



**UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
REGION II  
SAM NUNN ATLANTA FEDERAL CENTER  
61 FORSYTH STREET SW SUITE 23T85  
ATLANTA, GEORGIA 30303-8931**

March 31, 2000

Florida Power and Light Company  
ATTN: Mr. T. F. Plunkett  
President - Nuclear Division  
P. O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

**SUBJECT: PLANT PERFORMANCE REVIEW - ST. LUCIE NUCLEAR PLANT**

The purpose of this letter is to communicate our assessment of your performance and to inform you of our planned inspections at your facility. On February 25, 2000, we completed a Plant Performance Review (PPR) of St. Lucie Nuclear Plant. We conduct these reviews to develop an integrated overview of the safety performance of each operating nuclear power plant. We use the results of the PPR in planning and allocating inspection resources and as inputs to our senior management meeting (SMM) process. This PPR evaluated inspection results and safety performance information for the period from February 1, 1999 through January 31, 2000, but emphasized the last six months to ensure that our assessment reflected your current performance. Our most recent summary of plant performance at St. Lucie Nuclear Plant was provided to you in a letter dated October 13, 1999.

The NRC has been developing a revised reactor oversight process that will replace our existing inspection and assessment processes, including the PPR, the SMM, and the Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP). We recently completed a pilot program for the revised reactor oversight process at nine participating sites and are making necessary adjustments based on feedback and lessons learned. We plan to begin initial implementation of the revised reactor oversight process industry-wide, including your facility, on April 2, 2000.

This PPR reflects continued process improvements as we make the transition into the revised reactor oversight process. Instead of characterizing our assessment results by SALP functional area, we are organizing the results into the strategic performance areas embodied in the revised reactor oversight process. In addition, we have considered the historical performance indicator data that you submitted in January 2000 in conjunction with the inspection results in assessing your performance. The results of this PPR were used to establish the inspection plan in accordance with the new risk-informed inspection program (consisting of baseline and supplemental inspections). Although this letter incorporates some terms and concepts associated with the new oversight process, it does not reflect the much broader changes in inspection and assessment that will be evident after we have fully implemented our revised reactor oversight process.

During the last six months, St. Lucie Unit 1 completed a refueling outage on October 19, 1999, and operated at full power until a reactor trip from a leaking turbine block diaphragm on October 29. During startup on October 30, a manual scram was initiated due to a low steam generator water level. Unit 1 was returned to full power on October 31, and has operated continuously to the end of this assessment period. St. Lucie Unit 2 operated at full power for the last six months with the exception of a brief period at reduced power during the approach of Hurricane Floyd in September 1999.

Although the NRC noted some performance issues during this assessment period in the reactor safety strategic performance area, we note that St. Lucie continues to operate in a safe manner. The performance issues involved implementation of the Emergency Operating Procedures program. In an effort to ensure that these issues are addressed, additional inspection resources will be allocated to the review of the Emergency Operating Procedures program as indicated in the attached inspection plan.

We did not identify any significant performance issues in the radiation safety or safeguards strategic performance areas. As a result, only baseline inspections are planned.

In our March 13, 2000, letter to you, we discussed the high number of allegations received concerning activities at St. Lucie. The letter also acknowledged your ongoing Employee Concerns Program review and requested that the results of that review be shared with us.

Enclosure 1 contains a historical listing of plant issues, referred to as the Plant Issues Matrix (PIM), that were used during this PPR process to arrive at our integrated view of your performance trends. The PIM for this assessment is grouped by the prior SALP functional areas of operations, maintenance, engineering and plant support, although the future PIM will be organized along the cornerstones of safety as described in the revised reactor oversight process. The attached PIM includes items summarized from inspection reports or other docketed correspondence regarding St. Lucie Nuclear Plant. We did not document all aspects of licensee programs and performance that may be functioning appropriately. Rather, we only documented issues that we believe warrant management attention or represent noteworthy aspects of performance. In addition, the PPR may also have considered some predecisional and draft material that does not appear in the attached PIM, including observations from events and inspections that had occurred since our last inspection report was issued, but had not yet received full review and consideration. We will make this material publically available as part of the normal issuance of our inspection reports and other correspondence.

Enclosure 2 lists our planned inspections for the period April 2000 through March 2001 at St. Lucie Nuclear Plant to allow you to resolve scheduling conflicts and personnel availability in advance of our inspector arrival onsite. The inspection schedule for the latter half of the period is more tentative and may be adjusted in the future due to emerging performance issues at St. Lucie Nuclear Plant or other Region II facilities. Routine resident inspections are not listed due to their ongoing and continuous nature.

FPL

3

We will inform you of any changes to the inspection plan. If you have any questions, please contact me at 404/562-4540.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Leonard D. Wert, Chief  
Reactor Projects Branch 3  
Division of Reactor Projects

Docket Nos. 50-335, 50-389  
License Nos. DPR-67, NPF-16

Enclosures: 1. Plant Issues Matrix  
2. Inspection Plan

cc w/encls: (See page 4)

FPL

4

cc w/encls:

Rajiv S. Kundalkar  
Plant Vice President  
Florida Power & Light Company  
Electronic Mail Distribution

R. G. West  
Plant General Manager  
St. Lucie Nuclear Plant  
Electronic Mail Distribution

E. J. Weinkam  
Licensing Manager  
St. Lucie Nuclear Plant  
Electronic Mail Distribution

John Gianfrancesco, Manager  
Administrative Support & Special Projects  
Florida Power & Light Company  
Electronic Mail Distribution

Mark Dryden  
Administrative Support & Special Projects  
Florida Power & Light Company  
Electronic Mail Distribution

J. A. Stall  
Vice President - Nuclear Engineering  
Florida Power & Light Company  
P. O. Box 14000  
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

M. S. Ross, Attorney  
Florida Power & Light Company  
Electronic Mail Distribution

William A. Passetti  
Bureau of Radiation Control  
Department of Health  
Electronic Mail Distribution

Joe Myers, Director  
Division of Emergency Preparedness  
Department of Community Affairs  
Electronic Mail Distribution

J. Kammel  
Radiological Emergency  
Planning Administrator

Department of Public Safety  
Electronic Mail Distribution

Douglas Anderson  
County Administrator  
St. Lucie County  
2300 Virginia Avenue  
Ft. Pierce, FL 34982

Distribution w/encls:

S. Collins, NRR  
 J. Zwolinski, NRR  
 W. Dean, NRR  
 W. Gleaves, NRR  
 C. Thomas, NRR  
 G. Tracy, EDO  
 J. Borchardt, OE  
 L. Wert, RII  
 S. Rudisail, RII  
 PUBLIC

NRC Resident Inspector  
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
 P. O. Box 6090  
 Jensen Beach, FL 34957-2010

OFFICE	RII:DRP	RII:DRS	RII:DRS	RII:DRS	RII:DRS		
SIGNATURE							
NAME	SRudisail	ABelisle	KLandis	HChristensen	KBarr		
DATE	4/ /0	4/ /0	4/ /0	4/ /0	4/ /0	4/ /0	4/ /0
COPY?	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO	YES NO