



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 20

TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-16

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, ET AL.

ST. LUCIE PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-389

INTRODUCTION

By letter dated February 24, 1987, the Florida Power & Light Company proposed a change to the Technical Specifications (TSs). Specifically, the proposed change would revise TS 4.6.1.7.4 to require that the 8-inch containment purge supply and exhaust isolation valve be determined operable every 92 days. The proposed change is evaluated below.

EVALUATION

The NRC required in License Condition 2.C.8 of the St. Lucie Unit 2 Operating License, NPF-16, that prior to startup following the first refueling outage, the licensee shall install testing capability for the 8-inch purge valves which would allow for testing to the Standard Technical Specifications requirements every 92 days. Until the local leak rate testing (LLRT) modifications were made, the staff concluded in the St. Lucie Supplemental Safety Evaluation Report No. 3 (SSER 3), dated April 1983, that the proposed interim TS for testing the 8-inch purge valves on a cold shutdown basis was acceptable. (The current TS reflects this accepted interim TS). By letter dated November 20, 1984, FP&L informed the staff that the Continuous Containment Purge System was modified during the first refueling outage to allow for testing to the Standard Technical Specification requirement. Therefore, in accordance with the intent of License Condition 2.C.8, and per the staff's request by letter dated December 9, 1986 (E.G. Tourigny to C.O. Woody), FP&L has proposed the following TS:

"At least once per 92 days, each 8-inch containment purge supply and exhaust isolation valve with resilient material seals shall be demonstrated operable by verifying that the measured leakage rate is less than or equal to 0.05 La when pressurized to Pa."

This test would be required for Modes 1 through 4.

The staff finds this TS acceptable, as the increased frequency of testing provides greater assurance that containment isolation can be accomplished, and the proposed frequency of testing resolves the staff's concern stated in SSER 3.

8706040061 870520
PDR ADDCK 05000389
P PDR

THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

IN SENATE
January 10, 1907
REPORT
OF THE
COMMISSIONER OF THE
GENERAL LAND OFFICE
IN RESPONSE TO A
RESOLUTION PASSED
JUNE 15, 1905
BY THE SENATE

WASHINGTON:
GOVERNMENT PRINTING OFFICE:
1907.

1. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

2. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

3. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

4. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

5. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

6. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

7. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

8. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

9. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

10. The Commission of the General Land Office has the honor to acknowledge the receipt of the report of the Commission of the General Land Office, dated June 15, 1905, in response to a resolution passed by the Senate on June 15, 1905, and to express its appreciation of the thoroughness and accuracy of the information furnished.

ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

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 or a change in a surveillance requirement. 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 may be released offsite, and that there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. The Commission has previously published a proposed finding that the amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, the 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 the 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: May 20, 1987

Principal Contributor:

R. M. Perfetti