

FEB 23 1983

Docket No. 50-373

Docket No. 50-374

Commonwealth Edison Company

ATTN: Mr. Cordell Reed

Vice President

Post Office Box 767

Chicago, IL 60690

Gentlemen:

This refers to the routine safety inspection conducted by Messrs. W. G. Guldemon and A. L. Madison of this office on December 1 through 31, 1982, of activities at LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2, authorized by NRC Operating License No. NPF-11 and NRC Construction Permit No. CPPR-100 and to the discussion of our findings with Mr. G. J. Diederich at the conclusion of the inspection.

The enclosed copy of our inspection report identifies areas examined during the inspection. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of a selective examination of procedures and representative records, observations, and interviews with personnel.

During this inspection, certain of your activities appeared to be in non-compliance with NRC requirements, as specified in the enclosed Appendix. A written response is required. The item of noncompliance is, in our view, reflective of a broad problem involving administrative controls over equipment and plant operations. Paragraph 3 of the enclosed inspection report provides additional information. Your response to the item of noncompliance should address possible broad implications of the violation.

In addition to the item of noncompliance, two events occurred during the inspection period which, except for fortuitous circumstances, would also have resulted in items of noncompliance. The first item, detailed in Paragraph 3, involved a situation in which an abnormal indication was not identified in a timely fashion even though sufficient information was available. This topic has been the subject of several discussions between our staffs including a Management Meeting conducted in our offices on June 11, 1982. You are requested to evaluate the adequacy of the level of management attention in this area and to provide the results of the evaluation in your response to this letter.

8303170529 830223  
PDR ADOCK 05000373  
Q PDR

IEOJ

The second event, detailed in Paragraph 4, concerns instrument calibration control. In November 1982 the inspectors identified to station management a concern about the possibility of Technical Specification-related items being on the non-Technical Specification-related past due for calibration list. Little effort was made by the station to verify that this was not the case. As noted in Paragraph 4, an example bearing out the concern was subsequently identified by the inspectors on December 21, 1982. The lack of a timely response by the station which should have identified and corrected the example is of concern to us. You are requested to address this concern in your response to this letter.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the Commission's regulations, a copy of this letter, the enclosures, and your response to this letter will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room. If this report contains any information that you (or your contractors) believe to be exempt from disclosure under 10 CFR 9.5(a)(4), it is necessary that you (a) notify this office by telephone within ten (10) days from the date of this letter of your intention to file a request for withholding; and (b) submit within twenty-five (25) days from the date of this letter a written application to this office to withhold such information. If your receipt of this letter has been delayed such that less than seven (7) days are available for your review, please notify this office promptly so that a new due date may be established. Consistent with Section 2.790(b)(1), any such application must be accompanied by an affidavit executed by the owner of the information which identifies the document or part sought to be withheld, and which contains a full statement of the reasons which are the bases for the claim that the information should be withheld from public disclosure. This section further requires the statement to address with specificity the considerations listed in 10 CFR 2.790(b)(4). The information sought to be withheld shall be incorporated as far as possible into a separate part of the affidavit. If we do not hear from you in this regard within the specified periods noted above, a copy of this letter, the enclosures, and your response to this letter will be placed in the Public Document Room.

The responses directed by this letter (and the accompanying Notice) are not subject to the clearance procedures of the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, PL 96-511.

We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection.

Sincerely,

Original signed by C. E. Norelius

C. E. Norelius, Director  
Division of Project and  
Resident Programs

Enclosures:

1. Appendix, Notice  
of Violation
2. Inspection Report  
No. 50-373/82-55(DPRP);  
No. 50-374/82-23(DPRP)

cc w/encls:

Louis O. DelGeorge, Director  
of Nuclear Licensing  
D. L. Shamblin, Site  
Construction Superintendent  
T. E. Quaka, Quality  
Assurance Superintendent  
G. J. Diederich, Station  
Superintendent  
R. H. Holyoak, Project Manager  
DMB/Document Control Desk (RIDS)  
Resident Inspector, RIII  
Karen Borgstadt, Office of  
Assistant Attorney General

RIII  
*R.D.W.*  
Walker/jp  
2/7/83

RIII  
*JS*  
Streeter  
2/18

~~RIII  
Lewis~~

RIII  
*CEN*  
Norelius