

DISTRIBUTION

Docket OPA (CMiles)  
 NRC PDR TBAbenrathy  
 Local BDR JRBUchanan  
 ORB #2 Reading DJSkovholt  
 KRGOller WPGammill  
 TJCarter RLtedesco  
 RMDiggs  
 RDSilver  
 OELD - Bordanick  
 OI&E (3)  
 BJones(4)  
 BScharf (10)  
 JMcGough  
 JSaltzman  
 ACRS (16)  
 VStello  
 DRoss

Docket No. 50-335

JUN 30 1976

Florida Power & Light Company  
 ATTN: Dr. Robert E. Uhrig  
 Vice President  
 Nuclear and General Engineering  
 Post Office Box 3100  
 Miami, Florida 33101

Gentlemen:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 6 to Facility License No. DPR-67 for the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1. The amendment consists of a revision to License No. DPR-67 in response to your request dated June 30, 1976. Your proposed amendment has been modified and these modifications have been discussed with representatives of your staff.

The amendment revises Section E of Enclosure 1 of the license to delete items to be completed by June 30, 1976, and to add requirements to be completed by August 31, 1976.

Copies of the related Safety Evaluation and the Federal Register Notice also are enclosed.

The original requirements of Section E of Enclosure 1 to the license were part of the original operating license issued March 1, 1976. Our concerns related to these conditions were known to you well before March 1. However, the information necessary to complete our review by June 30 was not submitted until mid and late June. We do not consider this kind of scheduling on your part to be responsive or satisfactory for orderly regulatory review. Amendment No. 6 adds requirements to be completed to our satisfaction by August 31, 1976. The requested information should be submitted no later than July 31, 1976 to permit a timely and orderly review. Since delays in your responses create an undue burden on our efforts to maintain schedules and to conduct timely reviews, we also request that you inform us of measures to be taken to improve your responsiveness.

FOR PREVIOUS CONCURRENCES:  
 SEE PREVIOUS YEKLOW

Sincerely,  
 Original signed by  
 Dennis L. Ziemann

DSS&EA:AD/ST DSS:AD/PS  
 WPGammill RLtedesco  
 6/ 176  
 DOR:AD/OT DOR:AD/ORS  
 DEisenhut KRGOller

DOR:ORB #2 OELD  
 RMDiggs  
 6/30/76 6/ 176

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief  
 Operating Reactors Branch #2  
 Division of Operating Reactors

KRG  
 DLZiemann  
 6/30/76

OFFICE →	DOR:ORB #2	DPM:AD/QA&O				DOR:ORB #2
SURNAME →	RDSilver:ah	DJSkovholt				DLZiemann
DATE →	6/30/76	6/ 176				6/30/76

DISTRIBUTION

Docket  
NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
ORB #2 Reading  
KRGoller  
TJcarter  
RMDiggs  
RDSilver  
OELD -  
OI&E (3)  
BJones (4)  
BScharf (10)  
JMcGough  
JSatzman  
ACRS (16)  
VStello  
DRoss  
OPA (CMiles)

TBAbernathy  
JRBuchanan

Docket No. 50-335

Florida Power & Light Company  
ATTN: Dr. Robert E. Uhrig  
Vice President  
Nuclear and General Engineering  
Post Office Box 3100  
Miami, Florida 33101

Gentlemen:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment No. 6 to Facility License No. DPR-67 for the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1. The amendment consists of a revision to License No. DPR-67 in response to your request dated June 30, 1976. Your proposed amendment has been modified and these modifications have been discussed with representatives of your staff.

The amendment revises Section E of Enclosure 1 of the license to delete items to be completed by June 30, 1976, and to add requirements to be completed by August 31, 1976.

Copies of the related Safety Evaluation and the Federal Register Notice also are enclosed.

