 1	5/78	7/78	5/78	7/78	11/82E	12/82E	3/83E	4/82E	9/82E	4/83E	7/83E	9/83E	9/83E	9/83E	9/83E
MID-ATLANTIC AREA COUNCIL															
Salem 2	8/71	8/71	7/71	7/71	10/71	2/79	4/80E(LP) 10/80E(FP)	10/72	4/73	None	Req'd	2/80	4/80E	NA	4/80E (LP) 10/80E (FP)
Susque-hanna 1	4/78	7/78	5/78	6/78	2/81E	3/81E	5/81E	6/79	11/80E	6/81E 12/80E	8/81E 1/81E	4/81	10/81E	10/81E 3/81E	10/81E
Susque-hanna 2	4/78	7/78	5/78	6/78	2/81E	3/81E	5/81E	6/79	11/80E	6/81E 12/80E	8/81E 1/81E	4/82E	4/83E	10/81E 3/81E	4/83E

Plant	FSAR Tendered	FSAR Docketed	ER Tendered	ER Docketed	SER	ACRS	SER* Suppl.	DES	FES*	Hearing** Start	Hearing** Comp.	Const. Comp.*** App.Est.	Const. Comp.*** NRC Est.	ASLB** Decision	OL Issued
MID-AMERICA INTERPOOL NETWORK															
LaSalle 1	9/76	5/77	10/76	5/77	9/80E	10/80E	12/80E	3/78	11/78	None	Req'd	6/80E	12/80E	NA	12/80E
LaSalle 2	9/76	5/77	10/76	5/77	9/80E	10/80E	12/80E	3/78	11/78	None	Req'd	6/81E	2/82E	NA	2/82E
Byron 1	6/78	11/78	6/78	11/78	10/81E	11/81E	1/82E	2/81E	7/81E	2/82E 8/80E	4/82E 10/81E	4/82E	7/82E	6/82E 12/81E	7/82E
Byron 2	6/78	11/78	6/78	11/78	10/81E	11/81E	1/82E	2/81E	7/81E	2/82E 6/81E	4/82E 10/81E	4/83E	7/83E	6/82E 12/81E	7/83E
Braidwood 1	6/78	11/78	6/78	11/78	10/81E	11/81E	1/82E	1/83E	6/83E	2/82E 7/83E	4/82E 10/83E	5/83E	6/84E	6/82E 12/83E	6/84E
Braidwood 2	6/78	11/78	6/78	11/78	10/81E	11/81E	1/82E	1/83E	6/83E	2/82E 7/83E	4/82E 10/83E	4/84E	6/85E	6/82E 12/83E	6/85E
Callaway 1	10/79	8/80E	10/79	12/80E	6/82E	7/82E	8/82E	7/81E	12/81E	9/82E	10/82E	10/82E	12/82E	12/82E	12/82E
Clinton 1	12/79	10/80E	12/79	3/81E	9/82E	10/82E	11/82E	10/81E	3/82E	12/82E	1/83E	4/82E	3/83E	3/83E	3/83E
NORTHEAST POWER COORDINATING COUNCIL															
Shoreham	9/75	1/76	9/75	1/76	9/80E	10/80E	12/80E	3/77	10/77	1/81E	8/81E	11/80E	10/81E	10/81E	10/81E
SOUTHEASTERN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL															
North Anna 2	5/73	5/73	6/70	6/70	6/76	1/77	4/80 (LP) 10/80E(FP)	12/72	4/73	11/76 9/75	6/77 9/75	4/80	4/80	11/77 12/75	4/80 (LP) 10/80E(FP)
Sequoyah 1	12/73	1/74	(3)	(3)	3/79	5/79	2/80 (LP) 9/80E(FP)	10/71	7/74	None 7/74	Req'd 7/74	2/80	2/80	NA 2/75	2/80 (LP) 9/80E(FP)
Sequoyah 2	12/73	1/74	(3)	(3)	3/79	5/79	5/81E	10/71	7/74	None 7/74	Req'd 7/74	8/80E	5/81E	NA 2/75	5/81E

