

August 30, 2002

Mr. J. A. Stall
Senior Vice President, Nuclear and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Florida Power and Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420

SUBJECT: ST. LUCIE UNITS 1 AND 2 - ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS REGARDING
OPERABILITY OF SYSTEMS DURING MOVEMENT OF RECENTLY
IRRADIATED FUEL (TAC NOS. MB5188 AND MB5189)

Dear Mr. Stall:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 184 and 127 to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16 for the St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2. These amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your application dated May 23, 2002, as supplemented July 15, 2002.

These amendments revise the TS for certain systems (containment penetrations, spent fuel pool and shield building ventilation, and containment isolation) to require operability only during movement of recently irradiated fuel.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly *Federal Register* notice.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Brendan T. Moroney, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-335
and 50-389

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 184 to DPR-67
2. Amendment No. 127 to NPF-16
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures: See next page

August 30, 2002

Mr. J. A. Stall
Senior Vice President, Nuclear and
Chief Nuclear Officer
Florida Power and Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, Florida 33408-0420

SUBJECT: ST. LUCIE UNITS 1 AND 2 - ISSUANCE OF AMENDMENTS REGARDING
OPERABILITY OF SYSTEMS DURING MOVEMENT OF RECENTLY
IRRADIATED FUEL (TAC NOS. MB5188 AND MB5189)

Dear Mr. Stall:

The Commission has issued the enclosed Amendment Nos. 184 and 127 to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-67 and NPF-16 for the St. Lucie Plant, Units 1 and 2. These amendments consist of changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) in response to your application dated May 23, 2002, as supplemented July 15, 2002.

These amendments revise the TS for certain systems (containment penetrations, spent fuel pool and shield building ventilation, and containment isolation) to require operability only during movement of recently irradiated fuel.

A copy of the Safety Evaluation is also enclosed. The Notice of Issuance will be included in the Commission's biweekly *Federal Register* notice.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Brendan T. Moroney, Project Manager, Section 2
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-335
and 50-389

Enclosures:

1. Amendment No. 184 to DPR-67
2. Amendment No. 127 to NPF-16
3. Safety Evaluation

cc w/enclosures: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	PDII-2 R/F	HBerkow	KJabbour	BMoroney	RDennig
RGiardina	FMReinhart	J-YLee	SWeerakkody	DCullison	OGC
ACRS/ACNW	BClayton (paper copy)		GHill (4 paper copies)		LWert, RII

ADAMS Accession Number:ML022420403

OFFICE	PDII-2/PM	PDII-2/LA	SPLB/SC	SPSB/SC	RORP/SC	OGC	PDII-2/SC
NAME	BMoroney	BClayton	SWeerakkody	Mcaruso for FMReinhart	RDennig	AHodgdon	KJabbour
DATE	08/19/02	08/19/02	08/21/02	08/21/02	08/22/02	08/24/02	08/29/02

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

DOCKET NO. 50-335

ST. LUCIE PLANT UNIT NO. 1

AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No.184
License No. DPR-67

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Florida Power & Light Company (the licensee), dated May 23, 2002, as supplemented July 15, 2002, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, Facility Operating License No. DPR-67 is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and by amending paragraph 2.C.(2) to read as follows:

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 184, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Acting Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: August 30, 2002

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 184

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. DPR-67

DOCKET NO. 50-335

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the area of change.

Remove Pages

3/4 9-4
3/4 9-9
3/4 9-12

Insert Pages

3/4 9-4
3/4 9-9
3/4 9-12

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY
ORLANDO UTILITIES COMMISSION OF
THE CITY OF ORLANDO, FLORIDA
AND
FLORIDA MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY
DOCKET NO. 50-389
ST. LUCIE PLANT UNIT NO. 2
AMENDMENT TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE

Amendment No. 127
License No. NPF-16

1. The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has found that:
 - A. The application for amendment by Florida Power & Light Company, et al. (the licensee), dated May 23, 2002, as supplemented July 15, 2002, complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's rules and regulations set forth in 10 CFR Chapter I;
 - B. The facility will operate in conformity with the application, the provisions of the Act, and the rules and regulations of the Commission;
 - C. There is reasonable assurance (i) that the activities authorized by this amendment can be conducted without endangering the health and safety of the public, and (ii) that such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations;
 - D. The issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public; and
 - E. The issuance of this amendment is in accordance with 10 CFR Part 51 of the Commission's regulations and all applicable requirements have been satisfied.

