ATTACHMENT F

(Page 1 of 2)

LAP 820-2
Revision 19
April 7, 1982
20

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LaSalle UNIT 0 50-373

SYSTEM RS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP1330-21

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERMINATION OF REACTOR COOLANT CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT THE HRSS REVISION 2

EQUIPMENT NAME NA

EQUIPMENT NUMBER NA

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE Method of determining the reactor coolant chloride concentration during normal operating and post-accident conditions utilizing the HRSS Panels.

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? ____ Yes X No, because: Chemistry procedure, and there are means of analyzing the reactor coolant if this fails.

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ____ Yes X No, Because: does not affect as presented in FSAR.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____ Yes X No, Because: more refined means of determining reactor coolant Chloride concentration are available.

X005
s
1/1

* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

Performed By Gul Kroll Date 4/29/82

Approved By [signature] Date 4/30/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. C&P/1370-21
REVISION 2

Does this constitute a change to procedures as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( ) No X

Is a change in the Technical Specification involved?

No X

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no', and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?

   ____Yes ___X___No,

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ____Yes ___X___No,

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes ___X___No,

Yes ( )

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No X

Request and receive Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes' should be reported in the annual report to the NRC.

Performed by Paul Knoll

Date 4/29/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 1 of 2)

LAP 820-2
Revision 19
April 7, 1982
20

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT 0

SYSTEM ~~0~~ PS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP 1330-22

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE CALIBRATION OF THE MODEL 10 DIONEX ION CHROMATOG REVISION 2

EQUIPMENT NAME MODEL 10 DIONEX ION CHROMATOGRAPH ON CHEM. ANAL. PANEL

EQUIPMENT NUMBER OPLE1J.

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE Method of calibrating HRSS ion chromatograph for chloride analysis.

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? ____Yes X No, Because: other means of analysis for chloride are available.

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ____Yes X No, Because: does not affect ~~No Change~~ FSAR.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes X No, Because: other means of chloride analysis available.

* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

Performed By Paul Farrell Date 4/29/82

Approved By J.S. Marshall Date 4/30/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. L2P1330-22
REVISION 2

Does this constitute a change to procedures as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( ) No X

Is a change in the Technical Specification involved?

No X

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no', and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?

   ___ Yes X No,

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ___ Yes X No,

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ___ Yes X No,

Yes ( )

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No X

Request and receive Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes' should be reported in the annual report to the NRC.

Performed by Paul Knoll

Date 4/29/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 1 of 2)

LAP 820-2-
Revision 19
April 7, 1982
20

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT Ø

SYSTEM PS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP1330-23

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERM. OF Rx COOLANT PH, COND. + D.O. AT THE HRSS REVISION 1

EQUIPMENT NAME NA

EQUIPMENT NUMBER NA

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE Method of determining Rx Coolant PH, conductivity and dissolved oxygen concentrations at the HRSS panels during normal operating and post-accident conditions

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? ____Yes X No, Because: Chemistry Procedure, also backup methods are available if the equipment malfunctions

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ____Yes X No, Because: ~~Does not affect the previous~~ FSAR.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes X No, Because: Backup and more accurate methods are available.

* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

Performed By Paul Knoll Date 4/29/82

Approved By Jon Marshall Date 4/30/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LZP1330-23
REVISION 1

Does this constitute a change to procedures as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( ) No (X)

Is a change in the Technical Specification involved?

No (X)

Yes ( )

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no', and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?
   ____Yes ___X___ No,

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ____Yes ___X___ No,

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes ___X___ No,

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No (X)

Request and receive Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes' should be reported in the annual report to the NRC.

Performed by Paul Knoll

Date 4/6/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 1 of 2)

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LaSalle UNIT Ø

SYSTEM [redacted] CM TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP1330-26

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE SAMPLING OF CONTAINMENT AIR AT THE HRSS REVISION 2

EQUIPMENT NAME [redacted]

EQUIPMENT NUMBER

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE delineates method of obtaining a containment air sample during post-accident and normal operating conditions at the HRSS.

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? ____Yes X No, Because: The sample partitioner is not mentioned in the FSAR, however the CCP + CASP are mentioned & this in no way changes the intent.

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ____Yes X No, Because: [redacted] sampling does not affect FSAR, and there are other means of monitoring containment air.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes X No, Because: it is a sampling procedure, & will aid in monitoring, it is not the only means of monitoring the containment.

* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

Performed By Paul Strall Date 5-6-82

Approved By [signature] Date 5-7-82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. ZAP1330-26
REVISION 2

Does this constitute a change to procedures as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( ) No X

Is a change in the Technical Specification involved?

No X

Yes ( )

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no', and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?
   ___ Yes X No, does not change FSAR

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? ___ Yes X No, does not change FSAR.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ___ Yes X No, does not change, only an extra monitoring and

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No X

Request and receive Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes' should be reported in the annual report to the NRC.

Performed by Paul Kuell

Date 5-6-82