

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 8312020351 DOC. DATE: 83/11/29 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: ALEXICH, M. P. AUTHOR AFFILIATION: Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.
 RECIP. NAME: DENTON, H. R. RECIPIENT AFFILIATION: Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Director

SUBJECT: Application to amend 830418 Tech Spec change request for
 Licenses DPR-58 & DPR-74 re administrative controls,
 incorporating statement concerning operations
 superintendent.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001S COPIES RECEIVED: LTR ENCL SIZE: 2x5
 TITLE: OR Submittal: General Distribution

NOTES:

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES		RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES	
		LTTR	ENCL		LTTR	ENCL
	NRR ORB1 BC 01	7	7			
INTERNAL:	ELD/HDS3	1	0	NRR/DE/MTEB	1	1
	NRR/DL DIR	1	1	NRR/DL/ORAB	1	0
	NRR/DSI/METB	1	1	NRR/DSI/RAB	1	1
	<u>REG FILE</u> 04	1	1	RGN3	1	1
EXTERNAL:	ACRS 09	6	6	LPDR 03	2	2
	NRC PDR 02	1	1	NSIC 05	1	1
	NTIS	1	1			

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 26 ENCL 24

: 6450 :

JANUARY: JOURNAL		JANUARY: JOURNAL		JANUARY: JOURNAL		JANUARY: JOURNAL	
DATE	DESCRIPTION	DATE	DESCRIPTION	DATE	DESCRIPTION	DATE	DESCRIPTION
1	RECEIVED	1	RECEIVED	1	RECEIVED	1	RECEIVED
2	RECEIVED	2	RECEIVED	2	RECEIVED	2	RECEIVED
3	RECEIVED	3	RECEIVED	3	RECEIVED	3	RECEIVED
4	RECEIVED	4	RECEIVED	4	RECEIVED	4	RECEIVED
5	RECEIVED	5	RECEIVED	5	RECEIVED	5	RECEIVED
6	RECEIVED	6	RECEIVED	6	RECEIVED	6	RECEIVED
7	RECEIVED	7	RECEIVED	7	RECEIVED	7	RECEIVED
8	RECEIVED	8	RECEIVED	8	RECEIVED	8	RECEIVED
9	RECEIVED	9	RECEIVED	9	RECEIVED	9	RECEIVED
10	RECEIVED	10	RECEIVED	10	RECEIVED	10	RECEIVED
11	RECEIVED	11	RECEIVED	11	RECEIVED	11	RECEIVED
12	RECEIVED	12	RECEIVED	12	RECEIVED	12	RECEIVED

INDIANA & MICHIGAN ELECTRIC COMPANY

P.O. BOX 16631
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43216

November 29, 1983
AEP:NRC:0659B

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316
License No. DPR-58 and DPR-74
AMENDMENT TO TECHNICAL SPECIFICATION CHANGE REQUEST FOR
OPERATIONS SUPERINTENDENT

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

Dear Mr. Denton:

This letter amends the Technical Specification (T/S) change request contained in our letter No. AEP:NRC:0659A, dated April 18, 1983, as per phone conversations held with members of your staff. More specifically, in the above referenced letter, we requested that T/S 6.3.1 be amended to include the statement, "and (3) the Operations Superintendent who shall not be required to hold a Facility Senior Reactor Operator's License." In this letter we are requesting insertion of the following statement in place of the previous proposal: "and (3) the Operations Superintendent shall obtain his Facility Senior Reactor Operator's License within two years if he has never held a Facility Senior Reactor Operator's License. However, he shall not be required to maintain the license."

The Attachment to this letter contains the revised T/S pages for Unit Nos. 1 and 2. It should be noted that the amended pages reflect the change proposed in this letter, as well as those previously proposed in our letter Nos. AEP:NRC:0659 and AEP:NRC:0659A. All changes are indicated by vertical bars on the right hand margin of the page.

Because the proposed change is purely administrative in nature, we believe that it does not involve significant hazards considerations, in that the operations of the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2, in accordance with the Amendments, would not: (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in margin of safety.

8312020351 831129
PDR ADOCK 05000315
P PDR

A001
11

17

[illegible][illegible]

10. $\frac{1}{2} \times \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{4}$

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is the identification of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the study. The next step is to design the study. This involves determining the methods to be used and the data to be collected. The third step is to collect the data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The fourth step is to analyze the data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The fifth step is to interpret the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The sixth step is to write the report. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The seventh step is to present the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The eighth step is to discuss the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The ninth step is to conclude the study. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The tenth step is to publish the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study.

1. The first step in the process of the investigation is the identification of the problem. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The investigator must first identify the problem and then determine the scope of the study. The next step is to design the study. This involves determining the methods to be used and the data to be collected. The third step is to collect the data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The fourth step is to analyze the data. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The fifth step is to interpret the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The sixth step is to write the report. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The seventh step is to present the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The eighth step is to discuss the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The ninth step is to conclude the study. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study. The tenth step is to publish the results. This is done by the investigator who is responsible for the study.


[illegible]

We interpret that the fee transmitted with our letter No. AEP:NRC:0659A covers the processing of this request since this letter modifies our previous submittal per your request.

This proposed change has been reviewed and approved by the Plant Nuclear Safety Review Committee (PNSRC) and will be reviewed by the AEPSC Nuclear Safety and Design Review Committee at its next scheduled meeting.

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

Very truly yours,


M. P. Alexich
Vice President

MPA/cam

Attachment

cc: John E. Dolan
W. G. Smith, Jr. - Bridgman
R. C. Callen
G. Charnoff
E. R. Swanson, NRC Resident Inspector - Bridgman

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the work during the year.

2. The second part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

3. The third part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

5. The fifth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.

6. The sixth part of the report deals with the results of the work during the year and the progress of the work during the year.