

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGION II 101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W. ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report No. 50-335/79-10

Licensee: Florida Power and Light Company

9250 West Flager Street Miami, Florida 33101

Facility Name: St. Lucie 1

Docket No. 50-335

License No. DPR-67

Inspection at St. Lucie site, Fort Pierce, Florida

SUMMARY

Inspection on April 14 - 17, 1979

Areas Inspected

This routine, announced inspection involved 32 inspector-hours onsite in the areas of preparation for refueling and fuel handling activities.

Results

Of the two areas inspected, no apparent items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

*C. Wethy, Plant Manager

- J. H. Barrow, Operations Superintendent
- *J. E. Bowers, Maintenance Superintendent
- *C. A. Wells, Operations Supervisor
- H. F. Buchanan, Health Physics Supervisor
- *R. K. Ryall, Reactor Supervisor
- *D. West, Outage Coordinator
- W. Windecker, Shift Supervisor
- D. Turcott, Shift Supervisor
- W. Pearce, Shift Supervisor
- J. Coulliette, Nuclear Watch Engineer
- J. Lewis, Vault Custodian

Other licensee employees contacted included operators.

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on April 17, 1979, with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above. During the exit interview, the licensee committed to implementing a change to applicable plant procedures which would ensure reinstating to operable status control room indicators whose associated plant equipment has been tagged out of service once the work on the component has been satisfactorily completed.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Preparation for Refueling

The inspector reviewed operating procedure 1610020 "Receipt and Handling of New Fuel" and the completed appendices to the procedure which addressed the inspection and acceptance of the new fuel assemblies received on site in support of this refueling outage.

Licensee personnel stated that no reconstitution of fuel bundles is planned during this outage. The following procedures were reviewed for content and performance prior to the onset of refueling activities:

- a. O.P. 1630022, "Spent Fuel Machine Operation"
- b. O. P. 1630023, "Fuel Transfer System Operation"
- c. O. P. 1630024, "Refueling Machine Operation"

Within the areas inspected no items of noncompliance were identified.

6. Refueling Activities

From review of operating procedure 1600023, "Refueling Sequence Guidelines" and the appendices to it, and review of operating procedure 1600022, "Unit 1 Refueling Operations," and those procedures identified in paragraph 5, the inspector concluded that the requirements of Technical Specifications 3/4.9 were met at the beginning of core alterations and beginning of fuel movement. By review of completed copies of Appendix A to the operating procedure 1600023, the inspector concluded that the surveillances that were required during refueling operations and specified in Technical Specifications 3/4.9 were current during the period reviewed. Proper crew composition in accordance with Technical Specification 6.2-1 was confirmed on several occasions by direct observation and discussions with persons involved in fuel handling. Other limiting conditions for refueling operations such as communications, vessel water level, and refueling machine operability were also confirmed by direct observation.

The following Plant Work Orders (PWO) relating to the reactor building polar crane maintenance and inspection were reviewed:

PWO 5642 Electrical maintenance inspection performed 4/1/79

PWO 2210 Mechanical maintenance inspection performed 4/1/79

PWO 2283 Annual magnetic particle inspection of the fuel cask crane and the polar crane and the attendant "Certificate of Inspection" issued 10/28/78 by QC Laboratories, Inc., of Hollywood, Florida.

Within the areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

7. Plant Tour

During a visit to the Control Room the inspector noticed that Annunciator N-1, "Holdup Tank 1A - High/Low Level" had been tagged out of service since 7/23/78. Although conversations with the operations personnel on shift at the time led the inspector to believe that the annunciator tag was still indicative of work outstanding on the PWO, further discussions with maintenance personnel revealed that the PWO against that hold tag had been completed and that the tag on the annunciator should have been removed. This discovery pointed to a deficiency in the plant's processing of Plant Work Orders in that there was no procedural provision for reinstating to operable status control room indicators whose associated plant equipment had been tagged out of service, once the work to be done had been completed. The licensee committed, during the exit interview, to implement a change to the applicable procedures which would ensure the prevention of similar situations in the future. This item will be carried as open item 50-335/79-10-01 pending re-inspection of the licensee's corrective action during a future inspection.

While observing the work in progress from the refueling bridge in the Containment Building, the inspector questioned the licensed operator on the bridge concerning what appeared to be an erratic readout on the tenths position of the digital hoist position display. As a result of this discussion, the licensee reviewed the problem and issued PWO #8230 to replace a printed circuit board on the panel responsible for the malfunction. The inspector had no further questions.

Within the areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

8. Followup on Open Item

The inspector reviewed the licensee's action on previous commitments made to the NRC as outlined in paragraph II.4 of RII report number 50-335/78-09. This commitment related to the revision of operating procedure OP 1630024, "Refueling Machine Operation", to indicate a range of acceptable load limits instead of the single value nominal limits then given in the procedure. Also, the commitment was made to compare present practice with respect to maintenance and inspection of cranes and training of crane operators with the recommendations and requirements of ANSI B30.2-1976, and to identify the difference between the then current practice and that standard.

By reviewing the current O. P. 1630024 the inspector was able to ascertain that the commitment related to load limits had been met.

In reference to the comparisons with ANSI 830.2-1976, the licensee's position during the exit interview was that plant practice differed from the standard only in that contrary to chapter 2.3 of the standard, they do not subject their operators to written or oral exams. They further stated that the Florida Power and Light Company's apprentice program adequately covered training of operators. Also, their position was that no major lifts in containment took place in the absence of either the foreman or the responsible department head. Operational crane qualification requirements of the pertinent foremen or department heads that would be present during major lifts were not discussed.

The inspector had no further questions at that time.

Within the areas inspected, no items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

