

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

## SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

## RELATED TO AMENDMENT NO. 10

## TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-16

FLORIDA POWER & LIGHT COMPANY, ET AL.

ST. LUCIE PLANT, UNIT NO. 2

DOCKET NO. 50-389

### INTRODUCTION

The licensee submitted letters on September 28 and October 19, 1984 to amend the technical specifications to change the nomenclature (tag numbers) of valves in the continuous containment purge system and the station air system.

#### EVALUATION

The change in nomenclature in Tables 3.6-1 and 3.6-2 is necessary because the currently listed valves are being replaced and will be given new/different tag numbers.

In the case of the continuous containment purge system, License Condition 2.C.8 required that a better valve be installed during the first refueling outage. A check valve was replaced with a butterfly valve and this is acceptable to the staff. The licensee has also chosen to replace two isolation valves in the station air system and needs to change the tag numbers in the same two tables. The replacement valves are better than those currently in the station air system and are acceptable.

Based on the above evaluation, the staff concludes that the licensee's proposed changes to the Technical Specifications are acceptable.

# 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. 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 S1.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR S1.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of the amendment.

85040 PDR	20459 ADOCK	05000389	ŢŢ
* • ·	، د	PDR	11

an and the state of the second

. •

tr a

۳ ۲ ۰

# 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: March 15, 1985

Principal Contributor: D. Sells

**,** ; •

.

. '

مسر ج مُسر مرد م 

, \* \* \* \* \* . .

ta anti-