

MAY 24 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Charles E. Morelius, Director  
Division of Projects and Resident Programs  
Region III

FROM: Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief  
Reactor Operations Analysis Branch  
Office for Analysis and Evaluation  
of Operational Data

SUBJECT: EVALUATION OF LA SALLE COUNTY STATION UNITS 1 AND 2  
LERS FOR THE PERIOD JANUARY 1, 1983 TO APRIL 30, 1984

The Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data has assessed the Licensee Event Reports (LERs) submitted under Docket Nos. 50-373 and 50-374 during the subject period. This has been done in support of the ongoing SALP review of the Commonwealth Edison Company with regard to their performance as a licensee of the La Salle County Station Units 1 and 2. Our perspective would be indicative of that of a BWR system safety engineer who, although knowledgeable, is not intimately familiar with the detailed site-specific equipment arrangements and operations. Our review focused on the technical accuracy, completeness, and intelligibility of the LERs. Our review covered a majority of the LERs submitted during the assessment period.

The LERs submitted were adequate in each important respect with few exceptions. The LERs provided clear descriptions of the cause and nature of the events as well as adequate explanations of the effects on both system function and public safety. Most of the LERs provided supplemental information in attachments to the LER forms. This enabled the LER reviewer to better understand the nature of the events encountered, thereby facilitating evaluation of the safety significance of the event. The described corrective actions taken or planned by the licensee were considered to be commensurate with the nature, seriousness and frequency of the problems found. The enclosure provides additional observations from our review of the LERs.

In summary, our review of the licensee's LERs indicates that the licensee provided adequate descriptions of the events. None of the LERs we received involved what we would consider to be a significant event or serious challenge to plant safety.

8406020447CF

VA YPD

FOIA-85-668

C/2

(2)

Charles E. Morelius

- 2 -

If you have any questions please contact either myself or Sal Salah of my staff on FTS 492-4432.

Karl V. Seyfrit, Chief  
Reactor Operations Analysis Branch  
Office for Analysis and Evaluation  
of Operational Data

Attachment:  
As stated

cc: Anthony Bournia, NRR  
Mike Jordan, SR R I  
Steve Guthrie, R Insp  
Thomas H. Tambling, R-III

## SALP REVIEW FOR LA SALLE COUNTY UNITS 1 AND 2

The licensee submitted 173 LERs for La Salle 1 and 10 LERs for La Salle 2 in the assessment period from January 1, 1983 to April 30, 1984. Our review included the following LER numbers:

For La Salle 1 -

83-001 through 83-155

84-001 through 84-018

For La Salle 2 -

84-001 through 84-010

The SALP review is presented with the topic reviewed followed by comments on that topic.

### 1. Review of LER for Completeness

- a) Is the information sufficient to provide a good understanding of the event?

We found that the LERs provided sufficient data to give clear and adequate descriptions of the occurrences, their direct consequences, and the corrective actions taken.

- b) Were the LERs coded correctly?

All coded entries reviewed appeared to be correct. Where applicable, the codes utilized agreed with the narrative descriptions.

- c) Was supplementary information provided when needed?

Most of the LERs reviewed contained supplementary attachments. The information provided in these attachments was clear, concise and adequate.

- d) Were follow-up reports promised and submitted?

The licensee submitted 11 follow-up LERs for La Salle 1.

- e) Were similar occurrences properly referenced?

The licensee appropriately referenced similar prior occurrences as necessary.

### 2. Multiple Event Reporting in a Single LER

The licensee did not report any multiple events in a single LER.

### 3. Preliminary Notification Follow-up Reports

The region issued twelve PNs during this review period. Three of the PNs which were issued should have been followed by LERs. Our review indicates that the licensee did issue LER 83-158, 84-005 and 84-011 for these PNs.

In summary, our review indicates that based on the stated criteria, the licensee provided clear and fully adequate event reports during the assessment period. No significant deficiencies were found in the LERs reviewed.