



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION
SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 59 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-11 AND
AMENDMENT NO. 39 TO FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. NPF-18

COMMONWEALTH EDISON COMPANY

LASALLE COUNTY STATION, UNITS 1 AND 2

DOCKET NOS. 50-373 AND 50-374

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated April 29, 1987, Commonwealth Edison proposed to amend Facility Operating License NPF-11 and NPF-18 pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90. The proposed amendment corrects an inconsistency between Technical Specification requirements regarding the suppression pool high level alarm.

2.0 EVALUATION

Commonwealth Edison discovered that an inconsistency exists between the requirements in Technical Specification 4.6.2.1.c and Technical Specification Table 3.3.3-2. Technical Specification 4.6.2.1.c.1 requires a setpoint of less than or equal to 26 feet 8 inches (equivalent to a plant elevation of 700 feet 0 inches) for the suppression pool high level alarm. Technical Specification 3.3.3-2 and the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) Table 7.3-1 require trip setpoint of less than or equal to 700 feet 1 inch and an allowable value of less than or equal 700 feet 2 inches for Suppression Pool Water Level - High. Both of these alarm setpoints are below the maximum allowable Suppression Pool level of 26 feet 10 inches indicated in Technical Specification 3.6.2.1.a.1.

The subsequent Commonwealth Edison investigation into the cause of the inconsistency concluded that one of the contributing factors was the use of different reference points for the suppression pool high level alarm setpoints identified in the Technical Specifications. That is, the levels were referenced to plant elevation in one case and to the bottom of the suppression chamber in the other. The investigation also found that the reference points used in the Technical Specifications for the Limiting Conditions for Operations and trip setpoints are not consistent with the instrument references used for the control room and local suppression pool level indications. The instrument zero for all plant suppression pool level indications is set at a plant elevation of 699 feet 11 inches.

These inconsistencies within the Technical Specifications and between the Technical Specifications and plant indications have the potential to cause future personnel errors. The licensee proposed that the following amendments be made to the Technical Specifications:

1. The suppression pool high water level alarm setpoint in Technical Specification 4.6.2.1.c.1 be raised 1 inch to be consistent with Technical Specification Table 3.3.3-2 and the UFSAR.
2. All references to suppression pool level in the Technical Specifications be amended to be consistent with plant indications.
3. A figure be added to the Technical Specification bases which will correlate plant evaluation, suppression chamber levels and suppression pool level indications.

The change to the suppression pool high level alarm setpoint does not effect the LCO for suppression pool level. By making the Technical Specification limits consistent with plant indications, the potential for future personnel errors occurring, due to misinterpretation of the technical specifications, will be reduced.

The staff has reviewed the proposed Technical Specification changes and concludes that they are consistent with the analyses described above and are acceptable. We conclude that the proposed Unit 1 and Unit 2 license amendments are acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32 the Commission has previously determined in an environmental assessment of the proposed action published in the Federal Register that granting this amendment will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment (53 FR 8520).

4.0 CONCLUSION

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's submittal to correct inconsistencies between Technical Specification requirements regarding the suppression pool high level alarm. Based on this review, the staff concludes that the proposed Technical Specification changes are acceptable.

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by operation in the proposed manner, and (2) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of these amendments will not be inimical to the common defense and security or to the health and safety of the public.

REFERENCE

Letter from C. Allen, Commonwealth Edison to USNRC dated April 29, 1987.

Principal Contributor: Paul Shemanski, NRR/PDIII-2

Dated: August 31, 1988