

ACCELERATED DISTRIBUTION DEMONSTRATION SYSTEM

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8809090047 DOC. DATE: 88/08/17 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-250 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 3, Florida Power and Light C 05000250
 50-251 Turkey Point Plant, Unit 4, Florida Power and Light C 05000251
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 CONWAY, W.F. Florida Power & Light Co.
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 GRACE, J.N. Region 2, Ofc of the Director

866
RFB

SUBJECT: Forwards mgt on shift (MOS) weekly rept, per NRC 871019
 order. Plant supervisor-nuclear shift repts also encl.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: D036D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 53
 TITLE: Turkey Point Management Onshift Program

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
	DRP/ADR-2	1 1	NRR/DRP-1/2	1 1
	PD2-2 PD	1 1	EDISON, G	2 2
INTERNAL:	AEOD	1 1	DEDRO	1 1
	NRR DEPY	1 1	NRR DIR	1 1
	NRR MORISSEAU, D	1 1	NRR/ADP 12-G-18	1 1
	NRR/ADT 12-G-18	1 1	NRR/DLPQ/PEB	1 1
	NRR/DOEA DIR 11	1 1	NRR/DRIS DIR 9A	1 1
	NUDOCS-ABSTRACT	1 1	OE LIEBERMAN, J	1 1
	OGC/HDS2	1 1	REG FILE	1 1
	RGN2 FILE 01	1 1		
EXTERNAL:	LPDR	1 1	NRC PDR	1 1
	NSIC	1 1		

IA-3

original
To: Region 2

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 23 ENCL 23

FPL

10:58

AUGUST 17 1988

L-88-354

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

Dear Dr. Grace:

Re: Turkey Point Units 3 and 4
Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251
Management-on-Shift Weekly Report

Pursuant to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Order dated October 19, 1987, the attached summary of Management-on-Shift (MOS) reports is submitted. The Plant Supervisor-Nuclear Shift Reports are also being submitted.

Should there be any questions on this information, please contact us.

Very truly yours,

W. F. Conway

W. F. Conway
Senior Vice President - Nuclear

WFC/SDF/gp

Attachment

cc: J. Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement, USNRC
Dr. G. E. Edison, Project Manager, NRR; USNRC
Senior Resident Inspector, USNRC, Turkey Point Plant
R. E. Tallon, President, FPL

mos001

8809090047 880817
PDR ADOCK 05000250
R PDC

an FPL Group company

*Original
To: Region 2
9036
1/1*

MANAGEMENT ON SHIFT (MOS)

WEEKLY SUMMARY REPORT

WEEK STARTING: 08/05/88

PAGE 1 OF 2

Six MOS Observers were on shift: James E. Jones, Westinghouse Electric Corporation (08/08-12/88, nights); Dave Powell, Operating Experience Feedback Coordinator, Juno Beach (08/05-08/88, days); Craig D. Bersak, Westinghouse Electric Corporation (08/05-08/88, nights); Russell Gouldy, Principal Engineer, Nuclear Licensing, Juno Beach (08/08-12/88, days); Howard L. Schneider, Turkey Point Nuclear Plant Quality Planned Maintenance Special Projects Supervisor (08/05-08/88, nights); and Paul Banaszak, Turkey Point Nuclear Plant Electrical Engineer (08/08-12/88, nights).

Both Units 3 and 4 operated in Mode 1 for the duration of the reporting period.

No immediate safety problems were noted by any Observer during the reporting period.

The Independent Observers noted one questionable work practice concerning inadequate Health Physics control of a potentially contaminated area. They also noted twelve areas for improvements as follows:

- Three recommendations to improve operating procedures.
- Two recommended hardware modifications for the intake structure.
- Two recommendations to supply additional information to the Control Room.
- Three recommendations concerning broken equipment.
- A recommendation to use a higher alarm setpoint for a pump bearing.
- A concern over inadequate communication to operators of equipment repair status.

ATTACHMENT: MOS DAILY REPORTS

8809090047

MANAGEMENT ON SHIFT (MOS)

WEEKLY SUMARY REPORT

WEEK STARTING: 08/05/88

PAGE 2 OF 2

The Turkey Point Observers noted one questionable work practice regarding a heavy piece of test equipment not adequately restrained. They noted seven areas for improvement as follows:

- Three comments on procedure problems.
- Two comments on housekeeping.
- A recommendation to use a portable demineralizer.
- A concern regarding the labelling on fuses. This concern was echoed by an Independent Observer.

