

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8106230137 DOC. DATE: 81/06/19 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-335 St. Lucie Plant, Unit 1, Florida Power & Light Co. 05000335
 AUTH. NAME: UHRIG, R.E. AUTHOR AFFILIATION: Florida Power & Light Co.
 RECIP. NAME: CLARK, R.A. RECIPIENT AFFILIATION: Operating Reactors Branch 3

SUBJECT: Advises that util cannot respond to SER re environ qualification of safety-related electrical equipment until concerns submitted 810408, in response to partial review equipment evaluation rept are addressed.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A048S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 3 ENCL 0 SIZE: /
 TITLE: Equipment Qualification (OR & PRE-OL)

NOTES:


ACTION:	RECIPIENT	COPIES	COPIES		RECIPIENT	COPIES
	ID CODE/NAME		LTR	ENCL		
	CLARK, R.	10	7			
INTERNAL:	DIR/DOLI	17	1		EQUIP QUAL BR05	5
	I&E	18	3		NRC PDR	02
	OELD	20	1		OGC	21
	REG. FILE	01	1		WILLIAMS, M.H.	22
EXTERNAL:	ACRS	23	16		LPDR	03
	NSIC	04	1			

HA
4

JUN 25 1981

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTR 39 ENCL 0

5



June 19, 1981
L-81-255

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. Robert A. Clark, Chief
Operating Reactors Branch #3
Division of Licensing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Clark:

Re: St. Lucie Unit 1
Docket No. 50-335
Environmental Qualification of
Safety-Related Electrical Equipment



Your letter of May 29, 1981 transmitted the Safety Evaluation Report (SER) for the Environmental Qualification of Safety-Related Electrical Equipment for St. Lucie Unit 1. This letter requested that we provide within 90 days of its receipt an item-by-item re-evaluation of specific information identified in the SER. It was further stated that the action required of us which would be necessary to comply with the Order for Modification of License Concerning the Environmental Qualification of Safety-Related Electrical Equipment dated October 24, 1980, was identified in the SER.

Following receipt of the Partial Review Equipment Evaluation Report (PREER), FPL submitted a response to your office dated April 8, 1981 (L-81-161) addressing a number of specific staff concerns listed in the PREER. However, our preliminary review of the SER revealed that it is essentially identical to the PREER transmitted to us by Mr. Thomas M. Novak's letter dated March 26, 1981, and as a result does not consider our response of April 8, 1981. Since the SER does not clarify the staff's concerns beyond the letter codes provided in the PREER, we remain in a position of being unable to respond explicitly to the staff's concerns in an item-by-item manner as requested. We noted our inability to respond to the letter codes in our response to the PREER dated April 8, 1981. At that time we also requested a meeting between our engineers and your staff to explicitly identify each concern. It is our sincere hope that our request can be granted as soon as possible, in order to avoid a waste of manpower in responding to assumed concerns and to prevent delays in resolving the staff's concerns. We emphasize that we are willing to meet with your technical staff at your earliest convenience.

Very truly yours,

Robert E. Uhrig
Vice President
Advanced Systems & Technology

REU/JEM/ah

cc: J. P. O'Reilly, Director, Region II
Harold F. Reis, Esquire

A048
69/0

P
8106280 137