Sincerely,

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #2  
Division of Operating Reactors

Enclosures:

- 1. Amendment No. 6 to License No. DPR-67
- 2. Safety Evaluation
- 3. Notice

cc w/enclosures:

See next page

*DOR:OT*  
*DKP*  
*6/30/76*  
*OELD*  
*BMB*  
*B. Buchanan*  
*6/30/76*  
*SSY*

OFFICE >	<del>DOR:ORB #2</del>	DOR:ORB #2	DPM:AD/QASO	DSS&EA:AD/ST	DSS:AD/PS	DOR:ORB #2
SURNAME >	RDSilver:ah	RMDiggs	DJSkovholt	WPGammill	RLTedesco	DLZiemann
DATE >	6/30/76	6/ 176	6/ 176	6/ 176	6/30/ 76	6/30/76

June 30, 1976

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 6 to  
License No. DPR-67
2. Safety Evaluation
3. Notice

Chief, TIRB (2)  
Technology Assessment Division  
Office of Radiation Programs  
EPA, Room 647A, East Tower  
Waterside Mall  
401 M Street, S. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20460

cc w/enclosures:

Jack R. Newman, Esquire  
Lowenstein, Newman, Reis & Axelrad  
1025 Connecticut Avenue, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20036

Norman A. Coll, Esquire  
McCarthy, Steel, Hector & Davis  
14th Floor, First National Bank Building  
Miami, Florida 33131

Mr. John L. McQuigg  
P. O. Box 1408  
Stuart, Florida 33494

Indian River Junior College Library  
3209 Virginia Avenue  
Ft. Pierce, Florida 33450

Mr. Weldon B. Lewis  
County Administrator  
St. Lucie County  
Post Office Box 700  
Ft. Pierce, Florida 33450

Mr. Bruce Blanchard  
Environmental Projects Review  
Department of the Interior  
Room 5321  
18th and C Streets, N. W.  
Washington, D. C. 20240

cc w/enclosures and cy of FP&L's  
filings dtd. June 3\*, 14, 22, 25\*,  
28 and 30, 1976:

Mr. Ed Maroney  
Bureau of Intergovernmental Relations  
725 South Bronough Street  
Tallahassee, Florida 33450

Mr. Shepard N. Moore, Region IV  
Environmental Protection Agency  
1421 Peachtree Street, N. E. Suite 300  
Atlanta, Georgia 30390

\* w/o proprietary attachment

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-335

ST. LUCIE PLANT UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 6  
License No. DPR-67

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
  - A. The application for amendment by Florida Power & Light Company (the licensee) dated June 30, 1976, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
  - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
  - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
  - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
  - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended to revise Enclosure 1 thereto as indicated below:

A. Revise item E to read:

"E. The following items shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Commission by August 31, 1976."

B. Revise item E.1 to read:

"The licensee shall provide the bases for concluding that the erosion protection (sheet pile groins and bulkhead) near the eastern edge of the ultimate heat sink will function as intended during severe hurricane wave erosion conditions. Prior to Commission approval of the documentation, the licensee shall notify the Commission if a hurricane or tropical cyclone is predicted for eastern or southern Florida."

C. Delete items E.2 and E.3 in their entirety.

D. Renumber item E.4 to be E.2 and revise it to read:

"2. Implementation of the commitments and revisions to the security plan identified in the Attachment to Florida Power & Light Company letters L-76-208 dated June 3, 1976 and L-76-237 dated June 25, 1976."

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Original signed by  
Dennis L. Ziemann  
Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #2  
Division of Operating Reactors

Date of Issuance: JUN 30 1976

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 6 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-67

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ST. LUCIE PLANT UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-335

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 30, 1976, Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) requested an amendment to Facility License No. DPR-67 for the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1. The amendment request, as modified, would revise Section E of Enclosure 1 of the license to delete items to be completed by June 30, 1976, and add requirements to be completed by August 31, 1976.

The amendment proposed by FPL has been modified and these modifications have been discussed with representatives of the FPL staff. Background information regarding the requested amendment was provided by FPL letters dated June 3, 14, 22, 25, and 28, 1976.

DISCUSSION

Section E of Enclosure 1 of the license states:

- "E. The following items shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Commission by June 30, 1976:
1. Installation of erosion protection (steel sheetpile groins and bulkheads) in the area of the emergency intake cooling water canal to Big Mud Creek, north of the plant island.
  2. Installation of the seismic Category I, permanent, ultimate heat sink barrier dam (not including water flow control gates/valves).
  3. The licensee shall provide qualification test records which demonstrate that the balance of plant Class IE electrical equipment, selected prior to issuance of this license for audit by the Commission, has been environmentally qualified. In the event that adequate demonstration is not provided, a supplementary program of qualification verification, acceptable to the Commission, shall be completed.

