ATTACHMENT I

Marked-up Technical Specification Pages
Facility Operating License
DPR-67

Page 3

EJW3/043/2

C. This license shall be deemed to contain and is subject to the conditions specified in the following Commission regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I: Part 20, Sections 30.34 of Part 30, Section 40.41 of Part 40, Section 50.54 and 50.59 of Part 50, and Section 70.32 of Part 70; and is subject to all applicable provisions of the Act and to the rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect; and is subject to the additional conditions specified or incorporated below;

(1) Maximum Power Level

The licensee is authorized to operate the facility at steady state reactor core power levels not in excess of 2700 megawatts (thermal), provided that the construction items, preoperational tests, startup tests, and other items identified in Enclosure 1 to this license have been completed as specified in Enclosure 1. Enclosure 1 is an integral part of, and is hereby incorporated in this license.

(2) Technical Specifications

The Technical Specifications contained in Appendices A and B, as revised through Amendment No. 84 are hereby incorporated in the license. The licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the Technical Specifications.

(3) Fire Protection

The licensee may proceed with and is required to provide a schedule for and to complete the modification and evaluations identified in Paragraphs 3.1 through 3.15 of the NRC's Fire Protection Safety Evaluation, dated August 17, 1979 for the facility. If any modifications or evaluation cannot be completed on schedule the licensee shall submit a report explaining the circumstances together with a revised schedule.

The licensee is required to implement the administrative controls identified in Section 6 of the Safety Evaluation. The administrative controls shall be in effect within 90 days from the date of issuance of this amendment.

(Deleted by Amendment No. — to license issued on ——)

(4) ~~Prior to reaching 38,000 MWd/MTU peak assembly, the licensee must use an approved method to show that Combustion Engineering fuel will not experience creep collapse unless the new Exxon Corporation methodology has been approved for use by the staff and its results are valid for Cycle 6.~~

(Deleted by Amendment No. — to license issued on ——)

(5) ~~The licensee shall provide a supplement to XN-NF-85-117, "St. Lucie Unit 1 Revised LOCA-ECCS Analysis with 15% Steam Generator Tube Plugging", that will provide the complete large-break LOCA spectrum results to demonstrate full compliance with the criteria of 10 CFR 50.46 and Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50 for the Commission staff's review and approval.~~

ATTACHMENT 2

SAFETY EVALUATION

FPL and the NRC Staff have completed two of the St. Lucie Unit 1 License Conditons 2.C.(4) and 2.C.(5).

The two License Conditions are reproduced below. The docketed references which represent FPL's submittals to close out these License Conditions and the NRC Staff's Safety Evalutions indicating completion of staff review are also detailed.

License Condition 2.C.(4)

(4) Prior to reaching 38,000 MWd/MTU peak assembly, the licensee must use an approved method to show that Combustion Engineering fuel will not experience creep collapse unless the new Exxon Corporation methodology has been approved for use by the staff and its results are valid for Cycle 6.

Documented Resolution

By letter L-84-251, dated September 17, 1984, FPL submitted its response to the NRC's request of July 5, 1984 (Miller to Williams) related to a request for additional information on creep collapse calculations submitted as a part of the St. Lucie Unit 1, Cycle 6 reload (FPL letter L-83-290, dated May 13, 1983).

By letter dated February 19, 1985 (Sells to Williams) the NRC forwarded to FPL its Safety Evaluation resolving this issue. This resolution of this issue was also recognized in the NRC's letter dated August 5, 1987 (Tourigny to Woody).

As a result of the above, FPL proposes to delete License Condition 2.C.(4) from Facility Operating License DPR-67.

License Conditon 2.C.(5)

(5) The licensee shall provide a supplement to XN-NF-85-117, "St. Lucie Unit 1 Revised LOCA-ECCS Analysis with 15% Steam Generator Tube Plugging", that will provide the complete large break LOCA spectrum results to demonstrate full compliance with the criteria of 10 CFR 50.46 and Appendix K to 10 CFR Part 50 for Commission staff's review and approval.

Documented Resolution

By letter L-86-36, dated January 29, 1986, FPL submitted XN-NF-85-117 Supplement 1, "St. Lucie Unit 1 Revised LOCA-ECCS Analysis with 15% Steam Generator Tube Plugging Break Spectrum and Exposure Results," dated December 1985. This analysis confirmed the linear heat generation rate limit for St. Lucie Unit 1 and demonstrated continued compliance with 10 CFR 50.46 and 10 CFR Part 50 Appendix K. This License Condition had been imposed at the time of issuance of Amendment 70 to St. Lucie Unit 1 Facility Operating License No. DPR-67.

[illegible]

By letter dated March 27, 1986 (Sells to Woody), the NRC Staff stated that it had reviewed FPL's January 29, 1986 submittal regarding this License Condition and found it to be acceptable. The staff additionally stated that it had completed action on this requirement and that a request to delete this License Condition may be included in a future proposed amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR-67.

As a result of the above, FPL proposes to delete License Condition 2.C.(5) from Facility Operating License No. DPR-67.

ATTACHMENT 3

DETERMINATION OF NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION

The standards used to arrive at a determination that a request for amendment involves no significant hazards consideration are included in the Commission's regulations, 10 CFR 50.92, which states that no significant hazards considerations are involved if the operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. Each standard is discussed as follows:

(1) Operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The License Conditions deletions being proposed to the Facility Operating License are administrative; they do not affect assumptions contained in plant safety analyses, nor do they affect Technical Specifications that preserve safety analysis assumptions. Therefore, the proposed changes do not affect the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed.

(2) Use of the modified specification would not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The changes being proposed to the Facility Operating License are administrative. Therefore, the proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

(3) Use of the modified specification would not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The changes being proposed by FPL are administrative; they do not relate to or modify the safety margins which have been previously reviewed and approved by the NRC. Therefore, the proposed changes should not involve any reduction in a margin of safety.

Based on the above, we have determined that the amendment request does not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated, (2) create the probability of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety; and therefore does not involve a significant hazards consideration.