2. Accordingly, Facility Operating License No. NPF-16 is amended by changes to the Technical Specifications as indicated in the attachment to this license amendment, and by amending paragraph 2.C.2 to read as follows:

2. Technical Specifications

- The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 127, are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

3. This license amendment is effective as of its date of issuance and shall be implemented within 60 days of issuance.

FOR THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

/RA/

Kahtan N. Jabbour, Acting Chief, Section 2
Project Directorate II
Division of Licensing Project Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Attachment:
Changes to the Technical
Specifications

Date of Issuance: August 30, 2002

ATTACHMENT TO LICENSE AMENDMENT NO. 127

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-16

DOCKET NO. 50-389

Replace the following pages of the Appendix A Technical Specifications with the attached pages. The revised pages are identified by amendment number and contain marginal lines indicating the area of change.

Remove Pages

3/4 6-27
3/4 9-4
3/4 9-4a
3/4 9-10

Insert Pages

3/4 6-27
3/4 9-4
- - -
3/4 9-10

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NOS. 184 AND 127

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSES NOS. DPR-67 AND NPF-16

FLORIDA POWER AND LIGHT COMPANY, ET AL.

ST. LUCIE PLANT, UNITS NO. 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-335 AND 50-389

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated May 23, 2002, as supplemented July 15, 2002, Florida Power and Light Company, et al. (the licensee), requested amendments to Operating Licenses DPR-67 and NPF-16 for St. Lucie Unit 1 and 2, respectively. The proposed amendments would revise the Technical Specifications (TS) regarding the operability of certain systems during the movement of recently irradiated fuel.

The licensee's supplementary submittal dated July 15, 2002, did not affect the original proposed no significant hazards determination, or expand the scope of the request as noticed in the *Federal Register* on June 25, 2002 (67 FR 42827).

2.0 REGULATORY EVALUATION

Section 182a of the Atomic Energy Act requires applicants for nuclear power plant operating licenses to include TS as part of the license. The Commission's regulatory requirements related to the content of the TS are contained in Title 10, *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.36. The TS requirements in 10 CFR 50.36 include the following categories: (1) safety limits, limiting safety systems settings and control settings, (2) limiting conditions for operation, (3) surveillance requirements, (4) design features, and (5) administrative controls. The requirements for system operability during movement of irradiated fuel are included in the TS in accordance with 10 CFR 50.36(c)(2), "Limiting Conditions for Operation."

As stated in 10 CFR 50.59(c)(1)(i), a licensee is required to submit a license amendment pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90 if a change to the TS is required. Furthermore, the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59 necessitate that U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) approve the TS changes before the TS changes are implemented. The licensee's submittal meets the requirements of 10 CFR 59(c)(1)(i) and 10 CFR 50.90. The staff's evaluation of the proposed change will be discussed in the Technical Evaluation section.

The licensee proposes to revise the TS in accordance with TS Task Force (TSTF) Traveler 51. TSTF-51, Revision 2, was approved by the NRC on October 15, 1999. TSTF-51 allows removal of the TS requirements for engineered safety features (ESF) to be OPERABLE after sufficient radioactive decay has occurred to ensure off-site doses remain below a small fraction of 10 CFR Part 100 limits. Fuel that is not sufficiently decayed to allow relaxation of OPERABILITY requirements is referred to as “recently” irradiated fuel. Recently irradiated fuel could still be moved but the appropriate ESF systems need to be OPERABLE. TSTF-51 also allows the deletion of OPERABILITY requirements for ESF mitigation features during CORE ALTERATIONS.

