



5562

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

DOCKETED
USNRC

February 5, 1988

'88 FEB -9 AM 11:28

OFFICE OF SECRETARY
DOCKETING & SERVICE
BRANCH

B. Paul Cotter, Jr., Chairman
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dr. Richard F. Cole
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Glenn O. Bright
Administrative Judge
Atomic Safety and Licensing
Board Panel
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

In the Matter of
FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
(St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 1)
Docket No. 50-355-OLA; (SFP Expansion)

Dear Administrative Judges:

It has come to the Staff's attention that two contention numbers were transposed in the conclusion on page 26 of the "NRC Staff Response to Amended Petition to Intervene," dated February 4, 1988. In order to avoid any possible confusion, attached is a corrected page which accurately reflects a summary of the Staff's position (i.e., Contention 8 should be rejected and Contention 9 admitted).

Sincerely,

MITZEL A. Young
Counsel for NRC Staff

Encl.: As stated
cc: Service List

8802120023 880205
PDR ADOCK 05000355
G PDR

D507

Proposed Contention 16 states:

CONTENTION 16: That FPL has not responded to concerns as presented by the NRC by outlining a loading schedule for the spent fuel pool detailing how the most recently discharged fuel and/or a full core discharge in order to mitigate potential risks from fires in the spent fuel pools resulting in releases in radioactivity into the environment in excess of Part 100.

Contention 16 alleges that Licensee has not responded to NRC "concerns" by outlining a loading schedule for isolation of recently discharged fuel from other fuel to mitigate potential risks from fires in the spent fuel pools. As a basis for the contention, Petitioner provides quotations from the BNL Report that address reduction of the risks of beyond design basis accidents to support the assertion that a "loading and storage configuration for all discharged fuel and a full core discharge is necessary." Amended Petition at 12.

As stated with respect to Contention 8, supra, Petitioner has not provided an adequately specific basis to support a contention asserting the occurrence of beyond design basis accidents. In addition, the basis makes vague reference to "NRC concerns" about loading schedules but does not provide a citation for such concerns. Consequently, the Staff is of the opinion that the contention should be rejected because it lacks an adequately specific basis.

III. CONCLUSION

For the reasons discussed above, it is the Staff's view that proposed Contentions 1, 2, 3, 7, 8, 10, 12, 13, 14, and 16 are inadmissible and should be rejected. However, Contentions 4, 5, 6, 9,