The Plant Supervisors-Nuclear (PSNs) noted one questionable work practice regarding the Intake Cooling Water travelling screens. The recommendation is to run the screens constantly until the differential pressure instrument is repaired. They also noted one related area for improvement, specifically to replace the copper tubing with plastic on the differential pressure sensor. This recommendation was also echoed by an Independent Observer.



Date 08/05/88

Shift Report

Shift Mids

Shift Management

Don Salkeld APSN Singer/Reese NWE Eddinger

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By [Signature] Date 8/8/88 Actions Completed Date

Date 08/05/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Peaks _____

Shift Management

Wogan

APSN

Singer

NWE

Vetromile

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By K. P. Case Date 8/8/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/05/88

From: David Powell
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day
☐ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Normal Unit operation, Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Unit 3 flux mapping
- Corrective maintenance, Unit 3 - N-44 Drawer
- Shift turnover
- Plant tours

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

During the 4A and 4B Containment Spray (CS) pump test conducted on Wednesday, August 3, 1988, some problems occurred as a result of poor Health Physics (HP) coverage by one individual. The details of the event are noted below. The observations were discussed with the HP Supervisor Wednesday afternoon and again on Thursday morning with members of his staff. Corrective actions were taken and provided to me today. A copy of the evaluation is attached for information. I have held off reporting this event until I could provide the corrective actions that were given to me today.

Event description:

Prior to the CS pump test an I&C Specialist had to vent a gage in the CS room. Effluent from the gage is potentially contaminated and therefore he was dressed in protective clothing and the room was monitored for airborne activity. During this evolution some liquid effluent inadvertently spilled onto the floor next to one of the CS pumps. The water was wiped up and the I&C Specialist left the room and proceeded to the Unit 4 Boric Acid Evaporator Room control point to undress. (Note: I did not witness the spill, but I did witness the I&C Specialist go to the control point - the other information was provided to me after the fact).

After the I&C Specialist left the room, the individuals who were to perform the pump test were then allowed to enter the room. They were told by the HP Technician who monitored the venting that they would need to put on some protective shoe covering. I went down to watch the test about two minutes later. (I did not enter the room because of the number of people in the room, the fact that it was a radioactive area and I could see everything from the doorway.) Shortly after I arrived, another individual, who was to perform thermography on the pumps, entered the room along with a different HP Technician. Neither of these individuals were wearing protective shoe coverings. The new HP Technician did not seem concerned about it (this part of the CS room is posted as a clean area), so I thought the other individuals were just being cautious while working in the room.



When the test had concluded, one individual began to leave the room and I asked him why he was wearing the protective shoe covers. He indicated that one of the HP Technicians had told the group of the spill and that they had to wear the shoe coverings in case there was further contamination. At that point I indicated that we should talk to the other HP Technicians. The above information was discussed with these Technicians and they immediately went to the area, told everyone to stand fast and took swipes of the area. No contamination was found so the rest of the personnel were allowed to leave the room. I later talked to the HP Technicians who were present and they indicated that the first HP Technician had gone on break. They also indicated that they were not made aware of any of the information prior to his leaving.

In summary please note that:

1. The I&C Specialist should not have been allowed to leave the room because at the point he spilled the effluent he became potentially contaminated. However, no control point or step off pad had been put in place for this evolution so I presume it was more expedient to send him down the passageway to the control point noted above.
2. No one should have been allowed into the room until the area had been thoroughly cleaned and new swipes taken.
3. The area should have been posted and roped off until it was cleaned or verified to be a clean area.
4. The HP Technician should not have left the area to go on break until all of the information had been passed onto the other HP Technicians.

It is fortunate that these events occurred in a relatively clean area and the work that was performed was not likely to create a major contamination problem. Perhaps more cautious actions would have been taken had the work been performed in a more radiologically hazardous area, however, the rules and procedures we follow do not make any distinction when considering contaminated or potentially contaminated. They must be adhered to at all times by everyone; complacency cannot be allowed under any circumstances.

