

**From:** [SLIDER, James](#)  
**To:** [Klett, Audrey](#)  
**Subject:** 05-31-12 Phone Call Summary  
**Date:** Wednesday, June 20, 2012 3:36:05 PM  
**Attachments:** [FAO 12-02 Draft Summary of 05-31-12 Phone Call June20.doc](#)

---

Audrey,  
In the attached mark-up, we offer some clarifications for your consideration.  
Thank you.  
Best regards,  
Jim

James E. SLIDER  
Reactor Oversight Process/Nuclear Safety Culture  
Nuclear Generation Division  
Nuclear Energy Institute  
1776 I Street, NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006  
Phone: 202-739-8015  
E-mail: [jes@nei.org](mailto:jes@nei.org)



FOLLOW US ON



*This electronic message transmission contains information from the Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. The information is intended solely for the use of the addressee and its use by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error, and any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by electronic mail and permanently delete the original message. IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS and other taxing authorities, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.*

---

Sent through [mail.messaging.microsoft.com](mailto:mail.messaging.microsoft.com)

## Phone Call Summary:

On Thursday, May 31, 2012 at 1:00 pm, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held a teleconference with staff from the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) and Florida Power & Light Co. (FP&L) to obtain additional information regarding the St. Lucie Plant operators' response to a scram that occurred on March 31, 2012. The teleconference was held to support resolution of a Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) performance indicator program frequently asked question (FAQ). FAQ 12-03 was submitted to the NRC during an ROP working group public meeting held on May 2, 2012 (ML12144A235). NEI staff provided the NRC a revision of the FAQ on May 31, 2012 (ML12153A230) after this teleconference.

NRC staff requested that FP&L staff discuss actions taken and decisions made pertaining to the emergency operating procedures (EOPs) used following the scram. The EOPs referenced during the teleconference were EOP-01, "Standard Post-Trip Actions," EOP-02, "Reactor Trip Recovery," and EOP-05, "Excess Steam Demand (ESD)."

NRC staff requested FP&L staff to summarize the actions and decisions made in EOP-01 while focusing on issues involving reactor coolant system (RCS) temperature. FP&L staff confirmed that plant equipment was restoring RCS average temperature ( $T_{avg}$ ) to between 525 and 535 degrees Fahrenheit ( $^{\circ}$ F) during implementation of EOP-01. FP&L staff confirmed that all the questions on the left side of the EOP-01 diagnostic flowchart were answered, "yes;" therefore, operators were able to transition to EOP-02 without having to use another optimal recovery procedure prior to entering EOP-02. FP&L staff stated that the optimal recovery procedures consisted of EOP-02 through EOP-10.

NRC staff asked FP&L staff to describe the decision-making basis used while the operators were in EOP-02 regarding the transfer to EOP-05. NRC staff referenced EOP-02, Step 4.0.1, "Confirm Diagnosis," which requires operators to verify that uncomplicated Reactor Trip Safety Function Status Check acceptance criteria are satisfied every 15 minutes. Because St Lucie operators did not meet the criteria for RCS temperature, they had to follow the contingency action for that step, which directs operators to (1) re-diagnose the event using the EOP-01 Diagnostic Flow Chart and (2) go to one of the following procedures: the appropriate Optimal Recovery Procedure or EOP-15, "Functional Recovery." NRC staff asked FP&L staff why they decided to transition to EOP-05. The operators indicated that EOP-05 was appropriate because one of its entry criteria is that an ESD has occurred (which was true until the bypass valve closed shortly after the trip), and that the EOP would be used to confirm that an ESD did or would not recur. FP&L staff also stated that that because the safety function status criteria were not met in EOP-02, the operators would choose a procedure in which the safety function status criteria of that procedure would be met. NRC staff asked FP&L staff why EOP-02 requires that RCS temperature be within a band of 525 - 535  $^{\circ}$ F. FP&L staff responded that the low end of that temperature band serves to confirm that an excess cool-down is not in progress and that the upper band serves to confirm that there is not a loss of the heat sink.

NRC staff asked FP&L staff to describe the decisions made while in EOP-05 regarding the step that required operators to verify Safety Function Status Check acceptance criteria were satisfied every 15 minutes. EOP-05, Attachment 1, "Safety Function Status Check Sheet," Step 6 required that RCS  $T_{cold}$  be "stable or lowering." NRC staff asked FP&L operators about the decision basis for determining that the safety function status check criterion for RCS temperature was met given that the step requires RCS temperature to be stable or decreasing whereas the desired response of RCS temperature was to increase. FP&L staff responded that "stable" meant under control or performing as expected and not necessarily remaining at or near

a constant temperature value. NRC staff asked FP&L staff to confirm the purpose of the EOP-05 safety function status check for RCS temperature. FP&L staff stated that the requirement for RCS temperature to be stable or lowering was to avoid a pressurized thermal shock concern in the event that an excessive steam demand event was ongoing. However, since the Tcold did not drop to a level of concern for PTS, the requirement to keep temperature lowered was not appropriate. Consequently, the operators concluded that "stable" was met by the temperature slowly restoring to within the appropriate band.

Finally, FPL reiterated that the only reason for entry into EOP 5 was that EOP 2 requirements were not met and so the operators selected the most appropriate EOP. EOP 1 allows for RCS temperature to be within the band or being restored ("ENSURE SBCS or ADVs are restoring RCS T<sub>AVG</sub> to between 525 and 535°F") while EOP2 requires RCS temperature to be within the band ("RCS T<sub>AVG</sub> 525 to 535°F").

List of attendees:

Audrey Klett, NRR/DIRS/IPAB  
Chris Cowdrey, NRR/DIRS/IOEB  
Steven Rose, R2  
Malcolm Widmann, R2  
Philip Capehart, R2  
Craig Kontz, R2  
Tim Hoeg, R2  
Roger Reyes, R2  
Michael Donithan, R2  
Jim Slider, NEI  
Steve Catron  
Eric Katzman  
Paul Rasmus  
Ken Frehafer  
Tim [last name?]