

86 OCT 16 All : 5 OCTOBER 13 1986
L-86-419

Dr. J. Nelson Grace
Regional Administrator, Region II
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
101 Marietta St., N.W., Suite 2900
Atlanta, GA 30323

Dear Dr. Grace:

Re: Turkey Point Units 3 and 4
St. Lucie Units 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-250, 50-251, 50-335, 50-389
Systemmatic Assessment of Licensee Performance


Florida Power & Light Company has reviewed the Systemmatic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) report dated August 21, 1986. Included with that report were Inspection Reports 50-250/86-27, 50-251/86-27, 50-335/86-13 and 50-389/86-12.

We concur that performance at the St. Lucie Plant continued to be excellent and that performance at the Turkey Point Plant was improved over the period. We regret that better ratings for Turkey Point could not be justified, but understand the rating system and do not take issue with the mentioned values.

We have attached other clarifying comments concerning the details of the report for your consideration.

Should you or your staff have any questions on these comments, please contact us.

Very truly yours,


C. O. Woody
Group Vice President
Nuclear Energy

COW/PLP/cab

Attachment

cc: Harold F. Reis, Esquire

8610220076 861013
PDR ADDCK 05000250
Q PDR

TEO/

1954

...

...

...

...

...

...

RE: Docket # 50-250, 50,251
50-335, & 50-389

Attachment

St. Lucie Plant SALP Clarifying Comments

SALP Enclosure 2, Section IV B.1 Radiological Controls

The first comment concerns the reference to an inadvertant personal overexposure associated with steam generator sludge lancing activities. The SALP report has referenced NRC inspection report 335/86-01 as the source of the information. The Notice of Violation contained two areas in which the violation was identified:

Failure to establish radiation protection procedures.

Failure to perform adequate surveys (evaluations) of individual exposures.

The violation was issued as a result of a special, announced inspection in an area concerning the potential of whole body radiation exposure in excess of 10CFR20 limits. FPL concurs there was a potential to exceed the limits and the NRC issued the violation based on the potential for an overexposure.

SALP Enclosure 2, Section IV H.1 Outages.

The Outage portion of the evaluation expressed an NRC recommendation that FPL implement a more detailed and disciplined search for fuel failure mechanisms, during the next refueling outage. This was based on the additional fuel failures experienced since the last Unit 1 refueling outage. NRC should consider that with an 18 month refuel cycle, fuel performance improvements may require 4.5 years to be fully implemented. With less than 0.05% failed fuel rods at the end of Cycle 6, FPL sought to improve and will continue to seek improvements in fuel performance.