The HP Supervisor was very concerned about this event and he has taken immediate action to assure that similar occurrences will not occur. (~~See attached Radiological Investigation report~~). He has disciplined the responsible HP Technician. I concur with his actions.



D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Normal shift - Control Room activities.

Completed By: David Powell
MOS ObserverDate: 08/05/88Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - NuclearDate: 8/8/88Management
Review By:*[Signature]* *[Signature]* *[Signature]* *[Signature]*
PM-N Date SNP for Date VP Date

08/05/88

FINAL PAGE

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/05-06/88

From: H. L. Schneider
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Unit 3, 100% power operation
- Unit 4, 100% power operation
- Beginning of mid shift meeting

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

No recommendations

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Toured various plant areas.

Completed By: H. L. Schneider
MOS Observer

Date: 08/05-06/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:*[Signature]* 8/8/88 *[Signature]* 8/8/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/05-06/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/05-06/88

From: Craig D. Bersak
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Shift turnover and meeting
- Plant tours

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

- D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Quiet, routine shift.

Completed By: Craig D. Bersak
MOS Observer

Date: 08/05-06/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:

KC 18/8/88 KC 15/7/88
PM-N Date SVP for Date VP Date

08/05-06/88



Date 08/06/88

Shift Report

Shift Mids

Shift Management

Salkeld

APSN

Singer/Reese

NWE

Eddinger

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By *[Signature]* Date 8/8/88 Actions Completed Date

Date 08/06/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Peaks _____

Shift Management

Wogan

APSN

Singer

NWE

Vetromile

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By G. J. [Signature] Date 8/8/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/06/88

From: David Powell
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day
☐ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- o Normal plant operations - Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- o Shift turnover
- o Unit/Plant tours
- o Heat Exchanger cleaning

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Few activities in comparison to the weekly work effort. This made the Control Room routine a bit slower-paced. The work that was observed was performed well. Several supervisors and the Operations Superintendent were on site. Partly in response to the elevated Unit 3 Containment temperature and Component Cleaning Water (CCW) Heat Exchanger cleaning concerns. This was particularly helpful to the PSN/APSN who discussed the concerns and proposed actions with these individuals at length.

Control Room operations were performed in a routine but thorough manner.

Completed By: David Powell
MOS Observer

Date: 08/06/88

Reviewed By: *S. W. Pearce*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:

JSC 18/8/88 *JSC* 18/8/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/06-07/88

From: H. L. Schneider
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Unit 3, 100% power operation
- Unit 4, 100% power operation
- Beginning of mid shift meeting

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

- D. Areas for Improvement

No recommendations

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Toured various plant areas.

Completed By: H. L. Schneider
MOS Observer

Date: 08/06-07/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] PM-N [Signature] Date [Signature] SVP [Signature] Date [Signature] VP [Signature] Date

08/06-07/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/06-07/88

From: Craig D. Bersak
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Shift turnover and meeting
- Plant tour

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

No formal guidance is available to the operators, e.g., procedure steps, to direct the 2201 valve watches to isolate Intake Cooling Water (ICW) to Turbine Plant Cooling Water when necessary. A set of parameters should be developed and incorporated into the Emergency Operating Procedures (EOPs) (foldout pages possibly) to direct initiation of this action.

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

A controlled listing of the specific components served on each critical and non-critical heat tracing circuit should be provided the NWE/Admin. RCO to assist in clearance preparation. (Need identified by NWE).

Consideration should be given to establishing and maintaining an index and copies of Justification for Continued Operations (JCOs) for use by the PSN and Control Room staff.

Completed By: Craig D. Bersak
MOS Observer

Date: 08/06-07/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] PM-N [Signature] Date [Signature] SVP [Signature] Date [Signature] VP [Signature] Date

08/06-07/88

Shift Report

Date 08/07/88

Shift _____ Mids _____

Shift Management

N Salkeld APSN Guyer NWE Eddinger

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By *A. S. Pearce* Date 8/8/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____



Date 08/07/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Peaks _____

Shift Management

EN Wogan APSN Singer NWE Vetromile

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By L. A. Parce Date 8/8/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/07/88

From: David Powell
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day
☐ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Normal plant operations, Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Shift turnover
- Plant tours

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Very quiet day. Shift operations were conducted in a professional and thorough manner.

