

UNITED STATES NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION REGION II 101 MARIETTA STREET, N.W., SUITE 2900 ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30323

Report Nos.: 50-335/86-22 and 50-389/86-21

Licensee: Florida Power and Light Company 9250 West Flagler Street Miami, FL 33102

Docket Nos.: 50-335 and 50-389

G

License Nos.: DPR-67 and NPF-16

Facility Name: St. Lucie 1 and 2

Inspection Conducted: November 3 - 7, 1986

Inspector: Date Signed Burne ' *1*6 Approved by: F. Jape, Section Chief Engineering Branch Division of Reactor Safety

SUMMARY

Scope: This routine, unannounced inspection addressed the areas of reactor coolant system leakrate testing, thermal power monitoring, and followup of previous outstanding items.

Results: No violations or deviations were identified.

REPORT DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

Licensee Employees

- *J. H. Barrow, Operations Superintendent
- J. A. Dyer, Quality Control
- *R. J. Frechette, Chemistry
- K. N. Harris, Vice President
- C. F. Leppla, (I&C) Supervisor
- E. Ordway, I & C Engineer
- *L. W. Pearce, Operations Supervisor
- *N. G. Roos, Quality Control Supervisor
- D. A. Sager, Plant Manager
- *D. M. Stewart, Technical Staff
- *D. H. West, Technical Staff
- *C. L. Wilson, Mechanical Maintenance
- *B. Winnard, Independent Safety Engineering Group
- *E. Wunderlich, Reactor Engineering

Other licensee employees contacted included nuclear plant supervisors, assistant nuclear plants supervisors, operators, and office personnel.

NRC Resident Inspectors

R. V. Crlenjak, Senior Resident Inspector H. T. Bibb, Resident Inspector

*Attended exit interview

2. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and findings were summarized on November 7, 1986, with those persons indicated in paragraph 1 above. The inspector described the areas inspected and discussed in detail the inspection findings. No dissenting comments were received from the licensee. The licensee did not identify as proprietary any of the materials provided to or reviewed by the inspector during this inspection.

3. Licensee Action on Previous Enforcement Matters

This subject was not addressed in the inspection.

4. Unresolved Items

No unresolved item was identified during this inspection.

5. Reactor Coolant System Leakrate Measurement - Unit 1 (61728)

Data were collected at 15 minute intervals over a 3.25 hour period for analysis of the Unit 1 reactor coolant system gross and identified leak rates. This period encompassed the time the licensee was performing their routine surveillance to satisfy the requirements of Technical Specification 4.7.2.1.d. The licensee's procedure calls for a minimum two-hour test. The time was extended to facilitate comparison with the inspector's calculations, which were performed using the microcomputer program RCSLK9. That program is described in NUREG-1107, RCSLK9: Reactor Coolant System Leakage Determination for PWRs. The plant-specific data used in the analysis are shown in attachment 1 and the result of the 3.25 hour calculation in attachment 2.

2

The 13 sets of data collected allowed calculation of ten one-hour duration tests and six two-hour duration tests. The licensee's procedure allows addition of makeup water during the test, but for a 2.25 hour period no water was added. That period was separately analyzed as well as the total period. Finally, the program was used to obtain the temporal increase in mass deficit and collected mass at the end of each set of observations. These two data sets were each reduced to best fit straight lines using least-squares analysis. The slopes of the lines were taken as gross and identified mass leakage. The process was repeated for the ten observations of gross leakage without water addition. The results are summarized in the table below:

MEAN GROSS LEAKAGE (GPM)

10	1-HOUR TESTS	0.99 +/- 0.434
6	2-HOUR TESTS	1.10 +/- 0.126
1	2.25-HOUR TEST	1.04 (no water addition)
1	3.25-HOUR TEST	0.96
FIT	TO 13 OBSERVATIONS	1.06 +/- 0.074
FIT	TO 10 OBSERVATIONS	1.08 +/- 0.147 (no water addition)

The slope of the identified leakage line for 13 observations was 0.71 +/-0.015 gpm. The two-thirteen observation fits are shown in attachment 3 and the one-ten observation fit is shown in attachment 4. Both the regression analysis and the plotting of the results were performed with the SUPERCALC3 spreadsheet program.

One conclusion derived from these analyses was that water addition had no adverse effect on the quality of the results. This was surprising in light of results at other facilities. However, the makeup flow sensor, which inputs to the flow integrator, is based upon a calibrated orifice rather than a rotating vane or other less precise device, and calibration records showed the flow integrator to have good long term stability. (The calibration records of all instruments used in the measurement were inspected and found satisfactory.)