OFFICE ➤					
SURNAME ➤					
DATE ➤					

4. Implementation of revisions to the security plan, requested by NRC letter of April 30, 1976, after approval of the revisions by the Commission."

The Commission's Office of Inspection and Enforcement has verified that the steel sheetpile groins and bulkheads required by Section E.1 have been installed. However, by FPL letter L-76-233 dated June 22, 1976, the licensee described changes made to the original design of the erosion protection that had been approved by the staff. The licensee concluded that the design changes would not significantly effect the protection provided. The purpose of the groins and bulkheads is to provide protection to the ultimate heat sink barrier dam on the northwest side of the nuclear island during a very severe hurricane. We have initiated a review of the design changes to confirm their adequacy. By FPL letter L-76-243 dated June 30, 1976, the licensee agreed to provide, by August 31, 1976, the additional information necessary to complete our review. In the interim prior to the time we confirm the adequacy of the revised design the licensee will establish a special review procedure for evaluation of continued operation during severe storms. If a hurricane or a tropical cyclone landfall is predicted for eastern or southern Florida, the licensee's Facility Review Group at St. Lucie will assess whether or not power operation of St. Lucie Unit No. 1 is to be continued. In addition, their procedure will require that continued power operation under such circumstances must have the concurrence of the Company Nuclear Review Board. FPL also stated that they will inform us if a hurricane or tropical cyclone landfall is predicted for eastern or southern Florida. By license amendment we would require FPL to provide the additional information needed to complete our review of the changes in design of the erosion protection system. We would also require that FPL notify us if a hurricane or tropical cyclone is predicted so that we can take any licensing action we deem appropriate under the circumstances. We conclude that the completion of the installation of the groins and bulkheads provides reasonable assurance that the barrier dam would not be jeopardized during most severe hurricanes. In addition, sufficient information would be made available to us regarding predicted severe storms to enable us to take any licensing action we deem appropriate.

The Commission's Office of Inspection and Enforcement has verified that the barrier dam required by Section E.2 has been completed. By letter of June 28, 1976, the licensee also informed us that the dam was complete and that temporary earthen construction dikes will be removed by July 31, 1976. We consider the removal of these dikes by July 31 to be a prudent measure. We conclude that the requirement of Section E.2 has been resolved satisfactorily.

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

Inspection of environmental qualification records of selected Class IE electrical equipment at St. Lucie Unit No. 1 was performed by our Office of Inspection and Enforcement. That Office has verified that the conditions of Section E.3 have been satisfactorily completed with the exception of the environmental qualification of the containment fan cooler motors. The qualification of these motors was reviewed by our staff based on FPL letter L-76-221 dated June 14, 1976, and discussions at a meeting on June 29, 1976.

The licensee based the qualification of the containment cooler fan motors on a topical report, "Fan Cooler Motor Unit Test," Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-7829, April 1972. We reviewed this topical report and determined that it did not provide an acceptable basis for qualification of these motors because 1) it was difficult to extrapolate the test motor design parameters to the St. Lucie Unit No. 1 motors, 2) it incorrectly assumed that the thermal model for the heat exchanger had been approved, and 3) it neglected the requirement for seismic qualification.

The staff met with FPL, the architect engineer, and the nuclear steam supplier to resolve the discrepancies between the motor design parameters which were used in the qualification test program reported in WCAP-7829 and the design of the motors used at St. Lucie Unit No. 1. Written responses to questions on the material contained in the topical report and oral clarifications were presented at this meeting. The information showed that the St. Lucie Unit No. 1 fan cooler motors have smaller rotor end loops than the test motor, will rotate at one third the speed of the test motor and therefore will be subject to lower stresses than the test motor. The methods used to determine the insulation temperature rise at full load were also described and shown to be applicable to the St. Lucie motors. Based on the information presented, we conclude that the extrapolation from the test motor to the actual motor used at St. Lucie Unit No. 1 is acceptable.

