

SEP 16 1982

Mr. F. G. Lentine  
Nuclear Licensing Administrator  
Commonwealth Edison Company  
P. O. Box 767  
Chicago, Illinois 60606

54-295

Dear Mr. Lentine:

We appreciate the notification of the Zion, Unit 1 Cycle 8 schedule delay and your plans to delay, correspondingly, Commonwealth Edison Company's (CECO's) fuel management schedules.

It is noted, however, that the submittal schedules for the summary presentation to NRC has been slipped 8 months and the methodology topical report to be submitted to NRC for review has been slipped 14 months. This allows only five months between receipt of the topical report and its approval - an unreasonably short review period. The thirteen month review period in the original schedule is more realistic.

We also reiterate a point made during our May 12, 1981 meeting regarding the intended "50.59" letter submittal. Such a submittal may not be adequate. The initial reload analysis using a new methodology or by a new organization even though using an established methodology, normally requires a reload report. Therefore, CECO should be prepared to comply.

Other than the above items, the reschedule appears acceptable.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Cecil O. Thomas, Acting Chief  
Standardization & Special  
Projects Branch  
Division of Licensing

8209280338 820916  
PDR ADDCK 05000295  
P PDR

DISTRIBUTION

Central Files C. Berlinger  
SSPB Reading S. Varga  
NRC PDR P. Anderson  
NSIC  
NTIS  
C. Thomas  
J. Berggren \*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFFICE	DL:SSPB*	DL:SSPB*	DL:SSPB*	DSI:CPB*	DL:ORB#1*	DL:SSPB
SURNAME	JBerggren:cc	PAAnderson	HBernard	CBerlinger	SVarga	<i>C. Thomas</i>
DATE	8/27/82	8/27/82	8/27/82	8/30/82	9/3/82	9/15/82

Mr. F. G. Lentine  
 Nuclear Licensing Administrator  
 P. O. Box 767  
 Chicago, Illinois 60606

Dear Mr. Lentine:

We appreciate the notification of the Zion, Unit 1 Cycle 8 schedule delay and your plans to delay, correspondingly, CECO's fuel management schedule.

It is noted, however, that the submittal schedules for the Summary presentation to NRC was slipped 8 months and the Methodology Topical submitted to NRC for review was slipped 14 months. This allows only five months between receipt of the topical report and its approval - an unreasonably short review period. The thirteen months provided in the original schedule is more realistic.

We also reiterate a point made during the May 12, 1981 meeting regarding the intended "50.59" letter submittal. Such a submittal is not necessarily adequate. The initial reload analysis using a new methodology or by new organization even though using an established methodology, normally requires a reload report and CECO should be prepared to comply.

Other than the above items, the reschedule appears acceptable.

Sincerely,

Harold Bernard, Acting Chief  
 Standardization & Special  
 Projects Branch  
 Division of Licensing

DISTRIBUTION  
 Central Files  
 SSPB Reading  
 NRC PDR  
 NSIC  
 NTIS  
 C. Thomas  
 J. Berggren  
 C. Berlinger  
 P. Anderson

OFFICE	DL:SSPB	DL:SSPB	DL:SSPB	DSI:CPB	DL:ORB#1		
SURNAME	JBerggren:cc	PAnderson	HBernard	CBerlinger	SVarga		
DATE	8/17/82	8/27/82	8/27/82	8/30/82	8/27/82		