10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LA SALLE COUNTY UNIT 1 2

SYSTEM PROCESS RADIATION TEST/PROCEDURE No LTP 1200-4

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE Classification of a Liquid Release REVISION 1

EQUIPMENT NAME RMR service water, service water, Radwaste Effluent Lines

EQUIPMENT NUMBER 0D18-K606, 1(2)D18 K604, 1(2)D18-K605, 1(2)D18-K608

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Aid in the control classification of a liquid release

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:
Procedure provides instructions for evaluation and classification only

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:
Procedure provides evaluation and classification instructions only

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced?
_____ Yes __X__ No, Because:
Procedure is evaluating and classifying release only

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

Performed By K. Nowak Date 23 Apr 82

Approved By [signature] Date 4/27/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LTP 1200-4
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 ( )

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,

Interpret parameters only, doesn't affect them

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,

Provides for evaluation of status, doesn't affect status

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

Evaluation steps only

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 KD Yowale

Date 23 Apr 82

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

SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP 1330-21

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERMINATION OF REACTOR COOLANT CHLORIDE AT THE HRSS REVISION #3

EQUIPMENT NAME —

EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

DETERMINES REACTOR COOLANT CHLORIDE 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: Does not change procedure, only clarifies the steps.

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: no possibility of affecting plant

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes X No, Because: only clarifying existing procedure.

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

Performed By [signature] Date 6/1/82

Approved By [signature] Date 6/9/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. 2P1330-21
REVISION 25

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 procedure, only clarifies the steps.

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, no possibility of affecting plant.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ___ Yes ___X___ No, only clarifying existing procedures

Any Answer = Yes ( )

Request and receive Nuclear Regulatory Commission authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

All Answers No (X)

Initiate Procedure/Test Implementation

NOTE:

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

Performed by Paul A. Knoll

Date 6-1-82

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 HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP 1330-23

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE PH, COND, + D.O. AT HRSS REVISION +2

EQUIPMENT NAME —

EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Determines Rx coolant pH, conductivity and dissolved oxygen concentration 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: Does not change procedure, only clarifies existing steps.

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: No possibility of affecting plant

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes __X__No, Because: only clarifying existing procedure

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

Performed By Paul A Krull Date 6/1/82

Approved By [signature] Date 6/15/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LEP/1330-23
REVISION X 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, Does not change procedure, only clarifies the steps.

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, No possibility of affecting plant ops.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____ Yes ____X____ No, only clarifying existing procedures

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 C. Kroll

Date 6-1-82

ATTACHMENT F

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT 0

SYSTEM PS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP 1330-24

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERMINATION OF REACTOR COOLANT HYDROGEN CONCENTRATION AT THE HESS REVISION 1

EQUIPMENT NAME —

EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE
delineate ~~up~~ steps for determining reactor coolant hydrogen concentrations during normal + 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: procedure only clarifies use of panels.

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: only clarified use of panels.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____ Yes X No, Because: did not affect tech specs.

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

Performed By [signature] Date 5/18/82

Approved By J C Renwick Date 6/10/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LTP 1330-24
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

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, procedure only clarifies use of panels

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, only clarifies panel uses.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ___ Yes X No, does not affect Tech Specs.

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 A. Krull

Date 5/18/82

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LaSalle UNIT 0

SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP1330-25

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE Sampling Rx Coolant at HRSS REVISION 2

EQUIPMENT NAME —

EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Method of sampling Rx Coolant at 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:

only clarifies the procedure

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:

only clarifies the procedure

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

only clarifies the procedure

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

Performed By Paul Knoll Date 6/6/82

Approved By [signature] Date 6/10/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LEP 1330-25
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,

   only clarifies the procedure

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,

   only clarifies the procedure

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

   only clarifies the procedure

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 Knell

Date 6/6/82

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION ~~LSP1330-26~~ LA SALE UNIT 0

SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No LSP1330-26

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE SAMPLING CONTAINMENT AIR AT THE HRSS REVISION 3

EQUIPMENT NAME —

EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE
Method of sampling containment + Rx Bldg air from 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: No, only clarifies the steps of the procedure.

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: No, only clarifies the steps.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? ____Yes X No, Because: No, only clarifies the steps.

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

Performed By Paul O'Neill Date 6/5/82

Approved By [signature] Date 6/10/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LEP 1330-26
REVISION 3

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,

   only clarifies the steps

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,

   only clarifies the steps

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

   only clarifies the steps.

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 A Knoll

Date 6/5/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 1 of 2)

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT 0

SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP 1330-28

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE Sampling Process Waters Containing Radioactivity at HRSS REVISION 2

EQUIPMENT NAME —

EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Method of sampling drywell sumps + HRSS Waste Tank at 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:

   only clarifies required steps

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:

   only clarifies required steps.

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

   only Clarifies required steps

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

Performed By Paul Knol [signature] 6/6/82 Date

Approved By [signature] Date 6/6/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. CZP1330-28
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,
   only clarifies steps

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,
   only clarifies steps

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

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 6-6-82

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 # WRGM TEST/PROCEDURE No LZP 1330-32

TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE POST-ACCIDENT SAMPLING OF THE GEN. ATOMICS WRGM REVISION 1

EQUIPMENT NAME —

EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Method of sampling Stack and Standby gas treatment effluents in a post-accident condition

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:
only clarifies procedure

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:
only clarifies procedure

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced?
____Yes X No, Because:
only clarifies procedure

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

Performed By Paul J Kuell Date 6/8/82

Approved By J C Reed Date 6/8/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. CZP/1330-32
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

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,

only clarifies procedure

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,

only. clarifies procedure

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

only clarifies procedure.

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 Kuell

Date 6/5/82