Plant	FSAR Tendered	FSAR Docketed	ER Tendered	ER Docketed	SER	ACRS	SER* Suppl.	DES	FES*	Hearing** Start	Hearing** Comp.	Const. Comp.*** App.Est.	Const. Comp.*** NRC Est.	ASLB** Decision	OL Issued
SOUTHEASTERN ELECTRIC RELIABILITY COUNCIL (CON'T)															
McGuire 1	4/74	5/74	4/74	5/74	3/78	4/78	7/80E	10/75	4/76	8/78 3/77	8/78 4/77	5/80E	11/80E	4/79	11/80E (4)
McGuire 2	4/74	5/74	4/74	5/74	3/78	4/78	7/80E	10/75	4/76	8/78 3/77	8/78 4/77	1/82E	2/82E	4/79	2/82E (4)
Watts Bar 1	6/76	10/76	(5)	(5)	1/81E	2/81E	4/81E	6/78	12/78	None	Req'd	9/80E	5/81E	NA	5/81E
Watts Bar 2	6/76	10/76	(5)	(5)	1/81E	2/81E	4/81E	6/78	12/78	None	Req'd	6/81E	3/82E	NA	3/82E
Summer 1	12/76	2/77	12/76	2/77	8/80E	9/80E	11/80E	6/79	9/80E	12/80E 10/80E	2/81E 12/80E	12/80E	12/80E	4/81E 2/81E	4/81E
Farley 2	8/73	8/73	8/73	8/73	5/75	6/75	7/80E(LP) 12/80E(FP)	7/74	12/74	None	Req'd	6/80E	7/80E	NA	7/80E(LP) 12/80E(FP)
Bellefonte 1	2/78	6/78	2/78	6/78	2/82E	3/82E	6/82E	2/81E	7/81E	None	Req'd	7/82E	7/82E	NA	7/82E
Bellefonte 2	2/78	6/78	2/78	6/78	2/82E	3/82E	6/82E	2/81E	7/81E	None	Req'd	6/83E	6/83E	NA	6/83E
Catawba 1	3/79	10/80E	3/79	10/80E	8/82E	9/82E	10/82E	5/82E	9/82E	12/82E	2/83E	4/83E	4/83E	4/83E	4/83E
SOUTHWEST POWER POOL															
Grand Gulf 1	4/78	6/78	4/78	6/78	5/81E	6/81E	8/81E	2/81E	7/81E	None	Req'd	9/81E	9/81E	NA	9/81E
Waterford 3	9/78	12/78	9/78	12/78	5/81E	6/81E	8/81E	3/81E	8/81E	9/81E	12/81E	10/81E	2/82E	2/82E	2/82E
Wolf Creek	2/80	3/81E	2/80	10/81E	1/83E	2/83E	4/83E	5/82E	10/82E	7/83E	8/83E	10/82E	10/83E	10/83E	10/83E
WESTERN SYSTEMS COORDINATING COUNCIL															
Diablo Canyon 1	10/73	10/73	8/71	8/71	10/74	7/78	5/80E(LP) 1/81 (FP)	12/72	5/73	10/77 12/76	8/80E 12/76	5/80E	5/80E	10/80E	10/80E(LP) 1/81E(FP)
Diablo Canyon 2	10/73	10/73	8/71	8/71	10/74	7/78	1/81 (FP)	12/72	5/73	10/77 12/76	8/80E 12/76	3/81E	3/81E	10/80E	3/81E

Plant	FSAR Tendered	FSAR Docketed	ER Tendered	ER Docketed	SER	ACRS	SER Suppl.	DES	FES*	Hearing** Start	Hearing** Comp.	Const. Comp.*** App.Est.	Const. Comp.*** NRC Est.	ASLB** Decision	OL Issued
WESTERN SYSTEMS COORDINATING COUNCIL (CON'T)															
San Onofre 2	11/76	3/77	11/76	3/77	8/80E	9/80E	12/80E	11/78	10/80E	1/81E 10/80E	4/81E 11/80E	11/80E	5/81E	6/81E 1/81E	6/81E
San Onofre 3	11/76	3/77	11/76	3/77	8/80E	9/80E	12/80E	11/78	10/80E	1/81E 10/80E	4/81E 11/80E	1/81E	5/82E	6/81E 1/81E	5/82E
Washington Nuclear 2	3/78	6/78	12/76	4/77	3/82E	4/82E	7/82E	1/81E	6/81E	None	Req'd	7/82E	7/82E	NA	7/82E
Palo Verde	10/79	12/80E	12/79	12/80E	6/82E	6/82E	7/82E	7/81E	12/81E	8/82E	10/82E	11/82E	12/82E	12/82E	12/82E

ASSUMPTIONS USED FOR PROJECTING TARGET SCHEDULES

Commission decision on full-power NTOL requirements made in June 1980.

Commission decision on treatment of Class 9 accidents in NEPA statements adopts staff recommendation in SECY 80-131 and is made in June 1980.

Projected safety reviews are generally scheduled to start 33 months prior to construction completion dates including time for ACRS review and hearings.

Projected environmental reviews are generally scheduled to start 24 months prior to construction completion dates including time for hearing.

For plants with construction completion dates before the end of 1982 the target schedules for OL review were developed, based on the NRC construction completion dates, on a plant specific basis to minimize delays in OL issuance.

FOOTNOTES FOR TABLE 1

E Denotes estimated date

* Date entered is for last supplement to SER/FES issued.

** Where two entries are made, first entry concerns radiological safety matters and second concerns environmental matters. A single entry indicates Hearing and/or ASLB decision considered both radiological and safety matters.

*** The difference in estimates for construction completion, between the applicant and NRC, is attributable to an independent assessment by the NRC staff of factors affecting construction completion. Generally, the NRC staff estimates are more conservative (i.e., later completion dates) and are based upon actual experience in constructing similar plants. Second unit of a dual unit facility is usually completed about 18 months after first unit.

(LP) denotes low power

(FP) denotes full power

(1) Applicant construction schedule slipped from 11/80 to 4/84 due to foundation problems with auxiliary building and financial considerations.

(2) Work stoppage order issued by NRC in August 1979 for QA-related problems on safety portions of facility. NRC estimates about 18 months before full-scale construction will resume. Thus, the large difference in construction complete dates.

(3) Environmental reviews for Sequoyah 1 and 2 were conducted under a lead agency agreement with TVA. TVA's final environmental statements (FES) incorporated and addressed the AEC's comments on the respective draft statements. The FES's were then accepted as the NEPA statements for the project.

(4) Schedule shown assumes hearing record will not be reopened for TMI-2 issues. If ASLB reopens record, full power OL issuance may be delayed.

(5) TVA's FES for Watts Bar 1 and 2 were considered to be the environmental report submitted to NRC. NRC then issued its own DES and FES for project.