

LAP 420-3  
Revision 12  
August 25, 1982  
a FINAL

ATTACHMENT C

OFF-SITE PROCEDURE MODIFICATION FORM

march 7 83  
DATE

Nuclear Reactor Regulations (10)

Please REMOVE the following pages from your controlled copy of the LaSalle County Station \_\_\_\_\_ Procedures Manual. INSERT the new pages as indicated and REMOVE and DESTROY the superseded pages. SIGN this transmittal form in the space provided for Manual holder below. RETURN this signed sheet to:

Office Supervisor  
LaSalle County Station

R. M. Polycak  
Station Superintendent  
LaSalle County Station

96-105

MANUAL NUMBER

MANUAL HOLDER SIGNATURE \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
(IF NEW HOLDER, PLEASE ADVISE)

DOCUMENT	REMOVE/REV.	INSERT/REV/DATE
LZP INDEX		
LZP 1110-1	03	04 3/83
LZP 1310-1	02	03 3/83

## 10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION La Salle County Station UNIT Common  
 SYSTEM N/A TEST/PROCEDURE No LEP 1310-1  
 TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE "Notifications" REVISION 3  
 EQUIPMENT NAME N/A  
 EQUIPMENT NUMBER N/A

## DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

*Have GSEP response conditioning notification requirements clarified to comply with Nuc. Dir. Mgr. Directive #014*

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: *this in no way changes how we operate the reactor*
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: *this deals with how to use the ENS phone & what notifications are required*
3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes X No, Because: *this adds on to the notifications required*

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

*X005  
1/10*

Performed By H. [Signature] Date 9/22/82  
 Approved By [Signature] Date 10/1/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)  
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LAP 1310-1  
REVISION 3

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,

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,

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

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 G. Hentrich

Date 9/22/82

## 10CFR50.59 FORMAT FOR SAFETY EVALUATION

STATION LA SALLE UNIT 1 AND 2  
SYSTEM N/A TEST/PROCEDURE No LAP 1110-1  
STATION DIRECTOR (ACTING STATION DIRECTOR)  
TEST/PROCEDURE TITLE IMPLEMENTING PROCEDURE REVISION 4  
EQUIPMENT NAME N/A  
EQUIPMENT NUMBER N/A

## DESCRIPTION OF TEST/PROCEDURE

LIST OF ACTIONS TAKEN BY STATION DIRECTOR IN  
IMPLEMENTING GSEP PROGRAM.

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: THIS REVISION ADDS SUGGESTIONS FOR P.A. ANNOUNCEMENTS OF PLANT STATUS CHANGES + TSC, OSC ACTIVATION AND DOES NOT DECREASE FSAR OR TECH SPECS SAFETY MARGINS.
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: SEE #1.

3. Is the margin of safety, as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification, reduced? Yes ☒ No, Because: SEE #1.

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

Performed By Bill Pulte Date 1-17-82  
Approved By [Signature] Date 2/19/82

ATTACHMENT F

(Page 2 of 2)

SAFETY EVALUATION CHECKLIST (10 CFR 50.59)  
TEST/PROCEDURE No. LAP 1110-1  
REVISION 4

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

No (X)

SEE PAGE 1, #1.

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 (X)

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

Any Answer = Yes ( )

All Answers No (X)

Request and receive Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission  
authorization for change.

Authorization Received ( )

Initiate Procedure/Test  
Implementation

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

Performed by

Bill P. H.

Date

1-17-83