Another conclusion, based upon the standard deviations of the sets of oneand two-hour tests, was that the routine surveillance test duration should not be reduced below two hours. The data collected here as well as those used by the licensee were obtained by visual observation of control board instruments, and the tests are nothing more than comparison of endpoints of the observables. Errors in reading the endpoints become less significant as test duration increases.

3

Finally, the licensee's method of determining reactor coolant system leakrate is acceptable. Their result was bracketed by those obtained by the inspector.

6. Thermal Power Measurements (61706)

For each unit the hourly surveillance of thermal power is performed by the unit's digital data processing system (DDPS). The hourly log in addition to showing the result also echoes the variable data input to the calculation. That set of data when augmented by observation of steam generator and pressurizer levels is sufficient to perform an independent analysis of thermal power using the microcomputer program TPDCER2 (Thermal Power Determination in Combustion Engineering Reactors). That program has yet to be formally documented, but it is similiar to the program documented in NUREG-1167, TPDWR2: Thermal Power Determination in Westinghouse Reactors, Version 2.

To configure TPDCER2 for use with each unit, unit-specific parameters are required. To obtain the required data, the following references were reviewed:

- a. Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, St. Lucie Unit 1, January 22, 1986
- b. Updated Final Safety Analysis Report, St. Lucie Unit 2, April, 1986,
- c. C.E. Book No. 74267 (12/72), Steam Generators, St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 1, January 22, 1986, and
- d. C.E. Book No. 71272 (10/77), Steam Generators, St. Lucie Plant Unit No. 2.

Subsequently, it was determined that the FSAR descriptions of reactor coolant pump power and efficiency were not adequate, and those parameters were replaced by values determined during preoperational testing and used in the DDPS. Values for insulation surface area and conductivity were manipulated to force agreement with the heat losses determined during preoperational testing and used in the DDPS, hence the warning messages on attachments 5 and 6. The plant parameters used in the final analyses are shown in attachments 5 and 6 for Units 1 and 2, respectively.



With the cooperation of the licensee, the inspector was able to obtain four sets of data at 15 minute intervals from each DDPS. At the same time, the steam generator and pressurizer levels were recorded by hand from main control board instrumentation. Each analysis performed using TPDCER2 used two sets of data taken 15 minutes apart. Thus, two analyses were performed on each reactor resulting in four power determinations for each. The data from the DDPS were, in most cases, in different units from those required by TPDCER2, and it was necessary to set up a SUPERCALC 3 spreadsheet to make the required conversions reliably. Clearly, the versatility and flexibility of TPDCER2 would be much enhanced if it could accept a variety of units for the input.

4

The results of the eight individual power calculations from TPDCER2 were consistently higher than those reported by the DDPS, by from 5.8 to 9.1 megawatts thermal, but, in perspective, the worst disagreement was only 0.34% of the calculation. A review of the outputs did not reveal any obvious source of the disagreement. The results of a typical set of calculations by TPDCER2 are given in attachment 7.

It was concluded that the licensee's method of calculating thermal power to assure conformance to the license limit is acceptable.

7. Followup of Outstanding Items (92701)

(Closed) Inspector followup item 335/85-28-01: Discuss the monotonic change in the Unit 1 reactivity deviation. A review of the licensee's correspondence files confirmed that there had been continuing discussion with the fuel vendor on the issue of reactivity deviation, and that the vendor had submitted new prediction curves during the cycle. The licensee ascribed part of the vendor's problem in prediction with lack of experience in analysing the performance of boron carbide burnable poison rods. This item is closed.

(Closed) Unresolved item 335/389/85-28-03: The adequacy of the at-power moderator temperature coefficeient procedure as written and approved is in question. The procedure originally reviewed was OP 320051 (Revision 0). Since that time the licensee has revised the procedure and issued Revision 1 on March 13, 1986. The revised procedure contains adequate guidance on the collection and <u>analysis</u> of the required data. Based upon this observation and discussions with the licensee, this item is closed.

Attachments:

- 1. RCSLK9 Parameter List Unit 1
- RCSLK9 Results Unit 1
- 3. Fit of 13 Observations
- 4. Fit of 10 Observations
- 5. TPDCER2 Plant Parameters Unit 1
- 6. TPDCER2 Plant Parameters Unit 2
- 7. TPDCER2 Heat Balance Data Unit 2 (4 pages)

, i

•

5.a • 1 ,

۰. ٩ . ,

54 1 4

2 .