Completed By: David R. Powell
MOS Observer

Date: 08/07/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:*[Signature]* PM-N *[Signature]* Date *[Signature]* SVP *[Signature]* Date *[Signature]* VP *[Signature]* Date



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/07-08/88

From: Craig D. Bersak
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Shift turnover and meeting
- Plant tour

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Quiet, routine shift

Completed By: Craig D. Bersak
MOS Observer

Date: 08/07-08/88

Reviewed By: *L. W. Pounce*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:*McC* PM-N *Doyle* Date *McC* SVP *McC* Date *McC* VP *McC* Date

08/07-08/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/07-08/88

From: H. L. Schneider
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Unit 3, 100% power operation
- Unit 4, 100% power operation
- Beginning of mid shift meeting

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

No recommendations

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Toured various plant areas. Good information exchange during shift meetings.

Completed By: H. L. Schneider
MOS Observer

Date: 08/07-08/88

Reviewed By: *H. L. Schneider*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/8/88

Management
Review By:*PM-N* *8/8/88* *SVP* *8/8/88* *VP* *8/8/88*

08/07-08/88



Date 08/08/88

Shift Report

Shift Mids

Shift Management

Salkeld APSN Guyer NWE Eddinger

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By L. W. Pearce Date 8/8/88 Actions Completed Date

Date 08/08/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Peaks _____

Shift Management

PSN Jones APSN Haley NWE _____

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

viewed By *LaPearce* Date 8/9/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____



Date 08/09/88

Shift Report

Shift Mids

Shift Management

Salkeld

APSN

Guyer

NWE

Eddinger

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By *Sw Puma* Date 8/9/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/08/88

From: Russell Gouldy
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day
☐ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Shift turnovers (mid to day; day to peak)
- Unit 4 Rod Control System stepping surveillance
- Unit 4 Process Radiation Monitoring System, R-15 operability test.
- Unit 3 Nuclear Instrumentation System Power Range Surveillance
- RO and SRO training walkthroughs for upcoming NRC exam

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

There is no better indicator of professionalism than performance.

Unit 3 set site longest run record, exceeding the 130 day previous record held by Unit 4.

Congratulations to the plant staff for obtaining such performance.

Completed By: Russell Gouldy
MOS Observer

Date: 08/08/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/9/88

Management
Review By:*[Signature]* 1 8/9/88 *[Signature]* 1 8/9/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/08/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/08-09/88

From: Paul Banaszak
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Both Units 3 and 4 at 100% power operation
- Shift turnover, peaks to mids
- Plant tour

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None noted

D. Areas for Improvement

1. Unit 3 Intake Cooling Water (ICW) lube water pressure gage PI-3-3641 gage face opaque - unable to read gage. PSN assisted with issuance of a PWO. (WA880809031143)
2. Train A Emergency Diesel Generator (EDG) air compressor air filter loose. PSN assisted with issuance of a PWO. (WA880809033218)

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

All individuals encountered expressed great team spirit and willingness to work together.

Lighting levels on the intake structure are greatly improved over what this observer noted several months back on contingency guard force duty.

Completed By: Paul Banaszak
MOS Observer

Date: 08/08-09/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/9/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] 8/9/88 [Signature] 8/9/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/08-09/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/08-09/88

From: James Jones
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Routine checks, Nuclear Instrumentation System (NIS) periodic, Reactor Coolant System (RCS) leak check
- Unit 4 Accumulator filling
- Intake structure tour
- Discharge canal tour

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

The Demineralized Water Storage Tank (DWST) or "BURT" Degasifier control panel vacuum pump "RUNNING" lens cover needs to be replaced. It has the threads broken off and was temporarily fixed by using white caulking or glue.

On the same panel many of the lights labels have nearly eroded away. New placards could be made up that are not made of aluminum that was painted - like the ones on the lower half of that panel which are made of plastic.

The Decant station, which is apparently not operational, down by the discharge canal is quite an eyesore. The electrical control panel is very rusted and full of holes.



E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

The Unit 4 RCO responded well towards investigation of the main transformer temperature rising since about 3:30 A. M.

