



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

September 8, 1982

Mr. A. Schwencer, Chief
Licensing Branch #2
Division of Licensing
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Subject: LaSalle County Station Unit 1
Proposed Amendment to NPF-11
Appendix "A" Technical
Specifications
NRC Docket No. 50-373

Dear Mr. Schwencer:

The purpose of this letter is to request the following changes in Technical Specifications for LaSalle County Station Unit 1:

Change Request NPF-11/82-14

Revise the radioactive effluent technical specifications in accordance with the generic changes approved by the NRC to incorporate information that was reviewed and approved as part of a prior action and, as such, is one example of a Class II amendment.

Change Request NPF-11/82-15

Revise the qualification requirements for the position of Operating Assistant Superintendent. This change is purely administrative in nature and is being submitted as requested by the NRC staff. As such, this is one example of a Class II amendment.

These proposed changes are addressed in the Attachments. These changes have received on-site and off-site review and approval. Attachment B lists the status of Technical Specification Change Requests for LaSalle.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 170, this change reflects the two examples of a Class II amendment. A remittance of \$1,200 is, therefore enclosed.

Please contact this office if there are any questions in this matter.

*A001
w/check
\$1200.00*

A. Schwencer

- 2 -

September 8, 1982

Three (3) signed originals and thirty-seven (37) copies of this transmittal and attachments are provided for your use.

Very truly yours,

CW Schroeder 9/8/82

C. W. Schroeder
Nuclear Licensing Administrator

1m

Attachment

cc: NRC Resident Inspector - LSCS

SUBSCRIBED and SWORN to
before me this 8th day
of September 1982

Rosalie A. Penta
Notary Public

4962N

ATTACHMENT

LASALLE COUNTY STATION UNIT 1

TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST

NPF-11/82-14

Subject: Revise the Radioactive Effluent Technical Specifications in Accordance with ETS Branch Approved Changes.

Reference (a): Letter C. A. Willis of NRC to S. Pandey of Franklin Research Center dated 11/20/81, Recommending Changes to Radioactive Effluent Technical Specification (RETS).

Background

Reference (a) recommended five changes in the RETS as a result of NRC/AIF meetings and previous supportive data. These are listed below:

- 1) Doses from C-14 may be dropped since NRC data shows no significant contribution to effluent doses.
- 2) Airborne releases of radioiodine and particulates may be limited to the inhalation pathway only. This specification ensures compliance with the 20.106 limits which are based on inhalation doses.
- 3) Reporting requirements when offsite doses exceeds one half an annual design objective in one quarter may be changed to require consideration of doses during the remainder of the calendar year (rather than "the subsequent three calendar quarters"). This change is consistent with the requirements of appendix I which are based on the calendar year.
- 4) Add a statement to reduce reporting requirements to only those specified in the RETS. This is to reduce the number of valueless thirty day reports about inoperable instruments and like items.
- 5) Drop the requirement for monitoring liquid effluent for P-32 since an NRC sponsored study has shown that P-32 is not a major contributor to offsite doses.

The NRC Effluent Treatment Branch recommends these changes be made to the Standard Technical Specifications.

Discussion

The Radioactive Effluent Technical Specifications for LSCS were negotiated with the NRC Staff in approximately September, 1981. Shortly thereafter, the LSCS Tech Specs were "Frozen". Following a meeting with the AIF working group, the NRC Staff accepted the above changes to the Radiological Effluent Technical Specifications. This change simply incorporates these changes into the LSCS Technical Specifications.

Conclusion

Commonwealth Edison Company finds no unreviewed safety questions involved. These changes have previously been approved by the NRC, as documented in Reference (a).