We also reviewed the thermal analysis method used to determine the performance of the heat exchanger associated with the motor and the temperature of the air around the motor. The temperature of the wet air to the motor was determined analytically by a heat balance of the closed motor cooling system. Energy removal by the heat exchanger was determined from a Westinghouse correlation for flat plate finned coils in dry air. This correlation has been verified by a comparison to test data for this heat exchanger design. No credit was taken for increased heat removal by condensing heat transfer within the cooler due to the

OFFICE ➤					
SURNAME ➤					
DATE ➤					

steam from the containment. The heat load from the containment to the cooling air was maximized by a steady-state calculation at the peak calculated containment temperature. The heat load from the motor was determined by measured values at the DBA design power level. The results of the heat balance provide a conservative inlet air temperature which is used for the performance evaluation of the motor. We therefore conclude that the thermal analyses used to determine qualification are acceptable.

Seismic qualification information was also reviewed. The analyses presented addressed the structural integrity of the fan coolers including the motors. We have performed a preliminary evaluation of the information presented and have not found any unacceptable areas in the analyses for structural integrity. We have also initiated a review of the operability of the motors during and after a seismic event. It is our intent to pursue this question with the licensee. FPL has stated its intent to provide analyses by August 31, 1976, which we will evaluate to determine if operability during and after a seismic event has been established. We have concluded that with the exception of seismic qualification, the fan cooler motors are qualified to the requirements of IEEE Std 323-1971 and are, therefore, acceptable.

Since the containment fan coolers provide backup cooling to two containment spray systems, each of which can provide 100 percent of the required cooling, we do not consider completion of the evaluation to be vital. Based on our evaluation and considering the redundancy provided for the containment cooling, we agree with our previous conclusion in the Safety Evaluation of the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1, November 8, 1974, that the containment would be adequately cooled in the event of an accident.

Amendment No. 5 to the license and our letter to FPL of April 30, 1976, requested that FPL submit additional information and proposed revisions to the physical security plan. By FPL letters L-76-208 dated June 3, 1976, and L-76-237 dated June 25, 1976, the licensee submitted the requested additional information and made specific commitments to revise the security plan. In addition, they stated that it is their intent to revise the security plan to incorporate our requested changes and submit the revision by July 30, 1976, for our review. We have evaluated the information and commitments and have concluded that they are responsive to our letter of April 30, 1976, and are acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact

OFFICE >					
SURNAME >					
DATE >					

and pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) that an environmental statement, negative declaration, or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: JUN 30 1976

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NO. 50-335

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

NOTICE OF ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENT TO FACILITY  
OPERATING LICENSE

The U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 6 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-67, issued to Florida Power & Light Company (the licensee), which revised the license for operation of the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1 (the facility) located in St. Lucie County, Florida. The amendment is effective as of its date of issuance.

The amendment revises Section E of Enclosure 1 of the license to delete items to be completed by June 30, 1976, and adds requirements to be completed by August 31, 1976. Section E relates to the (1) installation of erosion protection during severe hurricane wave erosion conditions, (2) installation of an ultimate heat sink barrier dam, (3) qualification test records for certain electrical equipment, and (4) implementation of revisions to the security plan.

The application for the amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment. Prior public notice of this amendment was not required since the amendment does not

involve a significant hazards consideration.

OFFICE >

SURNAME >

DATE >

The Commission has determined that the issuance of this amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) an environmental statement, negative declaration or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with issuance of this amendment.

For further details with respect to this action, see (1) the application for amendment dated June 30, 1976 and related filings dated June 3, 14, 22, 25 and 28, 1976, (2) Amendment No. 6 to License No. DPR-67, and (3) the Commission's concurrently issued Safety Evaluation. All of these items are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 1717 H Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. and at the Indian River Junior College Library, 3209 Virginia Avenue, Ft. Pierce, Florida 33450.

A copy of items (2) and (3) may be obtained upon request addressed to the U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D. C. 20555, Attention: Director, Division of Operating Reactors.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland, this *30th day of June, 1976.*

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

*Original signed by*  
Dennis L. Ziemann

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #2  
Division of Operating Reactors

OFFICE >						
SURNAME >						
DATE >						

2. Accordingly, the license is hereby amended to revise Enclosure 1 thereto as indicated below:

A. Revise item E to read:

"E. The following items shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Commission by August 31, 1976."

