

CATEGORY 1

REGULATORY INFORMATION DISTRIBUTION SYSTEM (RIDS)

ACCESSION NBR: 9607020179 DOC. DATE: 96/06/27 NOTARIZED: NO DOCKET #
 FACIL: 50-315 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Indiana M 05000315
 50-316 Donald C. Cook Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 2, Indiana M 05000316
 AUTH. NAME AUTHOR AFFILIATION
 SAVITSCUS, C.C. Indiana Michigan Power Co. (formerly Indiana & Michigan Ele
 RECIP. NAME RECIPIENT AFFILIATION
 FITCHUK, J. Indiana Michigan Power Co. (formerly Indiana & Michigan Ele

SUBJECT: Forwards Safety Review PMI-5070, Rev 12, "ISI & Testing."

DISTRIBUTION CODE: A047D COPIES RECEIVED: LTR 1 ENCL 1 SIZE: 3+3
 TITLE: OR Submittal: Inservice/Testing/Relief from ASME Code - GL-89-04

NOTES:

| | RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME | COPIES LTTR ENCL | RECIPIENT ID CODE/NAME | COPIES LTTR ENCL |
|-----------|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------------|---------------------|
| | PD3-1 LA | 1 1 | PD3-1 PD | 1 1 |
| | HICKMAN, J | 1 1 | | |
| INTERNAL: | AEOD/SPD/RAB | 1 1 | <u>FILE CENTER</u> 01 | 1 1 |
| | NRR/DE/ECGB | 1 1 | NRR/DE/EMCB | 1 1 |
| | NRR/DE/EMEB | 1 1 | NUDOCS-ABSTRACT | 1 1 |
| | OGC/HDS2 | 1 0 | RES/DET/EMMEB | 1 1 |
| | RES/DSIR/EIB | 1 1 | | |
| EXTERNAL: | LITCO ANDERSON | 1 1 | NOAC | 1 1 |
| | NRC PDR | 1 1 | | |

C
A
T
E
G
O
R
Y

1

D
O
C
U
M
E
N
T

NOTE TO ALL "RIDS" RECIPIENTS:
 PLEASE HELP US TO REDUCE WASTE! CONTACT THE DOCUMENT CONTROL DESK,
 ROOM OWEN 5D-5 (EXT. 415-2083) TO ELIMINATE YOUR NAME FROM
 DISTRIBUTION LISTS FOR DOCUMENTS YOU DON'T NEED!

TOTAL NUMBER OF COPIES REQUIRED: LTTR 15 ENCL 14

Date June 27, 1996

Subject Cook Nuclear Plant Unit 1 and 2
Safety Review PMI-5070 Rev. 12
"In-service Inspection and Testing"

From C. C. Savitscus *CCS*

To J. Fitchuk

Introduction

The subject procedure has been determined to constitute a change in the facility as described in the UFSAR (see attached safety review screening). Currently the UFSAR references ASME Section XI for in-service testing of pumps and valves which is consistent with the 1983 edition of the code, the edition used for the present 10 year interval. During the third ten year interval, which begins July 1, 1996, the program will use the 1989 edition of the code which references OM standards for valves, pumps, and snubbers. Additionally, later versions of the OM code have been used to provide clarifications. The use of the later versions of the OM code for clarifications is consistent with the guidance given in NUREG 1482.

The third ten year program, however, has been developed in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 50.55a and the changes to the UFSAR are required to make the UFSAR consistent with the 10 CFR 50.55a requirements applicable to the third ten year interval.

Review Action Taken

This procedure has been reviewed in accordance with procedure 227700-STG-5400-01 Rev. 2 C.S. 1.

NSLS discussed this procedure with J. Fitchak PLE, and was informed that the subject procedure will be consistent with 10 CFR 50.55a and so it will be consistent with the Technical Specification 4.0.5. Also, NSLS was informed that there would be no changes per se to the facility as a result of this procedure.

The subject procedure requires in-service testing to be performed to ASME OM standards and not ASME section XI as referenced in UFSAR 5.4.4, 6.2.5, 9.3.5, 9.4.4 and 9.5.6.

Unreviewed Safety Question Determination

An unreviewed safety question determination has been performed. The answers to the seven questions regarding unreviewed safety questions as per 10 CFR 50.59 are as follows:

020021

9607020179 960627
PDR LADDOCK 05000315
G PDR

Intra-System

A047 1/1

1. Does the proposed activity increase the probability of occurrence of an accident previously evaluated in the UFSAR?

No. The changes to the UFSAR are required because of a requirement in the Code Of Federal Regulations that the in-service testing program be updated to the 1989 edition of ASME Section XI. There are no changes per se to the facility. Therefore there is no adverse impact on the probability or consequences on the present accident analysis nor are there any mechanisms introduced which could create a different type accident or cause an equipment malfunction.

2. Does the proposed activity increase the consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the UFSAR?

No. See response to question number 1.

3. Does the proposed activity increase the probability of an occurrence of a malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR?

No. See response to question number 1.

4. Does the proposed activity increase the consequences of a malfunction of equipment important to safety previously evaluated in the UFSAR?

No. See response to question number 1.

5. Does the proposed activity create the possibility of an accident of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR?

No. See response to question number 1.

6. Does the proposed activity create the possibility of malfunction of equipment important to safety of a different type than any previously evaluated in the UFSAR?

No. See response to question number 1.

7. Does the proposed activity reduce the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any technical specification?

No. These changes are consistent with Technical Specification 4.0.5 and so there is no reduction in safety margin.

June 27, 1996
Safety Review PMI-5070 Rev. 12

Conclusion

Based on the above, it is concluded that these changes do not constitute an unreviewed safety question as defined in 10 CFR 50.59 and do not represent a significant threat to the health and safety of the public. The UFSAR sections noted below need to be modified in 1996.


Keywords

ASME Section XI
In-service Inspection and Testing

References

UFSAR Section 5.4.4, 6.2.5, 9.3.5, 9.4.4, 9.5.6

Approved by:


J. B. Kingseed, Manager
Nuclear Safety

llg

cc: UFSAR Coordinator W/A
M. S. Ackerman W/A
Temp Secretary W/A
R. Ptacek W/A
PRONET W/A
DC-N-6944 W/A

1992 g31c