ATTACHMENT A

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST

LASALLE COUNTY STATION UNIT 2

BACKGROUND AND DISCUSSION

BACKGROUND

Generic Letter 84-23 indicated a large error could occur in indicated reactor vessel water level under certain accident conditions. This potential error was required to be eliminated by improvements to existing instrumentation by NUREG-0737, II.F.2. This requirement was made part of the Unit 2 license in License Condition 2.C.(18)(c).

Commonwealth Edison (CECo) provided a response to Generic Letter 84-23 in a letter dated June 10, 1986 in which certain design changes were proposed to correct this problem. The NRC Staff accepted our proposed solution in a letter dated March 2, 1987.

Installation of the proposed modification has resulted in two additional instrument lines which pass through the primary containment in existing containment penetrations. General Design Criteria 55 requires the use of isolation devices for these lines. Excess flow check valves and manual isolation valves were installed outside the containment to perform this function. The excess flow check valves acting as automatic primary containment isolation valves must be added to Technical Specification Table 3.6.3-1.

DISCUSSION

The proposed Technical Specification amendment adds the excess flow check valves installed as automatic isolation devices to Table 3.6.3-1. These valves are designated as 2B21-F570 and 2B21-F571.

These changes are administrative in nature and are similar to the one approved in Amendment 34 transmitted by letter from E.G. Adensam dated February 10, 1986 to add a containment isolation valve (1CM 102) for the containment flood up instrumentation.

4984K

ATTACHMENT B

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST

LASALLE COUNTY STATION UNIT 2

PROPOSED CHANGES TO APPENDIX A

REVISED PAGES:

NPF-18: 3/4 6-34

4984K

TABLE 3.6.3-1 (Continued)

PRIMARY CONTAINMENT ISOLATION VALVES

VALVE FUNCTION AND NUMBER

Excess Flow Check Valves[g] (Continued)

48. 2E12-F317
49. 2E12-F360A, B
50. 2E21-F304
51. 2E22-F304
52. 2E22-F341
53. 2E22-F342
54. 2B33-F319A, B
55. 2B33-F317A, B
56. 2B33-F313A, B, C, D
57. 2B33-F311A, B, C, D
58. 2B33-F315A, B, C, D
59. 2B33-F301A, B
60. 2B33-F307A, B, C, D
61. 2B33-F305A, B, C, D
62. 2CM004
63. 2CM002
64. 2CM012
65. 2CM010
66. 2VQ061
67. 2B21-F457
68. 2B21-F459
69. 2B21-F461
70. 2CM102
71. 2B21-F570
72. 2B21-F571

ATTACHMENT C

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST

LASALLE COUNTY STATION UNIT 2

SIGNIFICANT HAZARDS CONSIDERATION

The proposed Operating Licensing/Technical Specification Amendment has been evaluated to determine whether or not there is a Significant Hazards Consideration based on the questions provided by 10 CFR 50.92 requirements. In addition, the evaluation was measured against the criteria used to establish safety limits, the limiting safety system settings, and the limiting conditions for operations. The results of the evaluation are presented below.

1. Does the proposed amendment involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated?

   No, this change is administrative, adding two new valves to Technical Specification Table 3.6.3-1. The modification that installed these new instrument lines and excess flow check valves does not require a Technical Specification change. The design of these new valves, meets the requirements listed in UFSAR Section 6.2.4. The additional containment penetration was designed in accordance with General Design Criteria 55 and Regulatory Guide 1.11. This additional instrument line does not significantly increase the consequences of any postulated accident.

2. Does the proposed amendment create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated?

   No, instrument line failure has already been evaluated.

3. Does the proposed amendmont involve a significant reduction in the margin of safety?

   No, the instrument line meets regulatory requirements to ensure that the margin of safety is maintained.

Based on this preceding discussion, it is concluded that the proposed amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; nor involve a significant reduction in the required margin of safety. Therefore, based on the guidance provided in the Federal register and the criteria established in 10 CFR 50.92(c) the proposed amendment involves no significant hazards consideration.