



Commonwealth Edison
 One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois
 Address Reply to: Post Office Box 767
 Chicago, Illinois 60690 - 0767

September 29, 1988

Mr. A. Bert Davis
 Regional Administrator
 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
 Region III
 799 Roosevelt Road
 Glen Ellyn, IL 60137

Subject: LaSalle County Station Units 1 and 2
 Response to Inspection Report Nos.
 50-373/88013 and 50-374/88012
NRC Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374

Reference (a): Letter dated May 5, 1988 from Bruce S.
 Mallet transmitting Inspection Report
 Nos. 50-373/88013; 50-374/88012

Dear Mr. Davis:

This letter is in response to the inspection conducted by Mr. B. Drouin on April 11-15, 1988 of Security activities at LaSalle County Station. Reference (a) reported the results of that inspection in which no violations were identified. Commonwealth Edison (CECo) would like to provide some minor clarifications to the wording of certain statements within that report attributed to CECo. Those comments are included in Attachment A.

If you have any further questions regarding this matter, please direct them to this office.

Very truly yours,

C. M. Allen
 Nuclear Licensing Administrator

lm

Attachment

5166K

8810250371 830929
 PDR ADOCK 05000373
 G PNU

IE04

OCT 17 1988

111

ATTACHMENT A

CLARIFICATION TO INSPECTION REPORT

NOS. 50-373/88013; 50-374/88012

ITEM 1

Page 7, top paragraph, indicates that "...the Corporate Nuclear Security Administrator (NSA) stated that a revised security plan submittal to NRC HQ, in response to the miscellaneous amendments, will contain a requirement to change security locks and keys if the system is suspected to be comprised for any reason." The correct words from the Security Plan submittal are as follows..."Protected and Vital Area Locks and Keys will be rotated annually or whenever there is evidence of compromise." These words have been found acceptable and approved for security plans for the other five CECo Nuclear Stations and indicated acceptable for LaSalle in a telecon with the NRC HQ Security Reviewer, R. Skelton. Based on this discussion, the words in the Inspection Report, "for any reason" should be deleted.

ITEM 2

Page 10, second and fourth paragraphs, indicates that the NRC expects that a Quality Assurance (QA) auditor be specifically qualified on the basic security Officer Appendix B tasks. Although the current QA inspector has been trained to the Security Forces Training and Qualification Plan and the replacement QA inspector is scheduled to be similarly trained, CECo did not intend this to change the LaSalle QA security inspector qualification requirements.

Currently, eight out of twelve QA personnel assigned to LaSalle Station possess specific qualification to audit and survey the areas of security and employee screening. Generally, when other types of training opportunities are made available in an area, QA personnel participate in order to "enhance" their qualification. Such is the case at LaSalle with the QA inspectors T&Q training and this enhanced training should not be considered to be a "committed requirement" for QA inspectors in the future at LaSalle or any other CECo Station.