Improvements can easily be seen at the Intake Structure since my last MOS visit; painting, lighting improvements and Weir pit reconstruction are evidence of improvements in the general upkeep and maintenance of this area.

Completed By: James Jones

MOS Observer

Date: 08/08-09/88

Reviewed By: *Lawrence*

Operations Superintendent- Nuclear

Date: 8/9/88

Management
Review By:

W. Gore 18/9/88 *Joe* 18/9/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/08-09/88



Date 08/08/88

Shift Report

Shift K. Hart
Days

Shift Management

Anderson

APSN

Reese

NWE Dallau

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

None

Reviewed By SW Pearce Date 8/10/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____



Date 08/09/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Peaks _____

Shift Management

Jones

APSN

Haley

NWE

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

Operations Department should keep traveling screens running constantly until our Pressure Differential (Delta P) indicators across traveling screens is working.

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

We really need to replace the tubing for Pressure Differential (Delta P) across traveling screens expeditiously, because it could effect our load output as it did tonight. May I suggest we use poly-flow tubing as they do at St. Lucie and Turkey Point 1 and 2. Why should we use copper tubing again and have more problems later on.

Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Reviewed By SW Peave Date 8/10/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____

Date

08/10/88

Shift Report

Shift

Mids

Shift Management

PSN

Murphy

APSN

Singer

NWE

Fernandez

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Mechanical Maintenance did a great overall job on the traveling screens on Unit 4. Mechanical Maintenance supervision was there to direct the work; coordinate between Electrical Maintenance, Mechanical Maintenance, and Operations; and find necessary parts. We can all be proud of this and use it as an example for future endeavors.

Reviewed By

R.W. Pearce

Date

8/10/88

Actions Completed

Date



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/09/88

From: Russell Gouldy
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day
☐ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Dual Unit 100% power operations
- Shift turnovers (mids to days; days to peak)
- Reviewed NO's log against plant indication - all satisfactory
- Walkdown of Unit 3 Containment Sprinkler system, JCO review and temporary procedure usage
- Walkdown of secondary side drain, alternate dumps and trap valve for proper operation and leak free conditions
- Unit 3 Intake Blockage on 3B1 and 3B2 intake well. Peak shift troubleshoot the problem. Cycled pumps - limited unit transient to only a 10 MWE loss.

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

Control Room inaccessibility procedure O-ONOP-103 is posted at the Control room door so operators can grab the copy as they evacuate the Control Room. However, Document Control stamps the procedure with:

"This procedure may be affected by an On-The-Spot-Change (OTSC) verify information prior to use. Date verified _____ initials _____"

which means that the operator must go back into the Control Room and get the OTSC log to verify the procedure has not been revised. This condition exists on the annunciator response ONOP.

Corrective recommendation: If an OTSC is written against O-ONOP-103, attach it to the procedure. Document Control should remove the OTSC stamp from ONOPs and verify latest date.

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Good job by peak shift Operators for response. The ANPO had not gotten to this part of his first set of rounds early enough, such that when he got to the intake, the blockage had occurred. This event happened just after shift change (approximately 1 hour). Night shift MOS to follow-up on source of blockage and resolution.

Completed By: Russell Gouldy
MOS ObserverDate: 08/09/88Reviewed By: [Signature]
Operations Superintendent - NuclearDate: 8/10/88Management
Review By:

[Signature] PM-N 8/10/88 Date [Signature] SVP 8/10/88 Date [Signature] VP 1 Date

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/09-10/88

From: Paul Banaszak
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night**A. Plant Evolutions Observed**

- Operation of Unit 3 at 100% power
- Operation of Unit 4 at 100% power decreased to 50% and back to 80%.
- Shift turnover (peak to mids)
- Plant procedure 3-SMI-041.16 (delta T, Tav_g, setpoint checks)
- Efforts of Operations, Mechanical Maintenance and Electrical Maintenance in regards to resolution of problems associated with traveling screens

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None observed

C. Questionable Work Practices

None observed

D. Areas for Improvement

This Observer finds that probably more attention to detail should have been taken in monitoring operation of traveling screens. An existing MOS item from May, 1988 identified some concerns about inactive delta P monitoring systems and associated issues.

Surveillance should be revised to monitor screen operation by observing motor operation and screen movement until a working delta P monitoring system can be in place.

