

August 23, 1983

Note to T. Wambach

SUBJECT: PALISADES - FIRE SPRINKLER (OELD # 836 218)

In connection with proposed change #2, you need to explain a little more on why proposed change #2 fits the category of the example you have given. The example you have given is an additional limitation whereas you've described it to be additional equipment. This is probably an incorrect suggestion in the wording. The fire sprinklers are probably already there, aren't they? If so, then the next to last sentence of the no significant hazards basis should read "Proposed change #2 fits this category in that it imposes operating requirements on the fire sprinkler system in the _____ area. Although the fire sprinkler system in that area was included in the applicant's design, the technical specifications issued in _____ - whenever they were issued - did not specifically impose requirements relating to the operation of the sprinkler system in the _____ fire protection area." When you develop the words to include in the notice, give Myron Karman a call and the package probably will not need to come back to ELD.

AMB
Joe Scinto

cc: M. Karman

8502090215 B40518
PDR FOIA
ADAT084-166 PDR