٩ 2 A. . .

. я

1

۰. ۲ * *

PARAMETER LIST

Unit Identification: Plant Name Unit Number Docket Number Nuclear Steam System Supplier Vessel and Piping: Volume Pressurizer: Level Units Temperature Compensated Calibration Curve Slope Upper Level Limit Lower level Limit Relief Volume Control Tank: Level Units Calibration Curve Slope Upper Level Limit Lower level limit Geometric Method Available Drain Tank: Level Units Calibration Curve Slope Upper Level Limit Lower level limit Geometric Method Available Quench Tank: Level Units Calibratio<u>n</u> Curve Slope Upper Level Limit Lower level limit Geometric Method Available

ST. LUCIE 1 . 50-335 Combustion Engineering

9218 cubic feet

१ No

559.05 pounds per % 96.5 % 10.1 % Quench Tank

ક્ર

ક્ર

281.5 pounds per % 100 % 0 % No

%
145 pounds per %
60 %
20 %
No

137.44 pounds per % 60 % 50 % No

NRC

INDEPENDENT MEASUREMENTS PROGRAM

REACTOR COOLING SYSTEM LEAK RATES

STATION	:	ST. LUCIE		TEST DATE :	4 November	1986
UNIT	:	1		START TIME:	0800	
DOCKET	:	50-335	I.	DURATION	3.25 hours	

TEST DATA

Suctor Donomotors	Initial	Final
System Parameters		
Pressure, psia T Ave, degrees F	2250 571.75	2250 571.5
Water Levels	•	
Pressurizer, % Quench Tank, % Volume Control Tank, % Drain Tank, %	67 53.5 50.5 27	66.8 60.5 51 28.5
Water Charged = 210 gal	Water Drained	= 0 gal

TEST RESULTS

Change in Water Inventory in pounds:

Vessel & Piping Pressurizer	166 -112	Quench Tank (1) Drain Tank (1)	962 218
Volume Control Tank (Less: Water Charged Plus: Water Drained	(1) 141 1748 0	Collected Leakage	1180
Cooling System	-1553	,	

Leak Rates in gpm (3):

...

Gross	0.96
Identified	0.73
Unidentified	0.23

- (1) Determined from tank calibration curve.
- (2) Determined from tank dimensions.
- (3) The density used for converting inventory change to leak rate was 62.31 pounds/cubic foot based on standard conditions.







.

, p1 τ.

۰ ۰ , , , , **•**

71

· . 1 4 · ·

;

• L -1 · · · · · · 1 **4** 9 . . .



Plant Parameters

Identification

ڊ

Plant Name

ST. LUCIE 1

Unit Number

1

Reactor Coolant System

Piping and Components

Number of coolant loops	2 (2	!/3)
Pump power	4.53 MV	Veach
Pump efficiency	93.3 pe	ercent
Pressurizer inner diameter	95.3125 ir	nches

Reflective Thermal Insulation

Surface area	13350	sq ft
Heat loss coefficient	W 240	BTUs/hr-sq ft

Nonreflective Thermal Insulation

Surface area Thickness	8800 3	sq ft inches DAME (by ft D	
Thermal conductivity	.39	BTUs/hr-ft-F	

Steam Generators

Moisture carry-over.2percentDome inside diameter232.5inchesLow level downcomer O.D.156.25inchesHigh level downcomer O.D.230.125inchesLow water level79.656inchesHigh water level155.656inches

W - Warning, Data or Parameters preceded by W are suspicious or in error.



Plant Parameters

Identification .					
Plant Name	-	SI	r. LUCIE		
Unit Number	1	2			
Read	ctor Coolant Syst	em			
Piping and Components					
Number of coolant loop Pump power Pump efficiency Pressurizer inner diam	s eter		2 4.25 99 95.5625	(2/3) MW each percent inches	
Reflective Thermal Insulation	on				
Surface area Heat loss coefficient		Ŵ	13350 240	sq ft BTUs/hr∸sq ft	
Nonreflective Thermal Insul	ation				
Surface area Thickness Thermal conductivity	ų		8800 3 .39	sq ft inches BTUs/hr-ft-F	
Steam Generators				1	
Moisture carry-over Dome inside diameter Low level downcomer O. High level downcomer O Low water level High water level	D. .D.		.2 232.5 156.375 231.18 79.656 155.656	percent inches inches inches inches inches	

W - Warning, Data of Parameters preceded by W are suspicious or in error.

