



Commonwealth Edison
One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois
Address Reply to: Post Office Box 767
Chicago, Illinois 60680 - 0767

January 11, 1989

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Mr. Paul Shemanski
Washington, DC 20555

Subject: LaSalle County Station Unit 2
Supplement to Application for
Amendment to Facility Operating
License NPF-18, Appendix A,
Technical Specifications - Revision
of Table 3.8.3.2-1
NRC Docket No. 50-374

- References (a): W.E. Morgan letter to U.S. NRC dated
December 2, 1988 transmitting Proposed
- (b): P.C. Shemanski letter to H.E. Bliss
dated December 27, 1988.

Dear Mr. Shemanski:

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50, Commonwealth Edison applied for an amendment to Facility Operating License NPF-18, Appendix A, Technical Specification (Reference (a)). The purpose of this amendment was to revise Table 3.8.3.2-1 to reflect new locations of breakers for Valve 2E12-F009, Residual Heat Removal Shutdown Cooling Suction Isolation Valve.

Reference (b) requested Commonwealth Edison to reevaluate the significant hazards consideration of the above mentioned amendment request and resubmit it for NRC review. The following attachment provides the requested information.

Please direct any questions you may have regarding this matter to this office.

Very truly yours,

W. E. Morgan
Nuclear Licensing Administrator

lm

Attachment

9010020041 890111
PDR ADCK 05000374
P PDC

5492K

A001
11

ATTACHMENT

SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION

This proposed amendment reflects the change in location within the same motor control center of the breaker compartment used to control the Residual Heat Removal Shutdown Cooling Suction Isolation Valve 2E12-F009. It also deletes references to manufacturer part numbers because of changes to the part numbers.

Commonwealth Edison has evaluated the proposed Technical Specifications Amendment and has determined that it does not represent a significant hazards consideration. Based on the criteria for defining a significant hazards consideration established in 10CFR50.92, operation of LaSalle County Station Unit 2 in accordance with the proposed amendment will not:

- 1) Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated because:

The components themselves are unchanged with respect to their form, fit, and function. This change does not in any way compromise or change the basic function of the equipment affected.

- 2) Create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated because:

The function of the breakers affected is unchanged and all associated design requirements as required by the Technical Specifications are unchanged.

- 3) Involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety because:

The proposed change is merely an administrative change which has no effect on the margin of safety.