



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 70 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-11 AND
AMENDMENT NO. 54 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-18
COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY
LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2
DOCKET NOS. 50-373 AND 50-374

1.0 Introduction

By letter dated August 18, 1989 (Ref. 1), as amended by letter dated September 13, 1989 (Ref. 2), Commonwealth Edison Company (CECo, the licensee) proposed changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) for LaSalle County Station Units 1 and 2. The proposed changes would modify specifications having cycle-specific parameter limits by replacing the values of those limits with a reference to the Core Operating Limits Report (COLR) for the values of those limits. The proposed changes also include the addition of the COLR to the Definitions Section and to the reporting requirements of the Administrative Controls Section of the TS. Guidance on the proposed changes was developed by NRC on the basis of the review of a lead-plant proposal submitted on the Oconee plant docket by Duke Power Company. This guidance was provided to all power reactor licensees and applicants by Generic Letter 88-16, dated October 4, 1988 (Ref. 3).

2.0 Evaluation

The licensee's proposed changes to the TS are in accordance with the guidance provided by Generic Letter 88-16 and are addressed below.

- (1) The Definition Section of the TS was modified to include a definition of the Core Operating Limits Report that requires cycle/reload-specific parameter limits to be established on a unit-specific basis in accordance with an NRC approved methodology that maintains the limits of the safety analysis. The definition notes that plant operation within these limits is addressed by individual specifications.
- (2) The following specifications were revised to replace the values of cycle-specific parameter limits with a reference to the COLR that provides these limits.
 - (a) Specification 3/4.2.1

The Average Planar Linear Heat Generation Rate (APLHGR) limits for this specification are provided in the COLR.

(b) Specification 3/4.2.3

The Minimum Critical Power Ratio (MCPR) limits including the core flow adjustment factors Kf for this specification are provided in the COLR.

(c) Specification 3/4.2.4

The Linear Heat Generation Rate (LHGR) limits for this specification are provided in the COLR.

(d) Specification 3/4.3.6 (Table 3.3.6-2)

The Rod Block Monitor (RBM) Upscale Setpoint relationships for this specification are provided in the COLR.

The Bases of the affected specifications have been modified by the licensee to include appropriate reference to the COLR. Based on our review, we conclude that the changes to these Bases are acceptable.

- (3) Specification 6.6.A.6 was added to the reporting requirements of the Administrative Controls Section of the TS. This specification requires that the COLR be submitted, upon issuance, to the NRC Document Control Desk with copies to the Regional Administrator and Resident Inspector. The report provides the values of cycle-specific parameter limits that are applicable for the current fuel cycle. Furthermore, these specifications require that the values of these limits be established using NRC approved methodology and be consistent with all applicable limits of the safety analysis. The approved methodology is the following:

NEDE-24011-P-A, "General Electric Standard Application for Reactor Fuel," (latest approved version).

Finally, the specification requires that all changes in cycle-specific parameter limits be documented in the COLR before each reload cycle or remaining part of a reload cycle and submitted upon issuance to NRC, prior to operation with the new parameter limits.

On the basis of the review of the above items, the NRC staff concludes that the licensee provided an acceptable response to those items as addressed in the NRC guidance in Generic Letter 88-16 on modifying cycle-specific parameter limits in the TS. Because plant operation continues to be limited in accordance with the values of cycle-specific parameter limits that are established using an NRC approved methodology, the NRC staff concludes that this change is administrative in nature and there is no impact on plant safety as a consequence. Accordingly, the staff finds that the proposed changes are acceptable.

As part of the implementation of Generic Letter 88-16, the staff has also reviewed a sample COLR that was provided by the licensee. On the basis of this review, the staff concludes that the format and content of the sample COLR are acceptable.

The licensee also proposed changes to Technical Specifications 5.3.1 and 5.3.2. Specification 5.3.1 provides design features of the reactor core and fuel assemblies. Specification 5.3.2 provides the design features of the control rod assemblies. The proposed changes remove some details from the two specifications. However, the intent of the two specifications is maintained in that only fuel designs that have been approved for use in BWRs can be used by the licensee and control rods will allow the use of either boron carbide powder (B₄C) or hafnium metal (Hf) as the neutron absorber. Based on our review, we conclude that the changes to these two specifications are acceptable.

Although this amendment proposes Technical Specification changes for both LaSalle County Station units, Commonwealth Edison intends to implement these changes as Cycle 4 operation begins on the individual unit. The primary difference between the current Cycle 3 operation and Cycle 4 operation is that the reload fuel for both units will consist of the GE9B Fuel Design during Cycle 4 operation. Amendment 18 to GESTAR (NEDE-24011-P-A) incorporated the GE9B design, and received generic NRC approval in May of 1988. For this reason, Commonwealth Edison intends to employ the provisions in 10 CFR 50.59 for reviewing this new fuel design and will include the appropriate power distribution limits in the updated COLRs. Therefore, issuance of this amendment is needed to support the initial start-up of LaSalle County Unit 1 Cycle 4, currently projected for December 1989. The Unit 2 Technical Specification changes will not be required until Cycle 4 operation begins in June 1990 based on the current outage schedule.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves a change to a requirement with respect to the installation or use of a facility component located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 or a change to 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 issued a proposed finding that this amendment involves no significant hazards consideration and there has been no public comment on such finding. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). This amendment also involves changes in record-keeping, reporting or administrative procedures or requirements. Accordingly, with respect to these items, the amendments meet the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

We have reviewed request by the CECo to modify the Technical Specifications of the LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, that would remove the specific values of some cycle-dependent parameters from the specifications and place the values in a Core Operating Limits Report that would be referenced by the Specification. Based on this review, we conclude that these Technical Specification modifications are acceptable. We have also reviewed the proposed changes to Specifications 5.3.1 and 5.3.2 and conclude that they are acceptable. The staff has 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 issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

5.0 REFERENCES

1. Letter from J. A. Silady (CECo) to Thomas E. Murley (NRC), dated August 18, 1989.
2. Letter from J. A. Silady (CECo) to Thomas E. Murley (NRC), dated September 13, 1989.
3. Generic Letter 88-16, "Removal of Cycle-Specific Parameter Limits from Technical Specifications," dated October 4, 1988.

Principal Contributors: Daniel B. Fieno, NRR/SRXB
Paul C. Shemanski, NRR/PD3-2

Dated: December 18, 1989