ĺ

Heat Balance Data, Data Set 1

.

	Time	951	0000-2400 hours			
Letdown Line						
	Letdown Flow Letdown Temperature	34.27 195.6	gpm deg. F			
Char	ging Line					
	Charging Flow Charging Temperature	43.07 110.1	gpm deg. F			
Pres	surizer					
	Pressure Water Level	2250 201	psia inches			
Reac	tor					
	T ave T cold	573.88 549	deg. F deg. F			
Stea	m Generator A					
	Steam pressure Feedwater Flow Feedwater Temperature Surface Blowdown Bottom Blowdown Water level Moisture carry-over	859.8 5.869 437.1 0 24.48 123 .2	psia E6 lb/hr deg. F gpm gpm inches percent			
Stea	m Generator B -	t				
	Steam pressure Feedwater Flow Feedwater Temperature Surface Blowdown Bottom Blowdown Water level Moisture carry-over	868.8 6.04 435.9 0 20.21 117 .2	psia E6 lb/hr deg. F gpm gpm inches percent			



ų,

.

Ŧ

ς

Heat Balance Data, Data Set 2

Time	1005	0000-2400 hours			
Letdown Line					
Letdown Flow Letdown Temperature	35.09 195.3	gpm deg. F			
Charging Line					
Charging Flow Charging Temperature	43.47 110.1	gpm deg. F			
Pressurizer		u.			
Pressure Water Level	2250 201	psia inches			
Reactor					
T ave T cold	573.88 548.95	deg.F deg.F			
Steam Generator A					
Steam pressure Feedwater Flow Feedwater Temperature Surface Blowdown Bottom Blowdown Water level Moisture carry-over	859.8 5.868 437 0 25.17 123 .2	psia E6 lb/hr deg. F gpm gpm inches percent			
Steam Generator B -					
Steam pressure Feedwater Flow Feedwater Temperature Surface Blowdown Bottom Blowdown Water level Moisture carry-over	868.4 6.06 435.8 0 20.43 117 .2	psia E6 lb/hr deg. F gpm gpm inches percent			



.



96 .

• • •



TPDCER2 HEAT BALANCE

.

Plant Name : ST. LUCIE

Unit No.: 2

. .

Date : 11/06/86

Docket No. : 50-389

DATA SET 1 0951 hours	ENTHALPY (BTUs/lb)	FLOW (E6 lb/hr)	POWER (E9 BTUH)	POWER (MWt)
STEAM GENERATOR	A			
Steam Feedwater Surface Blowdow Bottom Blowdown	1196.3 416.1 520.1 466.6	5.859 -5.869 0.00000 0.00983	7.009 -2.442 0.00000 0.00458	
Power Dissipat	ed		4.5715	1339.8
STEAM GENERATOR	В			
Steam Feedwater Surface Blowdow Bottom Blowdown	1196.0 414.8 2n 521.6 466.6	6.032 -6.040 0.00000 0.00811	7.214 -2.506 0.00000 0.00379	
Power Dissipat	ed		4.7125	1381.1
OTHER COMPONENTS				
Letdown Line Charging Line Pressurizer Pumps Insulation Loss	168.8 83.9 611.5	0.01667 -0.02152 -0.00002	0.00281 -0.00181 -0.00001 -0.05742 0.00971	
Power Dissipat	ed		-0.04672	-13.7
REACTOR POWER				2707.3



FLOW POWER DATA SET 2 ENTHALPY POWER 1005 hours (BTUs/lb) (E6 lb/hr) (E9 BTUH) (MWt) STEAM GENERATOR A 1196.3 5.858 7.008 Steam Feedwater 416.0 -5.868 -2.441 Surface Blowdown 520.1 0.00000 0.00000 Bottom Blowdown 466.5 0.01010 0.00471 _____ 4.5712 1339.7 Power Dissipated STEAM GENERATOR B Steam 1196.0 6.052 7.238 Feedwater 414.7 -6.060 -2.513 Surface Blowdown 521.5 0.00000 0.00000 Bottom Blowdown 466.5 0.00820 0.00383 ____ Power Dissipated 4.7288 1385.9 OTHER COMPONENTS Letdown Line 168.5 0.01707 0.00288 Charging Line 83.9 -0.02172 - 0.00182-0.00002 -0.00001 Pressurizer 611.5 -0.05742Pumps Insulation Losses 0.00971 _____ Power Dissipated -0.04667 -13.7 2712.0 REACTOR POWER

. .

•

--