The Reviewer’s Note in TSTF-51 requires that licensees adding the term “recently” make a commitment consistent with draft NUMARC 93-01, Revision 3, Section 11.2.6, “Safety Assessment for Removal of Equipment from Service During Shutdown Conditions,” subheading “Containment - Primary (PWR)[Pressurized Water Reactor]/Secondary (BWR)[Boiling Water Reactor].” The commitment in the Reviewer’s Note reads:

The following guidelines are included in the assessment of systems removed from service during movement of irradiated fuel:

- During fuel handling/core alterations, ventilation system and radiation monitor availability (as defined in NUMARC 91-06) should be assessed, with respect to filtration and monitoring of releases from the fuel. Following shutdown, radioactivity in the fuel decays fairly rapidly. The basis of the Technical Specification operability amendment is the reduction in doses due to such decay. The goal of maintaining ventilation system and radiation monitor availability is to reduce doses even further below that provided by the natural decay.
- A single normal or contingency method to promptly close primary or secondary containment penetrations should be developed. Such prompt methods need not completely block the penetration or be capable of resisting pressure.

The purpose of the “prompt methods” mentioned above are to enable ventilation systems to draw the release from a postulated fuel handling accident in the proper direction such that it can be treated and monitored.

Since TSTF-51, Revision 2, was approved, NUMARC 93-01, Revision 3, was issued. The requirements of the draft Section 11.2.6 are now located in the final Section 11.3.6, “Containment - Primary (PWR)/Secondary (BWR).”

The licensee also proposes to add a note to Limiting Condition for Operation (LCO) 3.9.4.c, which is consistent with TSTF-312. TSTF-312, Revision 1, which was approved by the NRC on August 16, 1999, modified the LCO for containment penetration operability during refueling operations. The ability to open penetration flow paths under administrative controls, which is allowed during operation in Modes 1 through 4, was extended to refueling operations when the need for containment integrity is less, since a postulated accident would not cause pressure to

increase inside containment. TSTF-312 allows insertion of the following note after the LCO for containment penetration operability:

Penetration flow path(s) providing direct access from the containment atmosphere to the outside atmosphere may be unisolated under administrative controls.

3.0 TECHNICAL EVALUATION

3.1 Radiological Consequence Analysis

The licensee previously submitted similar license amendment requests for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2. For St. Lucie Unit 1, the licensee requested that the containment personnel airlock doors be opened during core alterations or movement of irradiated fuel in the containment during refueling operations under certain administrative conditions, and the staff approved the request in Amendment No. 172 on February 27, 2001. Separately, the licensee also requested for St. Lucie Unit 2, that the containment personnel airlock doors and the containment equipment door be opened during core alterations or movement of irradiated fuel in the containment during refueling operations under certain administrative conditions, and the staff approved the request in Amendment No. 120 on October 22, 2001.

In the radiological consequence analyses supporting the above two license amendments, the staff had previously performed confirmatory radiological consequence calculations. In its dose calculation, the staff had assumed all fission products are released to the environment from the containment within 2 hours following the postulated Fuel-Handling Accident (FHA). Both the licensee and the staff, in their respective dose calculations, took no credit for the closure or isolation of the containment penetrations. All other major parameters and assumptions used in the postulated FHA analyses by the licensee and the staff in the previous license amendments remain the same for this amendment request. The staff's analyses confirmed the licensee's conclusions that the radiological consequence would be well within the dose guideline values specified in 10 CFR Part 100 for the exclusion area boundary and within the dose acceptance criteria specified in the Standard Review Plan, Section 6.4, for the control room.

Therefore, the radiological consequence analyses previously performed by the licensee and by the staff for St. Lucie Units 1 and 2 still bound the radiological consequence analysis of the postulated FHA in this license amendment request.

