

NOV 1 1993

50-335

MEMORANDUM FOR: Herbert N. Berkow, Director
Project Directorate II-2
Division of Reactor Projects I/II

FROM: James A. Norberg, Chief
Mechanical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

SUBJECT: SALP INPUT FOR ST. LUCIE UNIT 1

Per the letter from Jan Norris dated October 14, 1993, enclosed please find the Mechanical Engineering Branch's SALP input for St. Lucie Unit 1. If you have any questions, please contact M. McBrearty at 504-2725 or P. Campbell at 504-1311.

151

James A. Norberg, Chief
Mechanical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

Enclosure: SALP Input

DISTRIBUTION:
Central Files
EMEB Rf/pf
BDLiaw
KManoly
MMcBrearty(CHRON)
PCampbell(CHRON)
GJohnson
JNorris
GZech

BRC

OFFICE	EMEB:DE:eh	EMEB:DE	EMEB:DE	EMEB:DE	EMEB:DE
NAME	MMcBrearty	KManoly	PCampbell	GJohnson	JNorberg
DATE	10/28/93	10/28/93	10/28/93	10/29/93	11/1/93

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
FILENAME: G:\McBreart\FPLSALP.INP

030044

Dupe 3 pp

9311090174

3 pp

XA

6/4
~~3/4~~

NRC FILE CENTER COE

memo

SALP INPUT

Facility Name: St. Lucie Unit 1

Summary of Review Activity

Perform a review of the licensee's response to GL 87-02 for the resolution of USI A-46, "Verification of Seismic Adequacy of Mechanical and Electrical Equipment in Operating Reactors." The staff's effort included the review of two licensee written responses to RAIs, and participation in two meetings, regarding several significant unresolved issues with the licensee's USI A-46 implementation program. This SALP pertains to the adequacy of the licensee's engineering support activities.

Narrative Discussion of Licensee Performance

The licensee's written responses have generally lacked sufficient information to adequately address the staff's RAIs. The licensee has relied on the staff to identify program weaknesses, and has taken the attitude of providing minimal information in responding to the staff's comments. Although the licensee has recently committed to expand its implementation program to address part of the staff's concerns, it has failed to provide clear or reasonable justification for several apparent programmatic shortcomings.

The staff was particularly dissatisfied with the licensee's most recent submittal addressing issues discussed during a July 20, 1993 meeting. At the meeting, the staff requested that the licensee document and justify its positions on three major programmatic issues. The staff stressed that the licensee's response should provide sufficient details to fully justify their position on each issue. In order to ensure that the licensee had ample time to adequately develop and document its response, the staff merely requested that the licensee respond within a timeframe of 2 months. At the end of the 2-month period, the licensee provided only a very brief response to each issue, and failed to provide technical details and justifications to support its positions.

Originator: Michael McBrearty, NRR/EMEB

Date: 10/27/93

IST Reviews:

The recent inservice testing (IST) program submittals and accompanying relief requests for TAC numbers M83482, M84562, M82057, M85670, M85563, and M86317, were neither outstanding nor problematic. The licensee has been involved in a major 10-year update which was recently submitted and EMEB has outstanding action underway to review the relief requests. The licensee does not appear to be as aggressive in this area compared to other licensees, but they appear to be maintaining the IST program adequately. Recent inspections identified areas that appeared to be inconsistencies between Unit 1 and Unit 2 and areas that could be improved; however, there were no issues that indicated major inadequacies in the IST program. Several of the issues should be addressed in the 10-year update for Unit 2, and may have already been incorporated into the Unit 1 IST program. The recommended SALP category for the IST program area is a category 2.

Originator: Patricia Campbell

Date: 10/27/93