B. Revise item E.1 to read:

"The licensee shall provide the bases for concluding that the erosion protection (sheet pile groins and bulkhead) near the eastern edge of the ultimate heat sink will function as intended during severe hurricane wave erosion conditions. Prior to Commission approval of the documentation, the licensee shall notify the Commission if a hurricane or tropical cyclone is predicted for eastern or southern Florida to enable the Commission to determine the safety of operation during the predicted storm."

C. Delete items E.2 and E.3 in their entirety.

D. Renumber item E.4 to be E.2 and revise it to read:

"2. Implementation of the commitments and revisions to the security plan identified in the Attachment to Florida Power & Light Company letters L-76-208 dated June 3, 1976 and L-76-237 dated June 25, 1976."

3. This license amendment is effective as of the date of its issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Dennis L. Ziemann, Chief  
Operating Reactors Branch #2  
Division of Operating Reactors

Date of Issuance:

OFFICE ➤						
SURNAME ➤						
DATE ➤						

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 6 TO LICENSE NO. DPR-67

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ST. LUCIE PLANT UNIT NO. 1

DOCKET NO. 50-335

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated June 30, 1976, Florida Power & Light Company (FPL) requested an amendment to Facility License No. DPR-67 for the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1. The amendment request, as modified, would revise Section E of Enclosure 1 of the license to delete items to be completed by June 30, 1976, and add requirements to be completed by August 31, 1976.

The amendment proposed by FPL has been modified and these modifications have been discussed with representatives of the FPL staff. Background information regarding the requested amendment was provided by FPL letters dated June 3, 14, 22, 25, and 28, 1976.

DISCUSSION

Section E of Enclosure 1 of the license states:

"E. The following items shall be completed to the satisfaction of the Commission by June 30, 1976:

1. Installation of erosion protection (steel sheetpile groins and bulkheads) in the area of the emergency intake cooling water canal to Big Mud Creek, north of the plant island.
2. Installation of the seismic Category I, permanent, ultimate heat sink barrier dam (not including water flow control gates/valves).
3. The licensee shall provide qualification test records which demonstrate that the balance of plant Class IE electrical equipment, selected prior to issuance of this license for audit by the Commission, has been environmentally qualified. In the event that adequate demonstration is not provided, a supplementary program of qualification verification, acceptable to the Commission, shall be completed.

OFFICE >					
SURNAME >					
DATE >					

- 4. Implementation of revisions to the security plan, requested by NRC letter of April 30, 1976, after approval of the revisions by the Commission."

The Commission's Office of Inspection and Enforcement has verified that the steel sheetpile groins and bulkheads required by Section E.1 have been installed. However, by FPL letter L-76-233 dated June 22, 1976, the licensee described changes made to the original design of the erosion protection that had been approved by the staff. The licensee concluded that the design changes would not significantly effect the protection provided. We have determined a need to review these design changes and such a review has been initiated.

The purpose of the groins and bulkheads is to provide protection to the ultimate heat sink barrier dam on the northwest side of the nuclear island during a very severe hurricane. To assure ourselves that the barrier wall protection is adequate while completing our review, we would require the licensee to notify us if a hurricane or tropical cyclone is predicted for eastern or southern Florida. This information would enable us to consider the safety of continued operation during the predicted storm. We would also require the licensee to provide prior to August 31, 1976, the documentation necessary to complete our evaluation of the changes. We conclude that the completion of the installation of the groins and bulkheads provides some assurance that the barrier dam would not be jeopardized during a severe hurricane and that sufficient information would be made available to us regarding predicted severe storms to enable us to determine if any additional precautions would be necessary during the storms.

The Commission's Office of Inspection and Enforcement has verified that the barrier dam required by Section E.2 has been completed. By letter of June 28, 1976, the licensee also informed us that the dam was complete and that temporary earthen construction dikes will be removed by July 31, 1976. We consider the removal of these dikes by July 31 to be a prudent measure. We conclude that the requirement of Section E.2 has been resolved satisfactorily.

