

August 18, 1983

Note to T. Novak

SUBJECT: SUSQUEHANNA 1 - MAIN STEAM LINE RADIATION SETPOINT (OELD # 835 871)

I have no objection to this proposed notice on Susquehanna but I do want to point out to you that I hope that the SER, when we propose to take action on this, considers not only changing the monitor setpoint but also the safety implications of the reason for requesting the change. The incoming indicates that the reason for the change is the fact that the plant has condensate demineralizer resin fines blowing into the core. The FR notice does not address that at all. It limits the question to a matter of simply changing the high setpoint for this monitor. I hope that when we take action on this the SER recognizes and addresses the safety implications of the basic plant problem.

Joe Scinto

8502090280 840518
PDR FOIA
ADAT084-166 PDR



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

9/14/83

FROM: SELLS
ORB#3
NRF:

DOCUMENT DATE: DATE RECEIVED TASK BASIS NO:
09/02/83 836855

CLASS: AMDT

PENDING BEFORE:
FACILITY: (05000335) ST LUCIE 1

DESCRIPTION:

AMDT TO OL RE DELETES THE FLUX PEAKING
AUGMENTATION CURVE FOR FUEL CYCLE 6

REFERRED TO:
SCINTO
RUTBERG/PATON

RECEIVED:
9/9
09/02/83

REMARKS:

FOR LEGAL REVIEW OF AMDT AND FRN ONLY

DUE DATE: 09/12/83

8289 9/6
[Signature]
9/14

COMMENTS:

No concurrence

*¶1 of ~~SE~~ S.E. says this is a
supplement to Cycle 6 reload
amendment.*

*— Dr. Sells tells
me the cycle 6 reload amendment
has not been issued.*

*W.D. Paton
I agree. SG for this action appears to
be premised on the schedule for cycle 6 9-9-83
— we theoretically may still deny cycle 6 reload request.*

*P.S. I think the SE contains sufficient reasons
to make it O.K. for cycle 6 but not cycle 7.*

Also Actin cycle 7 looks like a fertile denial.

*going to
have
more
problems
like
this*