

DISTRIBUTION AFTER ISSUANCE OF OPERATING LICENSE

NRC FORM 195
(2-78)

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NUMBER

50-250/254/335

NRC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL

FILE NUMBER

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☐ NOTORIZED

PROP

INPUT FORM

NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED

☒ ORIGINAL
☒ COPY☒ UNCLASSIFIED

1 SIGNED

DESCRIPTION

ENCLOSURE

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

(1-P)

(2-P)

RJL 1/24/78

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

1 ENCL

SAFETY

FOR ACTION/INFORMATION

BRANCH CHIEF: (7)

LEAR
DAVIS

(7)

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

☒ REG-FILE

NRC PDR

T & E (2)

OELD

MANAGER

~~CHIEF~~

ETSENBHIT

SHAO

BAER

BUTLER

BRIMES

U. COLLINS

~~U. MCCOUGH~~

STELLO

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

CONTROL NUMBER

L2DR: MIAMI / FT. PIERCE FLA.

TIC

NSIC

ACRS 16 CYS SENT CATEGORY R

54.1
780240251

GD

REGULATORY DOCKET FILE COPY


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,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "L. C. Oakes".
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

1. 1. The first
 2. 2. The second
 3. 3. The third
 4. 4. The fourth
 5. 5. The fifth
 6. 6. The sixth
 7. 7. The seventh
 8. 8. The eighth
 9. 9. The ninth
 10. 10. The tenth
 11. 11. The eleventh
 12. 12. The twelfth
 13. 13. The thirteenth
 14. 14. The fourteenth
 15. 15. The fifteenth
 16. 16. The sixteenth
 17. 17. The seventeenth
 18. 18. The eighteenth
 19. 19. The nineteenth
 20. 20. The twentieth
 21. 21. The twenty-first
 22. 22. The twenty-second
 23. 23. The twenty-third
 24. 24. The twenty-fourth
 25. 25. The twenty-fifth
 26. 26. The twenty-sixth
 27. 27. The twenty-seventh
 28. 28. The twenty-eighth
 29. 29. The twenty-ninth
 30. 30. The thirtieth
 31. 31. The thirty-first
 32. 32. The thirty-second
 33. 33. The thirty-third
 34. 34. The thirty-fourth
 35. 35. The thirty-fifth
 36. 36. The thirty-sixth
 37. 37. The thirty-seventh
 38. 38. The thirty-eighth
 39. 39. The thirty-ninth
 40. 40. The fortieth
 41. 41. The forty-first
 42. 42. The forty-second
 43. 43. The forty-third
 44. 44. The forty-fourth
 45. 45. The forty-fifth
 46. 46. The forty-sixth
 47. 47. The forty-seventh
 48. 48. The forty-eighth
 49. 49. The forty-ninth
 50. 50. The fiftieth
 51. 51. The fifty-first
 52. 52. The fifty-second
 53. 53. The fifty-third
 54. 54. The fifty-fourth
 55. 55. The fifty-fifth
 56. 56. The fifty-sixth
 57. 57. The fifty-seventh
 58. 58. The fifty-eighth
 59. 59. The fifty-ninth
 60. 60. The sixtieth
 61. 61. The sixty-first
 62. 62. The sixty-second
 63. 63. The sixty-third
 64. 64. The sixty-fourth
 65. 65. The sixty-fifth
 66. 66. The sixty-sixth
 67. 67. The sixty-seventh
 68. 68. The sixty-eighth
 69. 69. The sixty-ninth
 70. 70. The seventieth
 71. 71. The seventy-first
 72. 72. The seventy-second
 73. 73. The seventy-third
 74. 74. The seventy-fourth
 75. 75. The seventy-fifth
 76. 76. The seventy-sixth
 77. 77. The seventy-seventh
 78. 78. The seventy-eighth
 79. 79. The seventy-ninth
 80. 80. The eightieth
 81. 81. The eighty-first
 82. 82. The eighty-second
 83. 83. The eighty-third
 84. 84. The eighty-fourth
 85. 85. The eighty-fifth
 86. 86. The eighty-sixth
 87. 87. The eighty-seventh
 88. 88. The eighty-eighth
 89. 89. The eighty-ninth
 90. 90. The ninetieth
 91. 91. The ninety-first
 92. 92. The ninety-second
 93. 93. The ninety-third
 94. 94. The ninety-fourth
 95. 95. The ninety-fifth
 96. 96. The ninety-sixth
 97. 97. The ninety-seventh
 98. 98. The ninety-eighth
 99. 99. The ninety-ninth
 100. 100. The hundredth

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.