REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:8412070283 DOC.DATE: 84/12/03 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
ALEXICH,M.P. Indiana & Michigan Electric Co.
RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
DENTON,H.R. Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, Director

SUBJECT: Application for amends to Licenses DPR-58 & DPR-74, changing Tech Specs to make number of operating coolant loops required in Mode 3 consistent w/safety analysis in FSAR.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A001D COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 445
TITLE: OR Submittal: General Distribution

NOTES: 05000315
OL:10/25/74
05000316
OL:12/23/72

	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME		COPIES LTTR	ENCL
	NRR ORB1 BC	01	7	7				
INTERNAL:	ACRS	09	6	6	ADM/LFMB		1	0
	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
	REG FILE	04	1	1	RGN3		1	1
EXTERNAL:	LPDR	03	2	2	NRC PDR	02	1	1
	NSIC	05	1	1	NTIS		1	1

W/Check #150^{00}

#303-0407

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 27 ENCL 24

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible] clean [illegible]

[illegible] coolant loop. [illegible]

[illegible] analysis [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

INDIANA & MICHIGAN ELECTRIC COMPANY

P.O. BOX 16631
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43216

December 3, 1984
AEP:NRC:0895A

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316
License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74
REACTOR COOLANT PUMP TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS CHANGE REQUEST

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

Dear Mr. Denton:

This letter and its attachments constitute an application for amendment to the Technical Specifications for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Unit Nos. 1 and 2. Specifically, we are proposing to change T/S Section 3.4.1.2 and the Bases page B 2-7 for both Units 1 and 2. The reasons for the proposed changes and our analyses concerning significant hazards considerations are contained in Attachment 1 to this letter. The proposed revised Technical Specification pages are contained in Attachment 2.

We believe that the proposed changes will not result in (1) a significant change in the types of effluents or a significant increase in the amounts of any effluent that may be released offsite, and (2) a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

These proposed changes have been reviewed by the Plant Nuclear Safety Review Committee (PNSRC) and will be reviewed by the Nuclear Safety and Design Committee (NSDRC) at their next regularly scheduled meeting.

In compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.91(b)(1), a copy of this letter and its attachments have been transmitted to Mr. R. C. Callen of the Michigan Public Service Commission and Mr. George Bruchmann of the Michigan Department of Public Health.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 170.12(c), we have enclosed an application fee of $150.00 for the proposed amendments.

A001 w/check $150.00
1/1
303-0407

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,

MPAlexich

M. P. Alexich
Vice President

RB/G
12/3/84

MPA/cm

Attachments

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

ATTACHMENT 1 TO AEP:NRC:0895A

REASONS AND 10 CFR 50.92 ANALYSES FOR
CHANGES TO THE
DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT NOS. 1 AND 2
TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

The first change proposed here is to make the Technical Specification for the number of operating coolant loops required in Mode 3 consistent with the safety analysis in the FSAR. Technical Specification 3.4.1.2b, Units 1 and 2, is changed from "At least one of the above coolant loops shall be in operation.*" to "At least two of the above coolant loops shall be in operation unless the reactor trip breakers are disconnected.*" Also, Technical Specification 3.4.1.2.c is added; "At least one of the above coolant loops shall be in operation if the reactor trip breakers are disconnected.*" This specification change corrects the discrepancy between the FSAR and the Technical Specifications brought to our attention in a recent review done by Westinghouse (the letter summarizing the review was attached to our correspondence AEP:NRC:0895, dated July 30, 1984). This review states that the one coolant loop currently required to be in operation may not be adequate in the event of a bank withdrawal from subcritical. A bank withdrawal cannot occur if the reactor trip breakers are disconnected, hence the Specification 3.4.1.2.c, that the breakers be disconnected if only one coolant loop is operating. If the reactor trip breakers are connected, two coolant loops must be operating in order to be consistent with the FSAR safety analysis. This, consequently, is the justification for the change in Technical Specification 3.4.1.2.b from one to two coolant loops. Since these changes institute a higher degree of safety than the current Technical Specifications, they do not constitute a significant hazards consideration as defined by 10 CFR 50.92.

The second Technical Specification change is prompted by Noncompliance Report (NCR) REE-84-6-1 issued March 27, 1984. This NCR identified a discrepancy in the Unit 1 Technical Specification Bases page B 2-7. The time specified for the limit on the undervoltage signal delay (0.1 seconds) is not consistent with the Unit 2 Technical Specification or current plant installation (which require a delay of 0.9 seconds). It is our current policy when making a change, such as this for consistency, to use the language of the Westinghouse Standard Technical Specifications (STS) NUREG 0452, Revision 4). Therefore, we propose to change the bases of both Units to the exact wording used in the STS (with the exception that the undervoltage signal delay will be set at 0.9 seconds, slightly more conservative than the 1.2 second delay referenced in the STS). Since this change makes the Unit 1 Technical Specification equivalent to the previously approved Unit 2 Technical Specification, it does not present a significant hazards consideration as defined in 10 CFR 50.92.