3.2 Unit 1 TS Changes

TS 3.9.4, Containment Penetrations

The licensee proposes to delete "During CORE ALTERATIONS" from the Applicability statement, the Action statement, and the Surveillance Requirements. In addition, the licensee is proposing to add the term "recently" in front of "irradiated" in the statement ". . . movement of irradiated fuel assemblies . . ." in the Applicability statement, the Action statement, and the Surveillance Requirements.

The FHA is the only event during CORE ALTERATIONS that is postulated to result in fuel damage and radiological release. The LCO, Actions, and Surveillance Requirements will remain applicable during activities that could result in an FHA with fuel damage and radiological

release. Therefore, the deletion of CORE ALTERATIONS is acceptable. The addition of the term “recently” is consistent with the current FHA analysis and TSTF-51. Also, in accordance with the Reviewers Note in TSTF-51 mentioned above, the licensee committed to the containment closure guidelines located in NUMARC 93-01 for those periods when moving nonrecently irradiated fuel. Therefore, based on the preceding evaluation and the radiological consequence analysis in Section 3.1, these proposed changes are acceptable.

TS 3.9.4.c

The licensee proposes to add the following note to the LCO 3.9.4.c:

Note: Penetration flowpath(s) providing direct access from the containment atmosphere to the outside atmosphere may be unisolated under administrative controls.

The addition of this note is consistent with TSTF-312, Revision 1, “Administratively Control Containment Penetrations”; therefore, the proposed change is acceptable.

TS 3.9.4.b

The licensee proposes to change LCO 3.9.4.b from:

- b. A minimum of one door in each airlock is closed, or, both doors of the containment personnel airlock may be open if:
 - 1. at least one personnel airlock is capable of being closed,
 - 2. the plant is in Mode 6 with at least 23 feet of water above the fuel in the reactor core, and
 - 3. a designated individual is available outside the personnel airlock to close the door.

to:

- b. A minimum of one door in each airlock is closed.

The proposed change is more conservative than the current TS since it no longer allows both containment airlock doors to be open while moving recently irradiated fuel and is consistent with TSTF-51. Based on the above, the proposed change is acceptable.

TS 3.9.9, Containment Isolation System

The licensee proposes to delete “During CORE ALTERATIONS” and add the term “recently” in front of “irradiated” in the statement “. . . movement of irradiated fuel assemblies . . .” in the Applicability statement. The licensee also proposes to replace CORE ALTERATIONS in the Surveillance Requirements with “movement of recently irradiated fuel assemblies.”

The FHA is the only event during CORE ALTERATIONS that is postulated to result in fuel damage and radiological release. The LCO, Actions, and Surveillance Requirements will remain applicable during activities that could result in an FHA with fuel damage and radiological release. The addition of the term “recently” is consistent with the current FHA analysis and TSTF-51. Also, in accordance with the Reviewers Note in TSTF-51 mentioned above, the

licensee committed to the containment closure guidelines located in NUMARC 93-01 for those periods when moving nonrecently irradiated fuel. Therefore, based on the preceding evaluation and the radiological consequence analysis in Section 3.1, these proposed changes are acceptable.

TS 3.9.12, Fuel Pool Ventilation System

The licensee proposes to add the term “recently” in front of “irradiated” in the Applicability statement. The licensee also proposes to add the term “recently irradiated” in Action statement a. so it will now read:

- a. With no fuel pool ventilation system OPERABLE, suspend all operations involving movement of recently irradiated fuel within the spent fuel pool or crane operations with loads over the recently irradiated spent fuel until at least one fuel pool ventilation system is restored to OPERABLE status.

