

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LA SALLE County UNIT 112
 SYSTEM PROCESS RADIATION TEST/PROCEDURE NO LSP 1200-4
 TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE Classification of a liquid release REVISION 1
 EQUIPMENT NAME RAW service water service water, Radwaste Effluent U.S.
 EQUIPMENT NUMBER OD18-K606, 1(2) D18-K604, 1(2) D18-K605, 1(2) D18-K608

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Act in the initial classification of a liquid release

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide space 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:

Procedure provides instructions for evaluation and classification only

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:

Procedure provides reevaluation and classification instructions only

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

Procedure is evaluating and classifying release only X005

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

1/10

ATTACHMENT F

LAP-820-2
Revision 19
April 7, 19
21 final

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. L2P1200-4
REVISION 1

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

(Yes ()

No (X)

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 X No,

Interpret parameters only, doesn't affect them

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,

Provides for evaluation of status, doesn't affect status

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

Evaluation steps only

Any Answer = Yes ()

All Answers No (X)

Request and receive Nuclear
Regulatory Commission
authorization for change.

Authorization Received ()

Initiate Procedure/Test
Implementation

NOTE:

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

Performed by

KC Howard

Date

23 Apr 80

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LaSalle UNIT 0
 SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No LAP 1330-21
 TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERMINATION OF REACTOR COOLANT CHLORIDE AT THE HRSS REVISION 23
 EQUIPMENT NAME
 EQUIPMENT NUMBER

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

DETERMINES REACTOR COOLANT CHLORIDE UTILIZING THE
 HRSS PANELS

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: Does not change procedure, only clarifies the steps.
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: no possibility of affecting plant
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes X No, Because: only clarifying existing procedure.

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

Performed By

Paul G. Hall

Date

6/1/82

Approved By

JCP

Date

6/9/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

LAP-820-2
Revision - 19
April 7, 19
21 final

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LAP/330-21
REVISION 25

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 procedure, only
clarifies the steps.*
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 ☒ *no possibility of
affecting plants.*
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical
Specification, reduced? Yes ☐ No ☒ *existing procedures
only clarifying*

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 E. Kroll

Date 6-1-84

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT 0
 SYSTEM H2SS TEST/PROCEDURE No L2P1330-23
 TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE pH, COND, + D.O. AT H2SS REVISION +2
 EQUIPMENT NAME _____
 EQUIPMENT NUMBER _____

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Determines Rx coolant pH, conductivity and dissolved oxygen concentration utilizing the H2SS panels

SAFETY EVALUATION: Answer the following questions with a "yes" or "no", and provide 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: clarifies existing steps. Does not change procedure, only
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: No possibility of affecting plant
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No, Because: only clarifying existing procedure

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

Performed by Paul Stull Date 6/1/82
 Approved by [Signature] Date 6/10/82

ATTACHMENT F

LAP-820-2
Revision 19
April 7, 19
21 final

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LEP/1330-23
REVISION X 2Does 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 procedure,
only clarifies the steps.*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 ☒ *affecting plant ops. No possibility of*3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical
Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No ☒ *existing procedures only clarifying*

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 Ruth K. KernDate 6-1-82

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La BilleUNIT 8SYSTEM PSTEST/PROCEDURE NO L2P1330-24TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE DETERMINATION OF REACTOR COOLANT
HYDROGEN CONCENTRATION AT THE PRESSREVISION 1EQUIPMENT NAME EQUIPMENT NUMBER

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

define steps for determining reactor coolant hydrogen concentrations during normal & 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: *procedure only clarifies use of panels.*
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: *only clarified use of panels.*
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes X No, Because: *did not affect Tech specs.*

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

Performed By Paul A. KrollDate 5/18/82Approved By JC RenwickDate 6/10/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LCP 1330-24
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 ☒ *procedure only clarifies
use of panels*
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 ☐ *only clarifies panel
uses.*
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical
Specification, reduced? Yes ☐ No ☒ *effect: tech specs. does not*

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 recorded in the
annual report to the NRC.

Performed by

[Signature]

Date

5/18/82

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LaSalle UNIT 0
SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No L2P1330-25
TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE Sampling R₁ Coolant at
HRSS REVISION 2
EQUIPMENT NAME _____
EQUIPMENT NUMBER _____

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Method of sampling R₁ Coolant at the HRSS 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 ☒ No, Because:
only clarifies the procedure
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:
only clarifies the procedure
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No, Because:
only clarifies the procedure

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

Performed By Paul Knoll Date 6/6/82
Approved By JEP Date 6/10/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

LAP-820-2
Revision 19
April 7, 1982
21 finalSAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. CEP1330-25
REVISION 2Does this constitute a change to procedures
as described in Safety Analysis Report?

Yes ()

No (X)

Is a change in the Technical Specification
involved?

No (X)

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 X No*only clarifies the procedure*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*only clarifies the procedure*3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical
Specification, reduced? Yes X No*only clarifies the procedure*

Any Answer = Yes ()

All Answers No (X)

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 KullDate 6/6/82

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION EB1330-26 LA SAGE UNIT D
 SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No EB1330-26
 TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE SAMPLING CONTAINMENT AIR AT REVISION 3
THE HRSS
 EQUIPMENT NAME _____
 EQUIPMENT NUMBER _____

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Method of sampling containment + R Bldg air from the
 HRSS Panels

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: No, only clarifies the steps of the procedure.
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: No, only clarifies the steps.
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? _____ Yes ☒ No, Because: No, only clarifies the steps.

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

Performed By

[Signature]

Date

4/5/82

Approved By

[Signature]

Date

6/10/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LAP/330-26
REVISION 3

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 ☒

only clarifies the steps

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 ☒

only clarifies the steps

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

only clarifies the steps.

Any Answer = Yes ()

All Answers No ☒

Request and receive Nuclear
Regulatory Commission
authorization for change.

Authorization Received ()

Initiate Procedure/Test
Implementation

NOTES:

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

Performed by Paul M. Hall

Date 4/5/82

10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle UNIT 0
SYSTEM HRSS TEST/PROCEDURE No LAP 1330-28
TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE Sampling Process Waters Containing
Radioactivity at HRSS REVISION 2
EQUIPMENT NAME _____
EQUIPMENT NUMBER _____

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Method of sampling drywell sumps + HRSS Waste Tank
at the HRSS 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 ☒ No, Because:
only clarifies required steps
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:
only clarifies required steps.
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No, Because:
only clarifies required steps

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

Performed By Paul Kroll Date 6/6/82
Approved By H. P. L. Date 6/8/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. CAP 1330-28
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 ☒

only clarifies steps

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 ☒

only clarifies steps

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

only clarifies steps

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 Kroll

Date

6-6-82

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 0
SYSTEM WRGM TEST/PROCEDURE No CRP 1330-32
TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE POST-ACCIDENT SAMPLING OF THE
GEN. ATOMICS WRGM REVISION 1
EQUIPMENT NAME —
EQUIPMENT NUMBER —

DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

Method of sampling Stack and Standby gas treatment effluents in a post-accident condition

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

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

Performed By Paul D. Kull Date 6/5/82
Approved By J. K. Rens Date 6/8/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)
TEST/PROCEDURE No. CRP/330-32
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 ☒

only clarifies procedure

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 ☒

only clarifies procedure

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

only clarifies procedure.

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 Kroll

Date 6/5/82