

RS-06-169

10 CFR 50.90

November 29, 2006

U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, D. C. 20555

LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2
Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-11 and NPF-18
NRC Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374

Subject: Additional Information Supporting the LaSalle County Station Units 1 and 2
180-day Response to NRC Generic Letter 2003-01, "Control Room
Habitability"

- References: 1. Letter from D. B. Matthews (U.S. NRC) to addresses, "NRC Generic Letter
2003-01: Control Room Habitability," dated June 12, 2003
2. Letter from M. P. Gallagher (Exelon Generation Company, LLC) to U.S. NRC,
"Exelon/AmerGen 60-Day Response to NRC Generic Letter 2003-01, Control
Room Habitability," dated August 11, 2003
3. Letter from M. P. Gallagher (Exelon Generation Company, LLC) to U.S. NRC,
"Exelon/AmerGen 180-Day Response to NRC Generic Letter 2003-01,
"Control Room Habitability," dated December 9, 2003

On June 12, 2003, the NRC issued Generic Letter 2003-01, "Control Room Habitability," (i.e., Reference 1). Exelon Generation Company, LLC, (EGC), submitted the required information for LaSalle County Station, (LSCS) Units 1 and 2 within 180-days as requested in Reference 1 by a letter dated December 9, 2003 (i.e., Reference 3).

In an email dated October 12, 2006, from Stephen Sands, NRC Project Manager to Alison Mackellar, EGC Licensing Engineer; additional information was requested to complete the review of the LSCS Response to Generic Letter 2003-01. An email response was subsequently provided to the NRC on October 17, 2006 addressing the additional information.

Following discussions with the NRC, the additional information was requested to be submitted as a supplemental letter to the original response (i.e., Reference 3). Attachment 1 provides the additional information requested.

November 29, 2006
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Page 2

There are no regulatory commitments contained in this letter. Should you have any questions concerning this letter, please contact Ms. Alison Mackellar at (630) 657-2817.

Respectfully,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Darin M Benyak". The signature is written in a cursive style with a long horizontal line extending to the right.

Darin M. Benyak
Manager, Licensing and Regulatory Affairs

Attachment 1: Response to Request for Additional Information

ATTACHMENT 1
Response to Request for Additional Information

Question No. 1

“In LaSalle's response to GL 2003-01 it was stated that the assumed values of 1200 cfm filtered inleakage for the control room and 1400 cfm filtered inleakage for the auxiliary electrical equipment room. It was further stated that the assumed unfiltered inleakage values of 7 cfm for the CR and 6 cfm for the AEER.”

Response

The LaSalle County Station (LSCS) GL 2003-01, “NRC Generic Letter 2003-01: Control Room Habitability,” response is correct. As stated in Reference 2, filtered inleakage of 1200 cfm for the Control Room (CR) and filtered inleakage of 1400 cfm for the Auxiliary Electric Equipment Room (AEER), and unfiltered inleakage of 7 cfm for the CR and unfiltered inleakage of 6 cfm for the AEER were assumed in the analysis.

Note that the LSCS Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) will need to be revised to clarify that the inleakage values documented are filtered inleakage values.

Question No. 2

“In the LaSalle response to the GL it was also reported that tracer gas test results of 673 cfm (+/-169) for the CR and 940 cfm (+/-316) for the AEER but it doesn't say whether the test results are for filtered or unfiltered inleakage. The response says that the measured values are less than the values assumed in the radiological analysis, but the response to the GL states those values are for filtered inleakage.”

Response

The LSCS GL 2003-01 response is correct. As stated in Reference 2, the limiting measured inleakage value for the CR was 673 cfm (+/-169) and 940 cfm (+/-316) for the AEER. To clarify what was previously submitted in Reference 2, the measured air inleakages for both the CR and the AEER are filtered inleakages, are less than the values assumed in the radiological analyses, and as such satisfy the requirements of General Design Criterion 19.

Question No. 3

“The SAR has the following info: Section 9.4.1.2.1.1.f states 1400 cfm unfiltered inleakage. Section 9.4.1.2.3.f states 1400 cfm unfiltered inleakage. Section 9.4.1.1.3.f states 1200 cfm unfiltered inleakage. Section 9.4.1.1.g [Section 9.4.1.1.1.g] states 1200 cfm unfiltered inleakage.”

Response

The LSCS GL 2003-01 response is correct, however, as stated in the response to Question 1, the LSCS UFSAR will need to be revised to correct Sections 9.4.1.2.1.1.f, 9.4.1.2.3.f, 9.4.1.1.3.f and 9.4.1.1.1.g to clarify that the inleakage values documented are in fact filtered inleakage values.

ATTACHMENT 1
Response to Request for Additional Information

LSCS entered this issue into the EGC Corrective Action database for resolution with a specific action for Design Engineering to revise the UFSAR as needed to clarify the inleakages into the LSCS Control Room Envelope are filtered inleakages.