According to the revised FHA analysis, the only FHA in the fuel building that could result in a release in excess of a small fraction of the 10 CFR Part 100 dose limitations can only occur during the movement of recently irradiated fuel assemblies or loads over recently irradiated fuel assemblies within the spent fuel pool. The revised Applicability requirements and Action statement reflect the FHA analysis by requiring at least one fuel pool ventilation system to be operable when those conditions exist. The change in applicability is consistent with the revised FHA analysis. According to the revised FHA analysis, an FHA with fuel decayed more than 72 hours will not exceed the small fraction of the 10 CFR Part 100 dose limits. Also, the licensee committed to the containment closure guidelines located in NUMARC 93-01 for those periods when moving nonrecently irradiated fuel or crane operations with loads over nonrecently spent irradiated fuel. Therefore, this change is acceptable.

TS 4.9.12.b

The licensee proposes to make several editorial changes to Surveillance Requirement 4.9.12 b. to remove hyphens splitting the words “maintenance” and “ventilation.” These editorial changes are acceptable.

3.3 Unit 2 TS Changes

TS 3.6.6.1, Secondary Containment - Shield Building Ventilation Systems (SBVS)

The licensee proposes to add the term “recently” in front of “irradiated fuel” in the Applicability statement and Action statements c(1) and c(2).

According to the revised FHA analysis, the only FHA in the shield building that could exceed 10 CFR Part 100 dose limitations can only occur during the movement of recently irradiated fuel assemblies or loads over recently irradiated fuel assemblies within the spent fuel pool. The revised Applicability requirements and Action statement reflect the FHA analysis by requiring at least one SBVS to be operable when those conditions exist. The proposed changes are consistent with the revised FHA analysis. According to the revised FHA analysis, an FHA with fuel decayed more than 72 hours will not exceed the 10 CFR Part 100 dose limits. Also, the licensee committed to the containment closure guidelines located in NUMARC 93-01 for those

periods when moving nonrecently irradiated fuel or crane operations with loads over nonrecently spent irradiated fuel. Therefore, this change is acceptable.

TS 3.9.4, Containment Building Penetrations

The licensee proposes to delete “During CORE ALTERATIONS” from the Applicability statement, the Action statement, and the Surveillance Requirements. In addition, the licensee is proposing to add the term “recently” in front of “irradiated” in the statement “. . . movement of irradiated fuel assemblies . . .” in the Applicability statement, the Action statement, and the Surveillance Requirements.

The FHA is the only event during CORE ALTERATIONS that is postulated to result in fuel damage and radiological release. The LCO, Actions, and Surveillance Requirements will remain applicable during activities that could result in an FHA with fuel damage and significant radiological release. Therefore, the deletion of CORE ALTERATIONS is acceptable. The addition of the term “recently” is consistent with the current FHA analysis and TSTF-51. Also, the licensee committed to the containment closure guidelines located in NUMARC 93-01 for those periods when moving nonrecently irradiated fuel. Therefore, based on the preceding evaluation and the radiological consequence analysis in Section 3.1, these proposed changes are acceptable.

TS 3.9.4.c

The licensee proposes to add the following note to the LCO 3.9.4.c:

Note: Penetration flowpath(s) providing direct access from the containment atmosphere to the outside atmosphere may be unisolated under administrative controls.

The addition of this note is consistent with TSTF-312, Revision 1, “Administratively Control Containment Penetrations”; therefore, the proposed change is acceptable.

TS 3.9.4.a

The licensee proposes to change LCO 3.9.4.a from:

- a. The equipment door closed and held in place by a minimum of four bolts or the equipment hatch may be open if:
 1. It is capable of being closed with four bolts within 30 minutes,
 2. The plant is in Mode 6 with at least 23 feet of water above the fuel in the reactor core, and
 3. A designated crew is available at the equipment door to close the door.

to:

- a. The equipment door closed and held in place by a minimum of four bolts.

The proposed change is more conservative than the current TS since it no longer allows equipment door to be open while moving recently irradiated fuel and is consistent with TSTF-51. Based on the above, the proposed change is acceptable.

