

## ATTACHMENT F

(Page 1 of 2)

LAP 820-2-  
Revision 19  
April 7, 1982  
20

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LaSalle UNIT Ø 50-373  
SYSTEM RS TEST/PROCEDURE No L2P1330-21  
TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERMINATION OF REACTOR COOLANT CHLORIDE CONCENTRATION AT THE HRS REVISION 2  
EQUIPMENT NAME NA  
EQUIPMENT NUMBER NA

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE: *Method of determining the reactor coolant chloride concentration during normal operating and post-accident conditions utilizing the HRS Panels.*

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? Yes X No, Because: *Chemistry procedure, and there are means of analyzing the reactor coolant if this fails.*
2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? Yes X No, Because: *does not affect FSAR.*
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes X No, Because: *more refined means of determining reactor coolant chloride concentration are available.*

\* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

8206080024 820527  
PDR ADOCK 05000373  
F PDR

Performed By Bul Knoll Date 4/29/82  
Approved By [Signature] Date 4/30/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)  
TEST/PROCEDURE No. C2P/370-2/  
REVISION 2

Does this constitute a change to procedures  
as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( )

No ☒

Is a change in the Technical Specification  
involved?

No ☒

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no',  
and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an  
accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously  
evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?

Yes

No ☒

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different  
type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis  
Report created? Yes ☒ No

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical  
Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No ☒

Request and receive Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission  
authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test  
Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes'  
should be reported in the  
annual report to the NRC.

Performed by Paul Knoll

Date 4/29/82

## ATTACHMENT F

(Page 1 of 2)

LAP 820-2-  
Revision 19  
April 7, 1982  
20

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT Ø  
SYSTEM PS TEST/PROCEDURE No CEP 1330 - 22  
TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE CALIBRATION OF THE  
MODEL 10 DIONEX ION CHROMATOGRAPH REVISION 2  
EQUIPMENT NAME MODEL 10 DIONEX ION CHROMATOGRAPH ON CHEM. ANAL. PAPER  
EQUIPMENT NUMBER OPLE15

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE Method of calibrating H<sup>35</sup>S ion chromatograph for chloride analysis.

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decisions:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? Yes ☒ No, Because: other means of analysis for chloride are available.
2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? Yes ☒ No, Because: does not affect FSAR.
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No, Because: other means of chloride analysis available.

\* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

Performed By Paul Kroll Date 4/29/82  
Approved By J. Marshall Date 4/30/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)  
TEST/PROCEDURE No. L2P1330-22  
REVISION 2

Does this constitute a change to procedures  
as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( )

No ☒

Is a change in the Technical Specification  
involved?

No ☒

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no',  
and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an  
accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously  
evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?

Yes ☒ No

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different  
type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis  
Report created? Yes ☒ No

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical  
Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No ☒

Request and receive Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission  
authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test  
Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes'  
should be reported in the  
annual report to the NRC.

Performed by Paul Knoll

Date 4/29/82

## 10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT Ø  
SYSTEM RS TEST/PROCEDURE No L2P1330-23  
TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERM. OF RX COOLANT PH, COND.  
+ D.O. AT THE HRS REVISION 1  
EQUIPMENT NAME NA  
EQUIPMENT NUMBER NA

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE *Method of determining Rx Coolant PH, conductivity and dissolved oxygen concentrations at the HRS panels during normal operating and post-accident conditions*

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decisions:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? Yes X No, Because: *Chemistry Procedure, also backup methods are available if the equipment malfunction*
2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? Yes X No, Because: *Does not affect previous FSAR.*
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes X No, Because: *Backup and more accurate methods are available.*

\* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

Performed By Paul Knoll Date 4/29/82  
Approved By J. Marshall Date 4/30/82



ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)  
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LAP-1330-23  
REVISION 1

Does this constitute a change to procedures  
as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( )

No ☒

Is a change in the Technical Specification  
involved?

No ☒

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no',  
and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an  
accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously  
evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?

Yes ☐ No ☒

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different  
type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis  
Report created? Yes ☐ No ☒

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical  
Specification, reduced? Yes ☐ No ☒

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No ☒

Request and receive Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission  
authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test  
Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes'  
should be reported in the  
annual report to the NRC.

Performed by

Paul Knoll

Date

4/24/82

## 10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LaSalle UNIT Ø  
 SYSTEM CM TEST/PROCEDURE No L2P1330-26  
 TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE SAMPLING OF CONTAINMENT AIR AT THE HRSS REVISION 2  
 EQUIPMENT NAME \_\_\_\_\_  
 EQUIPMENT NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE *describes method of obtaining a containment air sample during post-accident and normal operating conditions at the HRSS.*

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide specific reasons justifying the decisions:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence or the consequence of an accident, or malfunction of equipment important to safety as previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report increased? Yes ☒ No, Because: *The sample partitioner is not mentioned in the FSAR, however the CCP + CASP are mentioned & this in no way changes the intent.*
2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report created? Yes ☒ No, Because: *Sampling does not affect FSAR, and there are other means of monitoring containment air.*
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No, Because: *It is a sampling procedure, & will aid in monitoring, it is not the only means of monitoring the containment.*

\* Note: Any answer checked "YES" should be reported in the Annual Report to the NRC

Performed By Paul Kroll Date 5-6-82  
 Approved By [Signature] Date 5-7-82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)  
TEST/PROCEDURE No. L2P1330-26  
REVISION 2

Does this constitute a change to procedures  
as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ( )

No ☒

Is a change in the Technical Specification  
involved?

No ☒

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a 'yes' or 'no',  
and provide specific reasons justifying the decision:

1. Is the probability of an occurrence, the consequence of an  
accident, or malfunction of safety related equipment, as previously  
evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis Report, increase?

Yes

No ☒ does not change FSAR

2. Is the possibility for an accident or malfunction of a different  
type than any previously evaluated in the Final Safety Analysis  
Report created? Yes ☒ No, does not change

FSAR

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical  
Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No, does not

change, only an extra monitoring are

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No ☒

Request and receive Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission  
authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test  
Implementation

NOTE:

Any answer checked 'yes'  
should be reported in the  
annual report to the NRC.

Performed by

Paul Kull

Date

5-6-82