



Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Attention: Mr. Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Eisenhut:

Re: St. Lucie Unit No. 1
Docket No. 50-335
Proposed License Amendment
Sodium Hydroxide Flow Rate and Pressure Test

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.90, Florida Power & Light Company submits herewith three signed originals and forty copies of a request to amend Appendix A of Facility Operating License DPR-67.

This amendment is proposed to supply flow rates and tolerances for each of the two Sodium Hydroxide (NaOH) sources. This submittal is in accordance with the commitment of Amendment No. 49.

The proposed amendment is described below and shown on the accompanying Technical Specification pages.

Page 3/4 6-16b

The flow rates and tolerances and test pressures are provided.

The proposed amendment has been reviewed by the St. Lucie Facility Review Group and the Florida Power & Light Company Nuclear Review Board.

In accordance with 10 CFR 50.91(b)(1), a copy of the proposed amendment is being forwarded to the State Designee for the State of Florida.

In accordance with 10 CFR 170.12(c), a check for \$150.00 is attached.

Attachment I provides an evaluation of the proposed action in light of the three standards contained in 10 CFR 50.92 (No Significant Hazards).

Very truly yours,

J. W. Williams, Jr.
Group Vice President
Nuclear Energy

JWW/RJS/cab

Attachment

~~8409140171-840910~~
PDR ADOCK 05000335
PDR

Acc 1
/1
Rec'd w/ check #150.00
#5064

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Mr. Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Page 2

cc: J. P. O'Reilly, Region II
Harold F. Reis, Esquire

Lyle Jerrett, Ph.D., Director
Office of Radiation Control
Dept. Health & Rehabilitative Services
1317 Winewood Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32301

ATTACHMENT I

NO SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS EVALUATION

The St. Lucie Unit I Technical Specification includes a requirement to periodically test the Spray Additive System. The requirement was approved with a commitment by FPL to provide the actual flow rates following testing. The proposed changes provide those values.

The proposed change meets both example (i) and (ii) of the Examples of Amendments that are considered Not Likely to Involve Significant Hazards Considerations as presented in the Federal Register notice of April 6, 1983.

Example (i)" "A purely administrative change to the Technical Specifications: For example, a change to achieve consistency throughout the technical specifications, correction of an error, or a change in nomenclature."

In that the proposed change merely adds a test value to a system previously designed, installed, reviewed and approved by the NRC, the change meets this example.

Example (ii): "A change that institutes an additional limitation restriction or control not presently included in the technical specifications: for example, a more stringent surveillance requirement."

In that the proposed change adds additional testing requirements, it meets this example.

Therefore, since this change only incorporates additional testing values into an existing technical specification, we have concluded, in accordance with 10 CFR 50.92, that the proposed change does not involve a significant hazard in that it does 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.