

# ACCELERATED DISTRIBUTION DEMONSTRATION SYSTEM

## REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR:8802220262 DOC.DATE: 88/02/18 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. American Electric Power Co., Inc.  
 RECIP.NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION  
 Document Control Branch (Document Control Desk)

SUBJECT: Declines participation in ISAP II starting in 1988.Generic  
 Ltr 88-02 response format encl.

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A062D COPIES RECEIVED:LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 3  
 TITLE: OR Licensing Submittal: Integrated Safety Assessment Program (ISAPII)

### NOTES:

RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL	RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME	COPIES LTTR ENCL
PD3-3 LA	1 0	NRR MILLER,M	1 1
PD3-3 PD	5 5	WIGGINGTON,D	1 1
INTERNAL: ARM/DAF/LFMB	1 0	NRR/DEST/ADS 7E	1 1
NRR/DEST/CEB 8H	1 1	NRR/DEST/MTB 9H	1 1
NRR/DEST/RSB 8E	1 1	NRR/DOEA/TSB11F	1 1
NRR/PMAS/ILRB12	1 1	OGC 15-B-18	1 0
<u>REG-FILE</u> 01	1 1	RES/DE/EIB	1 1
EXTERNAL: LPDR	1 1	NRC PDR	1 1
NSIC	1 1		

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 21 ENCL 18

R  
I  
D  
S  
/  
A  
D  
D  
D  
S  
  
R  
I  
D  
S  
/  
A  
D  
D  
S



AEP:NRC:0938A

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2  
Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316  
License Nos. DPR-58 and DPR-74  
GENERIC LETTER 88-02 INTEGRATED SAFETY  
ASSESSMENT PROGRAM II (ISAP II)

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Attn: Document Control Desk  
Washington, D.C. 20555

Attn: T. E. Murley

February 18, 1988

Dear Dr. Murley:

This letter is in response to Generic Letter (GL) 88-02, dated January 20, 1988 on the Integrated Safety Assessment Program II. On the GL 88-02 Response Format, attached to this letter, we have marked item 2, "We believe that an industry/NRC seminar, consisting of a brief discussion by NRC followed by a question and answer period would be beneficial prior to making a decision."

We have reviewed GL 88-02 carefully and we are conducting a further study of all the ramifications of an ISAP II. The cost of implementing the ISAP II is a concern. We are now in the final stages of completing many of the post-Three Mile Island and Salem ATWS-related requirements. These projects have been expensive, and, when coupled with our own improvements such as the Steam Generator Replacement project, have placed a great burden on the consumer in the cost of generated power.

We appreciate the fact that commitment to ISAP II would ameliorate the impact of the Individual Plant Evaluation (IPE). However, since the specific requirements for an IPE have not yet been established, we are unable to evaluate the practical and cost benefit of participating in an ISAP II versus confining our immediate efforts to performing an IPE.

Therefore, until we can complete our evaluation of the most prudent course for us to follow, we respectfully decline participation in the ISAP II starting in 1988.

A062  
1/1




Dr. T. E. Murley

-2-

AEP:NRC:0938A

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.

Sincerely,

  
M. P. Alexich  
Vice President

cm

Attachment

cc: D. H. Williams, Jr.  
W. G. Smith, Jr. - Bridgman  
R. C. Callen  
G. Bruchmann  
G. Charnoff  
NRC Resident Inspector - Bridgman  
A. B. Davis - Region III

Enclosure 2

Integrated Safety Assessment Program (ISAP) II

Response Format to Generic Letter 88-02

Facility Name: Cook Nuclear Plant

Utility: Indiana Michigan Power/AEP

Individual Contact Name: J. G. Feinstein Phone Number: 614-223-2080

An expression of interest will not be considered a commitment to participate on the part of the utility.

1. Would you be interested in participating in ISAP II? If so, in what time frame?

We are conducting a study on the benefits and cost of ISAP II.

2. Do you believe that an industry/NRC seminar consisting of a brief discussion by NRC followed by a question and answer period would be beneficial prior to making a decision?

Yes we would be interested in a seminar prior to making a final decision on future participation.

3. Would you be interested in a one-on-one meeting with the NPC to discuss your particular facility or facilities?

A one-on-one meeting with the NRC to discuss the Cook Nuclear Plant specifics would be vital.

4. If you remain undecided regarding participation, what additional information do you need in order to make a decision?

As indicated in the cover letter, additional information concerning IPE requirements, and how ISAP II would fulfill these requirements, is essential.

5. Do you have any potential concerns about participating in ISAP II?

We are especially concerned with a cost-benefits analysis.

6. Do you have any suggestions for program improvements or changes?

None at this time.