In regards to the observance of the procedure 3-SMI 041.16, the I&C Specialist did follow the procedure. He was familiar with the overall purpose but a new procedure (4/88) was in use which also removed CT-3-412.6 (step 6.1.1) from service. The Specialist did not know why since it wasn't done in the old procedure and the procedure did not identify the purpose. This is a concern for a possible lack of employee training or a procedure which contained unnecessary steps. Also the procedure and the data sheet were repetitious because signoff for same activities were required in both places.

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Operations, Mechanical Maintenance and Electrical Maintenance personnel should be recognized for their efforts to resolve problems on the Unit 4 traveling screens in a timely and cooperative manner.

Thanks to their efforts both units were kept on line to continue their record breaking performance for the benefit of our customers and shareholders.

Completed By: Paul Banaszak
MOS Observer

Date: 08/09-10/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/10/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] SEC 1 8/10/88 *[Signature]* ISO 1 8/10/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/09-10/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/09-10/88

From: James Jones
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night**A. Plant Evolutions Observed**

- Unit 3 at 100% power
- Unit 4 power reduction to approximately 60% power due to traveling screen clogging
- Subsequent return to power on Unit 4
- Maintenance repair on Unit 4 traveling screens
- T-average delta T Channel 432 - Unit 3 analog check

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

MOS items identified by PSN Gordon Jones (included in MOS item 88-1077) proved to be an important issue tonight. The traveling screen Pressure Differential (delta P) measurement/indication and auto start features do not work which caused a reduction in load for Unit 4 when grass debris prevented sufficient water flow thru the screens. Problems identified are:

1. The use of approved plastic tubing for delta P measurement lines would eliminate the corrosion aspect and preserve the operability of the delta P measurement and auto start feature. The traveling screen delta P measurement presently used copper tubing which deteriorates under the presence of salt and subsequent corrosion.
2. The traveling screen drive slip clutch spring tension should be checked on all drive units to ensure drive sprocket teeth and chain breakage do not reoccur. The slip clutch should function to prevent this breakage. The slip clutch prevented damage to the 4A1 screen but failed to prevent damage to the 4B1 and 4A2 units.
3. The #4 screenwash pump has seized up and broke the coupling between the pump and motor due to the pump being run dry. Engineering should evaluate lowering the pump to prevent loss of suction when it is most needed.

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Operations decided to issue a policy to keep the traveling screens running.

Until the traveling screens are working right it may be wise to have the ANPO ensure the "screens" are moving when he takes his logs and include the same check in procedure O-OP-011 section 5.2 under manual screen operation.

A well done to Bruce Adams and ANPO Anthony who by stopping a circulating pump prevented seizing up another screenwash pump.

The up-power and down-power transients were smoothly run and coordinated. The PSN maintained good control and observation during the impending problem with the traveling screens.

Completed By: James Jones
MOS Observer

Date: 08/09-10/88

Reviewed By: *James Jones*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/10/88

Management Review By: *Ref in Sec 1 8/10/88* *James Jones 8/10/88*
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/0-10/88

Date 08/10/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Days _____

Shift Management

Anderson

APSN

Reese

NWE Dallau

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Continuous record breaking operation of both units.

Reviewed By L. J. Parre Date 8/11/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____

Date 08/10/88

Shift Report

Shift Peaks

Shift Management

Jones

APSN

Haley

NWE

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By *P. H. H. H.* Date 8/11/88 Actions Completed Date

Date 08/11/88

Shift Report

Shift Mids

Shift Management

Murphy

APSN

Singer

NWE

Fernandez

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By *[Signature]* Date 8/11/88 Actions Completed Date

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/10/88

From: Russell Gouldy
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day
☐ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Unit 4 return to 100% power and Xenon follow
- Unit 3, 100% power operation
- Unit 4 Reactor protection surveillance
- Unit 3, Component Cooling Water (CCW) pump surveillance
- Unit 4, A Containment Spray (CS) pump surveillance preparation

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism/Summary of Shift, Comments

Good start of peak shift meeting to allow coordination of the Unit 3 CCW and CS pump test.

