

July 6, 1983

*get
Callone's
note*

Note to H. Smith

SUBJECT: OYSTER CREEK 1 - CORE SPRAY SPARGER (OELD # 834 240)

I have a couple problems with the no significant hazards determination. First, it may be that the licensee doesn't expect any further degradation; why are we making a present guess that we expect no further degradation? I think you shouldn't phrase it that way but rather phrase it along the lines of if there has been no further degradation then we will consider the extension. If there has been further degradation, then they have to replace the spargers before they restart. That's the easy part. The hard part is - now you have to reach a no significant hazards consideration conclusion on the basis of the change. The change is going to let them operate with the interim repair for an additional cycle. That's another 18 months with this patched-up sparger system. You have to explain the basis for the justification for why another 18 months with this sparger system is okay. If you are using the same reasons given in the earlier SER, you have to explain why those reasons given in the earlier conclusion are still valid for another 18 months. You need to do some more work on this one. Its in the right direction but it just doesn't go far enough.

*Ann Bennette
for Joe Scinto*

cc: C. Trammell

*Jim, I don't
know if we
took care of
your problems,
AS 7/7
Believe
me did!
JTS
7/12*

*note:
our fixes
are based
on what Callone
gave you. JTS*

8310040096 XA

7/12/83

ECD

This version is in response to Colleen's note
Hazel 7/12

7/11

Can you wait for unit until...
...?

AS

CPW 7/12/83

Note to: J. Lombardo, LPM, ORB #5

From: Colleen Woodhead, OELD

SUBJECT: PROPOSED LICENSE AMENDMENTS FOR OYSTER CREEK NGS (1) TS REGARDING ISOLATION CONDENSER ISOLATION VALVES (TSCR 115) (2) DEFERRAL OF REPLACEMENT OF CORE SPRAY SPARGER (TSCR 104)

In reviewing the proposed finding of no significant hazards (NSH) for these amendments, I find that it is not clear on what basis the Staff has determined that no significant hazard exists and that the determination for the isolation condenser isolation valves rests on GPU's vague assessment rather than Staff's. As to the core spray sparger replacement, it is not clear why the Staff previously believed it necessary to replace it in Cycle 10 but now it is satisfactory to delay another cycle.

Please revise the explanation of the bases for the NSH and explain why the amendment will not (a) increase the probability or consequences of an accident, (b) significantly decrease the safety margin or (c) result in an accident different from any previously evaluated. As written, the proposed amendments state that GPU has reviewed the TS change for the condenser isolation valves and determined there is no significant hazard and that a past Staff assessment for a different cycle is valid for an additional one.

158478

8 310040101