Inspection of environmental qualification records of selected Class IE electrical equipment at St. Lucia Unit No. 1 was performed by our Office of Inspection and Enforcement. That Office has verified that the conditions of Section E.3 have been satisfactorily completed with the exception of the environmental qualification of the containment fan cooler motors. The qualification of these motors was reviewed by our staff based on FPL letter 76-221 dated June 14, 1976, and discussions at a meeting on June 29, 1976.

OFFICE →					
SURNAME →					
DATE →					

The licensee based the qualification of the containment cooler fan motors on a topical report, "Fan Cooler Motor Unit Test," Westinghouse Electric Corporation, WCAP-7829, April 1972. We reviewed this topical report and determined that it did not provide an acceptable basis for qualification of these motors. The topical was unacceptable because 1) it was difficult to extrapolate the test motor design parameters to the St. Lucie Unit No. 1 motors, 2) it incorrectly assumed that the thermal model for the heat exchanger had been approved, and 3) it neglected the requirement for seismic qualification.

The staff met with FPL, the architect engineer, and the nuclear steam supplier to resolve the discrepancies between the motor design parameters which were used in the qualification test program reported in WCAP-7829 and the design of the motors used at St. Lucie Unit No. 1. Written responses to questions on the material contained in the topical report and oral clarifications were presented at this meeting. Based on the information presented, we conclude that the extrapolation from the test motor to the actual motor used at St. Lucie Unit No. 1 is acceptable.

We also reviewed the thermal analysis method used to determine the performance of the heat exchanger associated with the motor and the temperature of the air around the motor. The temperature of the wet air to the motor was determined analytically by a heat balance of the closed motor cooling system. Energy removal by the heat exchanger was determined from a Westinghouse correlation for flat plate finned coils in dry air. This correlation has been verified by a comparison to test data for this heat exchanger design. No credit was taken for increased heat removal by condensing heat transfer within the cooler due to the steam from the containment. The heat load from the containment to the cooling air was maximized by a steady-state calculation at the peak calculated containment temperature. The heat load from the motor was determined by measured values at the DBA design power level. The results of the heat balance provide a conservative inlet air temperature which is used for the performance evaluation of the motor. We therefore conclude that the thermal analyses used to determine qualification are acceptable.

OFFICE >					
SURNAME >					
DATE >					

Seismic qualification information was also reviewed. The analyses presented addressed the structural integrity of the fan coolers including the motors. We have performed a preliminary evaluation of the information presented and have not found any unacceptable areas in the analyses for structural integrity. We have also initiated a review of the operability of the motors during and after a seismic event. It is our intent to pursue this question with the licensee. FPL has stated its intent to provide analyses by August 31, 1976, which we will evaluate to determine if operability during and after a seismic event has been established. We have concluded that with the exception of seismic qualification, the fan cooler motors are qualified to the requirements of IEEE Std 323-1971 and are, therefore, acceptable.

Since the containment fan coolers provide backup cooling to two containment spray systems, each of which can provide 100 percent of the required cooling, we do not consider completion of the evaluation to be vital. Based on our evaluation and considering the redundancy provided for the containment cooling, we agree with our previous conclusion in the Safety Evaluation of the St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1, November 8, 1974, that the containment would be adequately cooled in the event of an accident.

Amendment No. 5 to the license and our letter to FPL of April 30, 1976, requested that FPL submit additional information and proposed revisions to the physical security plan. By FPL letters L-76-208 dated June 3, 1976, and L-76-237 dated June 25, 1976, the licensee submitted the requested additional information and made specific commitments to revise the security plan. In addition, they stated that it is their intent to revise the security plan to incorporate our requested changes and submit the revision by July 30, 1976, for our review. We have evaluated the information and commitments and have concluded that they are responsive to our letter of April 30, 1976, and are acceptable.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and pursuant to 10 CFR §51.5(d)(4) that an environmental statement, negative declaration, or environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

OFFICE →					
SURNAME →					
DATE →					

CONCLUSION

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and do not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date:

OFFICE →						
SURNAME →						
DATE →						