

DISTRIBUTION AFTER ISSUANCE OPERATING LICENSE

NRC FORM 195 (2-78)	U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION	DOCKET NUMBER <i>50-250/251/335</i>
NRC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL		FILE NUMBER

TO: Mr. V. Stello	FROM: Oak Ridge National Lab Oak Ridge, Tennessee L. C. Oakes	DATE OF DOCUMENT 1/17/78
		DATE RECEIVED 1/24/78

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> LETTER	<input type="checkbox"/> NOTORIZED	<input type="checkbox"/> PROP	<input type="checkbox"/> INPUT FORM	NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ORIGINAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED			<i>1 SIGNED</i>
<input type="checkbox"/> COPY				

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"/> <del>ENGINEER</del>			
<input type="checkbox"/> EISENHILT			
<input type="checkbox"/> SHAO			
<input type="checkbox"/> BAER			
<input type="checkbox"/> BITTLER			
<input type="checkbox"/> CRIMES			
<input type="checkbox"/> U. COLLINS			
<input type="checkbox"/> <del>U. MCCOUGH</del>			
<input type="checkbox"/> STELLO			

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION	CONTROL NUMBER
LEDR: <i>(2) MIAMI / FT. PIERCE FLA.</i>	<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 5px; display: inline-block;"> <i>7</i> 780240251                 </div>
FIC	
NSIC	
ACRS 16 CYS SENT CATEGORY <i>R</i>	



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