

December 20, 1983

Note to Don Sells

SUBJECT: ST LUCE 2 FREQUENCY OF TURBINE OVER SPEED PROTECTION VALUES (840 296)

I have a lot of questions about this package. First, at the bottom of page 2, you say this economic impact, although not a safety consideration, was factored into the staff action. In what manner? It's not enough to say it was factored in. How was it factored in? What did you do with it? How did you weigh it? How did you assess it in reaching a conclusion that its alright to do this on a safety basis?

On page 3, I don't understand the conditions. Are those conditions proposed by Florida Power & Light in its June 6 and June 28 submittals? If not, it seems to me that you are denying the application as submitted and in fact imposing conditions. That's okay with me but this is not the correct form to do that. The licensee has another right to a hearing on those imposed conditions. So you grant in part and deny in part, issue a notice in part, granting but in part denying so that the part that denies them grants them a right to a hearing under 2.108. Now if you are not denying it in part and they were not contained in that original proposal, you can't get the licensee to agree to it now because you seem to be changing the package that was proposed. You have to renotify it. You have to do something about these conditions. I don't understand them and I don't understand the basis for imposing them.

Joe Scinto
Joe Scinto

cc: L.Chandler
W.Paton

8502090222 840518
PDR FOIA
ADAT084-166 PDR

117