### ATTACHMENT B

# TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST LASALLE COUNTY STATION UNIT 1

PROPOSED CHANGES TO APPENDIX A

REVISED PAGES:

NPF-11: 6-31

6-31a (new)

# TABLE 3.6.3-1 (Continued)

## PRIMARY CONTAINMENT ISOLATION VALVES

### VALVE FUNCTION AND NUMBER

Excess Flow Check Valves (g) (Continued)

- 46. 1E12-F359A, B
- 47. 1E12-F319
- 48. 1E12-F317
- 49. 1E12-F360A, B
- 50. 1E21-F304
- 51. 1E22-F304
- 52. 1E22-F341
- 53. 1E22-F342
- 54. 1B33-F319A, B
- 55. 1B33-F317A, B
- 56. 1B33-F313A, B, C, D
- 57. 1833-F311A, B, C, D
- 58. 1B33-F315A, B, C, D
- 59. 1B33-F301A, B
- 60. 1B33-F307A, B, C, D
- 61. 1833-F305A, B, C, D
- 62. 16M004 1CM 004
- 63. -16MOO2 1CMOO2
- 64. -ICMO12 1 CM 012
- 65. -1CM010 1CM010
- 66. -IVQ061 1 VQ 061
- 67. 1B21-F457
- 68. 1821-F459
- 69. 1821-F461
- 70. 1CM102

PRIMARY CONTAINMENT ISOLATION VALVES

VALVE FUNCTION AND NUMBER

Excess Flow Check Valves (9) (Continued)

69. 1821 - F 461

70, 1CM102

71.1821-F570

72. 1821-F571

#### ATTACHMENT C

# TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST LASALLE COUNTY STATION UNIT 1

#### 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.

 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.

Does the proposed amendment 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.