



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 6

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-16

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY

ORLANDO UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE CITY OF ORLANDO, FLORIDA

AND.

FLORIDA MUNICIPAL POWER AGENCY

ST. LUCIE PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-389

Background

In a letter dated December 22, 1983 Florida Power and Light Company (FP&L) requested a license amendment to modify the St. Lucie Plant, Unit No. 2, Axial Shape Index (ASI) figures to bring them into conformance with Unit No. 1, and to reflect the fact that the Limiting Conditions for Operation (LCO) are not needed below 30% of rated thermal power.

Discussion

Figure 3.2-2 and Figure 3.2-4 of the technical specifications provide conservative calculated values of the Departure from Nucleate Boiling (DNB) LCO. As the power decreases the permitted ASI becomes larger. However, for convenience it was truncated at $-.3$ and $+.3$, but the permissible ASI continues to increase as power decreases. The Local Power Density (LPD) Limiting Safety Setting Set-points (LSSS) for St. Lucie Unit 2 likewise increases as power decreases and has values of $-.4$ and $+.4$ from 80% to 0% power. FP&L has provided data that shows that the LSSS becomes more restrictive than the DNB LCO at approximately 77% power. FP&L has also provided data that show that the LSSS continues to be more restrictive as power continues to decrease.

Based on the staff review of the data submitted, the staff agrees that the LSSS value is more restrictive than the calculated DNB LCO below 30% power. Therefore, the staff approves of the proposed technical specification change allowing the LSSS to replace the DNB LCO below 30% power.

This amendment involves a change in the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that

840912045B 840810
PDR ADDCK 05000389
P PDR

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 this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets 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 this amendment.

Conclusion

We have 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, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of the amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: August 10, 1984

Principal Contributor:
M. Chatterton