TS 3.9.3.b

The licensee proposes to change LCO 3.9.4.b from:

- b. A minimum of one door in each airlock is closed, or, both doors of the containment personnel airlock may be open if:
 - 1. at least one personnel airlock is capable of being closed,
 - 2. the plant is in Mode 6 with at least 23 feet of water above the fuel in the reactor core, and
 - 3. a designated individual is available outside the personnel airlock to close the door.

to:

- b. A minimum of one door in each airlock is closed.

The proposed change is more conservative than the current TS since it no longer allows both containment airlock doors to be open while moving recently irradiated fuel and is consistent with TSTF-51. Based on the above, the proposed change is acceptable.

The licensee proposes to make an editorial change by moving Surveillance Requirement 4.9.4 to page 3/4 9-4 and deleting page 3/4 9-4a. This editorial change is acceptable.

TS 3.9.9, Containment Isolation System

The licensee proposes to delete "During CORE ALTERATIONS" and add the term "recently" in front of "irradiated" in the statement ". . . movement of irradiated fuel assemblies . . ." in the Applicability statement. The licensee also proposes to replace CORE ALTERATIONS in the Surveillance Requirements with "movement of recently irradiated fuel assemblies."

The FHA is the only event during CORE ALTERATIONS that is postulated to result in fuel damage and radiological release. The LCO, Actions, and Surveillance Requirements will remain applicable during activities that could result in an FHA with fuel damage and radiological release. The addition of the term "recently" is consistent with the current FHA analysis and TSTF-51. Also, the licensee committed to the containment closure guidelines located in NUMARC 93-01 for those periods when moving nonrecently irradiated fuel. Therefore, based on the preceding evaluation and the radiological consequence analysis in Section 3.1, these proposed changes are acceptable.

3.0 STATE CONSULTATION

Based upon a letter dated March 8, 1991, from Mary E. Clark of the State of Florida, Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, to Deborah A. Miller, Licensing Assistant, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the State of Florida does not desire notification of issuance of license amendments.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

These amendments change a requirement with respect to installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and change surveillance requirements. The NRC staff has determined that the amendments involve no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously issued a proposed finding that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding (67 FR 42827, dated June 25, 2002). Accordingly, these amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b) no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of these amendments.

5.0 CONCLUSION

The Commission has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations, and (3) the issuance of the amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributors: David Cullison, NRR
 Jay Y. Lee, NRR
 Robert Giardina, NRR

Date: August 30, 2002

Mr. J. A. Stall
Florida Power and Light Company

cc:
Senior Resident Inspector
St. Lucie Plant
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
P.O. Box 6090
Jensen Beach, Florida 34957

Craig Fugate, Director
Division of Emergency Preparedness
Department of Community Affairs
2740 Centerview Drive
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-2100

M. S. Ross, Attorney
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Douglas Anderson
County Administrator
St. Lucie County
2300 Virginia Avenue
Fort Pierce, Florida 34982

Mr. William A. Passetti, Chief
Department of Health
Bureau of Radiation Control
2020 Capital Circle, SE, Bin #C21
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1741

Mr. Donald E. Jernigan, Site Vice President
St. Lucie Nuclear Plant
6351 South Ocean Drive
Jensen Beach, Florida 34957

ST. LUCIE PLANT

Mr. R. E. Rose
Plant General Manager
St. Lucie Nuclear Plant
6351 South Ocean Drive
Jensen Beach, Florida 34957

Mr. J. T. Voorhees
Acting Licensing Manager
St. Lucie Nuclear Plant
6351 South Ocean Drive
Jensen Beach, Florida 34957

Mr. Don Mothena
Manager, Nuclear Plant Support Services
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. Rajiv S. Kundalkar
Vice President - Nuclear Engineering
Florida Power & Light Company
P.O. Box 14000
Juno Beach, FL 33408-0420

Mr. J. Kammel
Radiological Emergency
Planning Administrator
Department of Public Safety
6000 SE. Tower Drive
Stuart, Florida 34997