APR 2 2 1983

# SAFETY EVALUATION ST. LUCIE PLANT, UNIT 2 DOCKET NO. 50-389

 $\overline{N}$ 

# Introduction

By letter dated April 20, 1983, the licensee requested a change to the St. Lucie Plant, Unit 2 Technical Specifications, Section 3/4.3.1, Reactor Protective Instrumentation, Table 4.3-1 Reactor Protective Instrumentation Surveillance Requirements, to delete the surveillance requirement to obtain, evaluate and compare detector plateau curves to manufacturer's data for the Wide Range Logarithmic Neutron Flux Monitor.

### Evaluation

The surveillance requirement to obtain, evaluate and compare detector plateau curves to manufacturer's data as part of the calibration procedure is applicable only to proportional counter flux monitors. The Wide Range Logarithmic Neutron Flux Monitor is a fission chamber detector and not a proportional counter. A plateau curve cannot be accomplished on a fission chamber detector and is not required as part of the calibration procedure for a fission chamber detector and, therefore, the requirement to obtain, evaluate and compare detector plateau curves to manufacturer's data is not applicable to fission chamber detectors. The proposed amendment is, therefore, acceptable.

#### Environmental .Consideration

We have determined that the amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types or total amounts nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that the amendment involves an action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact and, pursuant to 10 CFR Section 51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

# Conclusion

ör

ma.a

1. 1

Based upon our evaluation of the proposed change to the St. Lucie Plant, Unit 2 Technical Specifications, we have concluded, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration; (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public. We, therefore, conclude that the proposed change is acceptable.

•		0 o(1.				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
OFFICE	D2?E8#3AAV	DL:18#3 10					
SURNAME	JWilson:yt	GWKnighton					
	4/22/83	4/23/83					
DATEP							
NRC FORM 318 (10-80) NRCM 0240			OFFICIAL	RECORD	COPY		USGPO: 1981—335-960

**ب** بلا الم

, .