



January 23, 1984  
L-84-16

Mr. James P. O'Reilly  
Regional Administrator, Region II  
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
101 Marietta Street NW, Suite 2900  
Atlanta, Georgia 30303

Dear Mr. O'Reilly:

Re: St. Lucie Units 1 and 2  
Docket Nos. 50-335, 50-389  
Inspection Report 83-41/69

Florida Power & Light Company has reviewed the subject inspection report and a response is attached.

There is no proprietary information in the report.

Very truly yours,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "J. W. Williams, Jr.", is written over the typed name.

J. W. Williams, Jr.  
Vice President  
Nuclear Energy Department

JWW/PLP/js

Attachment

cc: Harold F. Reis, Esquire  
PNS-LI-84-30

8402280156 840208  
PDR ADOCK 05000335  
Q PDR

St. Lucie Units 1 and 2  
Docket Nos. 50-335, 50-389  
Inspection Report 83-41/69

Finding:

Technical Specification 6.8.1.a requires that written procedures be established, implemented, and maintained for those functional areas identified in Appendix A of Regulatory Guide 1.33 Revision 2, 1978. General maintenance procedure M-0018 revision 8, Mechanical Maintenance Safety Related Preventive Maintenance Program, establishes and implements the necessary procedures to conduct preventive maintenance on safety-related or Technical Specification (TS) equipment. Maintenance procedure file M-0018-PM-04805 performs a semi-annual lubrication procedure for component cooling water pumps.

Contrary to the above, on December 1, 1983, the inspector found that plant work orders (PWO) 2573 and PWO 2575 were not completed in accordance with step 3.3 of M-0018-PM-04805.

RESPONSE

1. FPL concurs with the finding.
2. The finding occurred because although the condition of the oil was checked on both PWO's; it was not documented due to an oversight. The omission was not noticed during the review process.
3. As corrective action, the condition of the oil was noted on both PWO's.
4. The following corrective actions were taken to prevent future problems:
  - a. Because the oversight was caused by doing more than just preventive maintenance (PM) work on the PWO, in the future only PM activities will be on this type PWO.
  - b. The QC supervisor has sent a directive to QC personnel to review and initial the PWO review portion of the applicable quality instruction.
  - c. The involved mechanical maintenance supervisor has been made aware of his PWO review responsibility.
5. Full compliance was achieved January 17, 1984.