

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8205180270 DOC. DATE: 82/05/13 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-315 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Indiana & 05000315
 50-316 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2, Indiana & 05000316
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 HERING, R.F. Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 DENTON, H.R. Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Director

SUBJECT: Responds to 820405 request for info re. inservice insp. program. Thirty-day extension required to respond to specific info requests due to need for reinsp, re-evaluation & consultation w/inservice insp contractor.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A047S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 1/1
 TITLE: Inservice Inspection/Testing & Related Correspondence

NOTES:

| | RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME | | COPIES LTR ENCL | | RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME | | COPIES LTR ENCL |
|-----------|---------------------------|----|--------------------|----|---------------------------|----|--------------------|
| | ORB #1 BC | 01 | 7 | 7 | NRR CHANEY, D | | 1 0 |
| INTERNAL: | ELD/HDS3 | | 1 | 0 | NRR/DE/MEB | 15 | 1 1 |
| | NRR/DE/MTEB | 14 | 1 | 1 | <u>REG FILE</u> | 04 | 1 1 |
| | RGN3 | | 1 | 1 | | | |
| EXTERNAL: | ACRS | 16 | 10 | 10 | LPDR | 03 | 2 2 |
| | NRC PDR | 02 | 1 | 1 | NSIC | 05 | 1 1 |
| | NTIS | | 1 | 1 | | | |

1. The first step is to identify the problem or question that needs to be answered. This involves understanding the context and the specific requirements of the task.

2. The second step is to gather relevant information and data. This may involve research, consultation with experts, or collecting data from various sources.

3. The third step is to analyze the information and data collected. This involves identifying patterns, trends, and relationships that can help in understanding the problem.

4. The fourth step is to develop a solution or answer. This involves applying the knowledge and skills gained from the analysis to the problem at hand.

5. The fifth step is to evaluate the solution or answer. This involves checking the results against the original problem and requirements to ensure that the solution is valid and effective.

6. The sixth step is to communicate the solution or answer. This involves presenting the findings in a clear and concise manner to the relevant stakeholders.

7. The seventh step is to reflect on the process and results. This involves thinking about what worked well and what could be improved for future tasks.

8. The eighth step is to document the process and results. This involves creating a record of the work done, which can be used for future reference and learning.

9. The ninth step is to review the process and results. This involves looking back at the entire process to see if there were any areas for improvement or if the solution was successful.

10. The tenth step is to conclude the task. This involves finalizing the work and ensuring that all requirements have been met.

[illegible]

Figure 1. The effect of the concentration of the *Agrobacterium* suspension on the transformation efficiency of *Agrobacterium* strains. The *Agrobacterium* strains were grown in the YEA medium for 24 h at 28 °C. The cell concentration of the *Agrobacterium* strains was adjusted to 10⁸ cells/ml. The cell suspension was then mixed with the plant protoplasts and cocultured for 48 h. The transformation efficiency was determined by the number of GUS-positive cells. The data were the mean of three independent experiments. Error bars represent standard deviation.

1 2 3

INDIANA & MICHIGAN ELECTRIC COMPANY

P. O. BOX 18
BOWLING GREEN STATION
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10004

May 13, 1982
AEP:NRC:00070E

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit Nos. 1 & 2
Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316
License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74
INSERVICE INSPECTION PROGRAM

Mr. Harold R. Denton, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Denton:

The attachment to Mr. S. A. Varga's letter of April 5, 1982 contains a request for information relative to the Inservice Inspection (ISI) program for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2. The ISI non-destructive examination program for Class 2 welds for the Cook Plant was developed for us by General Physics Corp. more than three years ago. The criteria for determining the exemptions and code relief requests at that time are not readily available either at General Physics or at our facilities and it appears that this information will have to be re-established. In addition, some information requested requires re-inspection by Plant personnel, reevaluation and consultation with our ISI contractor (Southwest Research Institute), and substantial engineering review. For example, the systems that were previously exempted because of chemistry control, under IWC-1220 (c) will now have to be added to the program. Therefore, we need a thirty day extension to respond to the individual items in Mr. Varga's letter. At that time we will either supply the requested information, or submit a schedule for obtaining the detailed information. We will also be able to indicate areas in which our ISI program may be modified.

This document has been prepared following Corporate procedures which incorporate a reasonable set of controls to insure its accuracy and completeness prior to signature by the undersigned.

Very truly yours,



R. F. Hering
Vice President

RFH/md
cc:(attached)

8205180270 Q

A047
1/1

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

Mr. Harold R. Denton

- 2 -

AEP:NRC:00070E

cc: John E. Dolan - Columbus
R. S. Hunter
R. W. Jurgensen
W. G. Smith, Jr. - Bridgman
R. C. Callen
G. Charnoff
Joe Williams, Jr.
NRC Resident Inspector at Cook Plant - Bridgman

