UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION II
101 MARIETTA ST., N.W., SUITE 3100
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303

Report No. 50-335/80-24

Licensee: Florida Power and Light Company
9250 West Flagler Street
Miami, FL 33101

Facility Name: St. Lucie Unit 1

Docket No. 50-335

License No. DPR-67

Inspection at Ft. Pierce, Florida

Inspector: Mary Jane Graham 9/17/80
M. J. Graham Date Signed

Approved by: W. D. Martin 9/23/80
R. Martin, Section Chief, RONS Branch Date Signed

SUMMARY

Inspection on August 5-10, 1980

Areas Inspected

This routine, announced inspection involved 42 inspector-hours on site in the areas of operational practices and followup on events occurring while on site.

Results

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

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

   Licensee Employees

   *C. Wethy, Plant Manager
   G. Vaux, Quality Assurance/Quality Control Supervisor
   *R. Ryall, Reactor Engineer
   O. Hayes, Nuclear Plant Supervisor

   Other licensee employees contacted included technicians, operators, and office personnel.

   NRC Resident Inspector

   H. Bibb

   *Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

   The inspection scope and findings were summarized on August 11, 1980 with those persons indicated in Paragraph 1 above by telephone. Preliminary findings were discussed on site with the shift supervisor on August 10. The exit interview consisted largely of a discussion of the licensee's procedure for recovery of a dropped control assembly, as described in Paragraph 6.b.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Inspection Findings

   Not inspected.

4. Unresolved Items

   Unresolved items were not identified during this inspection.

5. Operations Practices

   The inspector reviewed the following Administrative Procedures:

   0010120 Duties and Responsibilities of Operators on Shift (Rev. 11)

   0010721 NRC Required Non-Routine Reports (Rev. 3)

   0010124 Control and Use of Jumpers and Disconnected Leads in Safety Systems

The inspector also observed activities in the auxiliary building and control room, and had discussions with plant operations personnel.

In the control room, the inspector verified that operational parameters and shift staffing were in accordance with technical specifications. The inspector observed change of shift and performance of surveillance testing. The operators and inspector discussed NRC reporting requirements, the use of the ENS phone system, the method of shift changeover, entries in the log books, and planned operational activities. At the time of the inspection, a transformer oil leak in the switchyard was being monitored to determine when entry into an outage for repair would be necessary. The planned power changes were discussed with the inspector.

The operator's log, shift Nuclear Watch Engineer's log, and the jumper control logs were reviewed by the inspector, and entries discussed with the operations staff. Followup to entries on dropped control assemblies is discussed in Paragraph 6b. Jumper and disconnected lead tags were discussed with the Nuclear Plant Supervisor. Several that were long-standing or by nature appeared to be permanent, were referred to the resident inspector for further review.

The inspector has no more questions in this area at this time.

6. Followup To Events On Site

The inspector followed up on control rod assembly dropping problems and on the licensee's preparations for hurricanes.

a. Hurricane Preparation

At the time of the inspection a major hurricane was being tracked in the Carribean. Although the eventual path of the storm was a long distance from eastern Florida, the licensee and inspector discussed precautionary measures to be taken in the event the storm turned toward the site. The licensee had completed those portions of the natural phenomena emergency procedure applicable at the beginning of the hurricane season, and discussed with the inspector the further portions to be done if the hurricane was expected to hit the area. In addition, in preparation for this particular storm, the Unit 2 construction crane boom was removed and put on the ground. In a previous hurricane, the boom had fallen, causing damage.

b. Dropped Control Assemblies

The inspector reviewed the licensee's followup to three dropped full-length control element assemblies (FLCEA) with respect to Off-Normal Operating Procedure No. 0010030, Rev. 5 FLECEA Off-Normal Normal Operation and Realignment. The dropped rods occurred on July 24 and August 4 and 5, 1980. In reviewing the July 24 event, the inspector noted that, contrary to the recommendation of the procedure, the licensee had not remained at the existing post-rod-recovery power for

at least an hour. In response to the inspector's questioning, the licensee stated at the exit interview that there was no technical basis for the one hour recommendation, and therefore no reason not to increase power. The inspector referred the procedure to the core physics specialist inspection group for further research on the background of the recommendations (Inspector Followup Item 80-24-01). The inspector also referred the procedure to the quality assurance specialist inspector group for evaluation of acceptability. (Inspector Followup Item 80-24-02).