

DISTRIBUTION AFTER ISSUANCE OPERATING LICENSE

NRC FORM 195
(2-78)

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NUMBER
50-250/251/335
FILE NUMBER

NRC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL

TO:
Mr. V. Stello

FROM:
Oak Ridge National Lab
Oak Ridge, Tennessee
L. G. Oakes

DATE OF DOCUMENT
1/17/78

DATE RECEIVED
1/24/78

LETTER
 ORIGINAL
 COPY

NOTORIZED
 UNCLASSIFIED

PROP INPUT FORM

NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED
1 SIGNED

DESCRIPTION

(1-P)

RJL 1/24/78

PLANT NAME: Turkey Point 3 & 4
St. Lucie 1

ENCLOSURE

Review of ltr. from Robert Uhrig (FPL)
to George Lear (USNRC) dtd. 12/14/77..

(2-P)

1 ENCL

SAFETY FOR ACTION/INFORMATION

BRANCH CHIEF: (7)	<i>LEAR</i>
(7)	<i>DAVIS</i>

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION


<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> REG FILE			
<input type="checkbox"/> NRC PDR			
<input type="checkbox"/> T & E (2)			
<input type="checkbox"/> OET-D			
<input type="checkbox"/> MANAGER			
<input type="checkbox"/> ENGINEER			
<input type="checkbox"/> EISENHILT			
<input type="checkbox"/> SHAO			
<input type="checkbox"/> BAER			
<input type="checkbox"/> BITTLER			
<input type="checkbox"/> BRIMES			
<input type="checkbox"/> U. COLLINS			
<input type="checkbox"/> U. MCCOY			
<input type="checkbox"/> STELLO			

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

(2)	
LEDR: <i>MIAMI / FT. PIERCE FLA.</i>	
FIC	
NSIC	
ACRS 16 CYS SENT CATEGORY <i>R</i>	

CONTROL NUMBER

9
780240251



OAK RIDGE NATIONAL LABORATORY

OPERATED BY
UNION CARBIDE CORPORATION
NUCLEAR DIVISION



POST OFFICE BOX X
OAK RIDGE, TENNESSEE 37830

January 17, 1978



Mr. V. Stello, Director
Division of Operating Reactors
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Mr. Stello:

Review of Letter from Robert Uhrig (FPL)
to George Lear (USNRC) Dated December 14, 1977

We have reviewed a letter (with enclosure) from Mr. Robert Uhrig, Florida Power and Light, to Mr. George Lear, USNRC, dated December 14, 1977, Docket Nos. 50250, 50251, and 50335. This letter was in response to a Request for Information.

It is our opinion that further clarification is needed as detailed in the attached commentary.

Sincerely,

L. C. Oakes

PJ

Attachment

cc: R. Brodsky, DOE
W. R. Butler, NRC
F. H. Clark
S. J. Ditto
H. N. Hill
T. A. Ippolito, NRC
G. D. McDonald, NRC
F. R. Mynatt
T. W. Reddoch
F. Rosa, NRC
D. B. Trauger

780240251

1947
1948
1949
1950
1951
1952
1953
1954
1955
1956
1957
1958
1959
1960
1961
1962
1963
1964
1965
1966
1967
1968
1969
1970
1971
1972
1973
1974
1975
1976
1977
1978
1979
1980
1981
1982
1983
1984
1985
1986
1987
1988
1989
1990
1991
1992
1993
1994
1995
1996
1997
1998
1999
2000
2001
2002
2003
2004
2005
2006
2007
2008
2009
2010
2011
2012
2013
2014
2015
2016
2017
2018
2019
2020
2021
2022
2023
2024
2025

1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025

1947 1948 1949 1950 1951 1952 1953 1954 1955 1956 1957 1958 1959 1960 1961 1962 1963 1964 1965 1966 1967 1968 1969 1970 1971 1972 1973 1974 1975 1976 1977 1978 1979 1980 1981 1982 1983 1984 1985 1986 1987 1988 1989 1990 1991 1992 1993 1994 1995 1996 1997 1998 1999 2000 2001 2002 2003 2004 2005 2006 2007 2008 2009 2010 2011 2012 2013 2014 2015 2016 2017 2018 2019 2020 2021 2022 2023 2024 2025

COMMENTARY ON LETTER 12/14/77, UHRIG (FPL) TO LEAR (USNRC)*

Question 1

The response to 1.3 gives limitations on the line based on long-term operation. It does not phrase an operational dictum like "The line may be operated at above x amperes but not exceeding y amperes for a time not to exceed z minutes," where z is a number small enough to provide operational guidance. We presume there is no such operational guideline.

Line sag is computed for two different temperatures, but no indication is given as to what the temperature of the line was when it relayed open. Can we presume that there is no recorded data on the line current over this 16-minute period (10:08-10:24) from which a temperature profile could be determined?


It was made very clear at the November 18 meeting that all conclusions should be supported by the data on which they were based. It was also made clear that because relays are more apt to respond to transient peak stress conditions than to interval average conditions, an estimate of average interval conditions serves little purpose. The power estimates given in 1.6 fail on both these counts. Therefore, we request the 16-minute (10:08-10:24) record of each variable that was used in making this power calculation and a sample of how the calculation was made. Also a reference is made in this response to past history of division of the load (between the two Ft. Myers-Ranch lines). If there are records of such a division of transmission on these lines at approximately 500-600 MW total power, please furnish them. In a dynamic situation such as the system was then experiencing would the relative loading of the two lines be expected to oscillate so that an average relative loading would not reflect peak conditions on one?

Also, in the response to 1.6, oscillogram records from Ringling are included; oscillogram records from Broward and Midway are cited but not included. Please, therefore, furnish copies of the Broward and Midway oscillogram records. Oscillogram records at locations remote from a fault cannot be interpreted without some knowledge of the intervening circuitry, particularly transformer coupling. Therefore, please furnish the indicated intervening circuitry description for Ringling, Broward, and Midway.

Question 2

The response "We have concluded that the Turkey Point trip could not, by itself, have caused the line to relay" is not supported. Furnish any supporting analysis with full description.

* Attachment to letter from L. C. Oakes to V. Stello, "Review of Letter from Robert Uhrig (FPL) to George Lear (USNRC) dated December 14, 1977," dated January 17, 1978.



Question 3

The response to Question 3 appears to suggest that the calculation involving the loss of Turkey Point 4 in the FCG study is to be considered to bound the events which occurred around 10:08 on 5/16/77. If this suggestion is intended, furnish a detailed description of this calculation showing relevant detail which causes it to be regarded as bounding.

Question 6

The response to Question 6 is unclear in some respects. It is our understanding that Southern Co. and Florida Power and Light have not yet entered an agreement for a 500 kV Georgia-Florida tie. Is that correct? It is our understanding that the 800 MW interchange capability from Georgia to Florida which was, according to referenced FPL reports, to be ready in 1976 is not yet available. Is that correct?

Question 7

The reply to Question 7.3 does not contain the discussion requested and is not satisfactory.

U.S. NRC
DISTRIBUTION SERVICES
BRANCH

978 JAN 24 AM 9 13

RECEIVED DOCUMENT
CONTROL DESK