



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

SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT  
AMENDMENT NO. 9 TO LICENSE NPF-11  
LA SALLE COUNTY STATION, UNIT NO. 1  
DOCKET NO. 50-373

Introduction

By letter dated August 19, 1982, Commonwealth Edison (licensee) proposed an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-11 for La Salle County Station, Unit No. 1 to change the Technical Specifications for removing test specimens from only one reactor vessel material surveillance capsule holder instead of three holders for the La Salle County Station Unit 1 reactor vessel material surveillance program.

Evaluation

There are three capsule holders in the La Salle County Station Unit 1 Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program. In the Technical Specifications, a withdrawal test specimen from each capsule holder is specified at 10 and 30 effective full power years (EFPY). In this application, Commonwealth Edison requested that test specimens be removed from one reactor vessel material surveillance capsule holder because the specimen holders are welded closed, and it is not realistic to remove samples from each holder at each scheduled withdrawal.

The reactor vessel material surveillance program of La Salle must be in conformance with the requirements of Appendix H, 10 CFR Part 50. Appendix H, 10 CFR Part 50 requires for La Salle Unit No. 1 that at 10 and 30 Service years, Charpy V-Not (CVN) impact test and tensile test specimens be withdrawn from the reactor vessel surveillance holders to determine the effect of neutron irradiation and thermal environment on the reactor vessel beltline materials.

Each capsule holder in the La Salle County Station Unit 1 Reactor Vessel Material Surveillance Program contains a sufficient number of CVN impact test and tensile test specimens for performing the tests required by Appendix H, 10 CFR Part 50. The NRC staff considers the licensee's revised reactor vessel material surveillance program acceptable, except that capsule holders must be withdrawn at 10 and 30 Service Years instead of 10 and 30 EFPY. The Technical Specifications specifies the new withdrawal schedule.

Environmental Consideration

We have determined that this amendment does not authorize a change in effluent types of total amount nor an increase in power level and will not result in any significant environmental impact. Having made this determination, we have further concluded that this amendment involves action which is insignificant from the standpoint of environmental impact, and, pursuant to 10 CFR Section 51.5(d)(4), that an environmental impact statement or negative declaration and environmental impact appraisal need not be prepared in connection with the issuance of this statement.

Conclusion

We have concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that; (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences or accidents previously considered, does not create the possibility of an accident of a type different from any evaluated previously, and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration; (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner; and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

Date: November 18 1982