Completed By: Russell Gouldy
MOS Observer

Date: 08/10/88

Reviewed By: *R. J. [Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/11/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] 8/11/88 *[Signature]* 8/11/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/10-11/88

From: Paul Banaszak
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Unit 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Shift turnover (peaks to mids)
- Plant tour
- Execution of Rod Position Indication (RPI) surveillance procedure (4-PMI-028.2)

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

The portable station battery discharge tester is stored in the 3A D.C. Equipment Room. This rather large apparatus is mounted on 4 wheels and does not appear to be tied down. Could affect plant equipment. Should be investigated by Engineering and Electrical Maintenance for acceptability.

D. Areas for Improvement

Temporary electric cords are draped too low on handrail of staircase on south end of Unit 4 Turbine Building on mezzanine level. These cords in present location may result in a possible personnel safety concern (slip, trip or fall).

Filling of Chemical Lab tank on Auxillary Building roof requires 3 operators and affects continuous operation of water treatment plant and/or Ecolochem trallers. Use of a portable demineralizer on service water source in the Auxillary building would help alleviate this concern.



E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

During execution of RPI system surveillance (procedure 4-PMI-028.2) I&C peak shift Supervisor noted that most recent procedure revision inadvertently deleted test of Pulse Analog Module. An On-The-Spot-Change was written and test was performed. A job well done!

Approximately 1:45 A.M. a large increase in Unit 4 Containment Sump level occurred. Unit 4 Reactor Operator recognized possible source of problem, contacted Unit 4 Nuclear Operator and determined that the Nuclear Operator inadvertently initiated drain down of pressurizer relief tank instead of Reactor Coolant drain tank.

During event all Control Room personnel responded immediately to diagnose cause of the events.

Completed By: Paul Banaszak
MOS Observer

Date: 08/10-11/88

Reviewed By: [Signature]
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/11/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] 10/11/88 [Signature] 8/11/88
PM-N Date SVPI Date VP Date

08/10-11/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/09-10/88

From: James Jones

(MOS Observer)

Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Rod Position Indication (RPI) testing
- Pulse to Analog Converter troubleshooting

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

1. The ONOP for Reactor Control malfunctions consists of several different parts. Each part is mixed up with parts relating to other problems. For example: Immediate actions for different events are grouped together and subsequent actions are grouped together. The procedure is workable as it is, however, with the way it is laid out, there is more chance for mistakes since the procedure for an event is not all together or at least refer the user to the next appropriate section to be used.
2. Per discussions with non-licensed operators, several pieces of plant equipment have for some time either not worked properly in automatic and have had to be operated manually, or have not worked at all. The NLOs have submitted these deficiencies in the past with no significant results. They would like to see the new FPL management listen and correct some of their identified problems. This action would concur with the Enercon Report, section 5.3.2 "Upgrade the physical condition of the plant".

NLO problems identified are:

1. 250# reducing stations Units 3 and 4.
2. Condenser makeup and reject valves - Units 3 and 4
3. Desuperheaters - Units 3 and 4
4. Primary water tank deaerator
5. Others (per NLOs)

It is unclear why proper repairs cannot be completed on these items.



E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

None other than Paul Banaszak's MOS report.

Completed By: James Jones
MOS ObserverDate: 08/10-11/88Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent- NuclearDate: 8/11/88Management
Review By:*[Signature]* 8/11/88 *[Signature]* 8/11/88
M-N Date SVP Date VP Date
08/10-11/88

Date 08/11/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Days _____

Shift Management

P Schimkus APSN Guyer NWE Newton

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By L. P. Paine Date 8/12/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____



Date 08/11/88

Shift Report

Shift _____ Peaks _____

Shift Management

Jones

APSN

Haley

NWE

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By L.W. Pearce Date 8/12/88 Actions Completed _____ Date _____



Date 08/12/88

Shift Report

Shift Mids

Shift Management

P Murphy APSN Singer NWE Fernandez

A. Questionable Work Practices/Actions Taken/Recommendations

None

B. Areas for Improvement/Recommendations/Actions Taken

None

C. Good Practices/Professionalism Observed

Routine operations

Reviewed By R. W. Pearce Date 8/12/88 Actions Completed Date

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/11/88

From: Russell Gouldy
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☒ Day
☐ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Dual Unit 100% power operations
- Shift turnovers (mids to day, days to peak)
- 3B Containment Spray Pump (CSP) impeller replacement and testing
- Results of Unit 4 Pressurizer inspection which found a leak on a flanged valve cover
- Preparations by peak shift for possible dual Unit shutdown (Unit 3 received additional 48 hours to repair and replace 3B CSP inboard bearing)

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

None

E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments


Both shifts had heavy workloads at all positions in Operations and Maintenance.

Completed By: Russell Gouldy
MOS Observer

Date: 08/11/88

Reviewed By: 
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/12/88

Management
Review By: 1 8/12/88 1 8/12/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date
08/11/88

To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/11-12/88

From: Paul Banaszak
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Both Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Shift turnover, peaks to mids
- Plant procedure 3-OSP-090.1
- Plant tour

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

The west exit door to the laundry room is locked or binding such that exit from inside is prohibited. This is a personnel safety problem (fire exit) and a possible Health Physics (HP) contamination problem if one must exit from the east side door after removing protective clothing at west doorway.

During execution of Main Generator Exciter fuse inspection, procedure 3-OSP-090.1, it was evident that on Unit 3 all exciter fuses were not labeled as per the procedure. The Unit 3 Turbine Operator was going to write a PWO to label fuses.

Operations procedure 1200.1 (pressurizer steam space venting) and Nuclear Chemistry procedure NC-6 (Pressurizer Steam sampling) do not match up. Problems exist on valve lineups for manual valves 989A, 969B and 966. One or both procedures need revision.

Chemistry procedure NC-6 is not included in the procedure file in the administration building file. It would seem logical that all procedures should be controlled by the same set of rules and location.

There are some manholes sealed for appendix R commitments. They tend to collect water. The wet surface becomes slippery and a safety hazard. They should be coated with a non-slip coating.



E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

Routine operations. All operators, watchstanders and Maintenance personnel acted in a professional manner. Special thanks to the Health Physics Technician who let me out of the laundry room.

Completed By: Paul Banaszak
MOS Observer

Date: 08/11-12/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/12/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] 12/12/88 *[Signature]* 8/12/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/11-12/88



To: Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 08/11-12/88

From: James Jones
(MOS Observer)Shift: ☐ Day
☒ Night

A. Plant Evolutions Observed

- Units 3 and 4 at 100% power
- Unit 3 Containment Spray Pump (CSP) LCO in effect
- Pressurizer pressure and level surveillance
- Main Generator exciter fuse inspections - 3-OSP-090.1
- Old pressurizer spray valve flange leak technical specification review by Operations

B. Immediate Safety Problems

None

C. Questionable Work Practices

None

D. Areas for Improvement

1. During performance of main generator fuse inspection - 3-OSP-090.11, the numbers of each fuse could not be read. This is required to be logged if a blown fuse is seen. Unit 4 also observed - the fuse numbers are generally readable. The fuse numbers should be made readily apparent as well as the fuse colors (red, white, or blue) for both units. Each unit has two rows of fuses. PWO deficiency tag# 401199 was written.
2. Occasionally during the day or hot periods, the 4A2 circulating water pump bearing hi temperature will come in. The alarm is presently set at 205° F. Per the night order book, the vendor is quoted saying it is permissible to go to 215° F. Instead of saying it is OK when the alarm does come in and stays in; wouldn't it be better to raise the alarm setpoint, then just leave the alarm in and hope the bearing doesn't burn up in the meantime.
3. Feed Regulating Valves 4A, 4B, 3B, and 3C are not full open at 100% power. Yet the Main Control Board Indicating lights say they are. They need fixing.



E. Professionalism, Summary of Shift, Comments

PSN George Murphy provided good feedback to the NLO's on shift as well as the rest of the crew, on the FPL management action on the 250# reducing station and other items, during the pre-shift briefing. This provided a positive attitude towards having identified problems fixed and listening to people in the plant who know where problems exist. This would make a good operations policy for all shifts to keep the crew informed in this manner.

Completed By: James Jones
MOS Observer

Date: 08/11-12/88

Reviewed By: *[Signature]*
Operations Superintendent - Nuclear

Date: 8/12/88

Management
Review By:

[Signature] 18/12/88 *[Signature]* 18/12/88
PM-N Date SVP Date VP Date

08/11-12/88

2-1-72

