PETER HOEKSTRA
2D DISTRICT, MICHIGAN

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives
Washington, DC 20515-2202

January 11, 1993

Mr. Dennis Rathbun, Director
Office of Congressional Affairs
Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555

Dear Mr. Rathbun:

Enclosed is correspondence I have received from one my constituents relative to her concerns about the deterioration on cooling tubes at several nuclear power plants (including D C Cook in Benton Harbor, Michigan). Her information came from an Associated Press article on that subject. I am writing to request information pertaining to the safety of the nuclear power plant in Benton Harbor.

Please provide a written response to the concerns raised by Mrs. Johnson. Is the press article accurate? Why are the NRC standards being ignored or waived in these cases? What is the potential risk to Michigan residents? Thank you in advance for your cooperation in this effort to alleviate my constituent's concerns. I look forward to your prompt reply.

Sincerely yours,

Pete Hoekstra

PETE HOEKSTRA
Member of Congress

PH:jk

Muskegon Area Office
900 Third Street, Suite 203
Muskegon, MI 49440
616-722-8386

308 W. 20th St.
Holland, MI 49423
Nov. 30, 1992

Mr. Peter Hoekstra
Herman Miller, Inc.
8500 Byron Rd.
Zeeland, MI 49464

Dear Mr. Hoekstra:

Congratulations on your recent election to Congress!

As one of your "future" constituents, I have some grave concerns about an Associated Press story of 11/24/92 regarding the severe deterioration of cooling tubes at several nuclear power plants, including D.C. Cook in Benton Harbor. Cracks in the tubes exceeding the NRC standard of 40% simply earn the plant a waiver to continue operating, despite admitted cracks of 90% of the wall's thickness, in some cases.

If this story is even partially reliable, it appears that D.C. Cook and other plants are simply Chernobyls waiting to happen! I implore you to use your influence in Congress to see that this doesn't happen. The NRC must be held accountable.

Sincerely yours,
Joan F. Johnson

50-315
2/16/2000

Distribution Sheet

Priority: Normal

From: Stefanie Fountain

Action Recipients:	Copies:	
RidsNrrPMJStang	0	OK
RidsNrrDlpmLpdiii1	0	OK

Internal Recipients:

TTC C-TNN	1	Paper Copy
RidsRgn3MailCenter	0	OK
RidsOgcMle	0	OK
RidsOeMailCenter	0	OK
RidsNrrDripRexb	0	OK
RidsNrrDipmOlhp	0	OK
RidsNrrDipmlipb	0	OK
RidsManager	0	OK
RidsEdoMailCenter	0	OK
RidsAcrsAcnwMailCenter	0	OK
OE	1	Paper Copy
FILE CENTER 01	1	Paper Copy
ACRS	1	Paper Copy

External Recipients:

NOAC	1	Paper Copy
INEEL Marshall	1	Paper Copy

Total Copies: 6

Item: ADAMS Document
Library: ML_ADAMS^HQNTAD01
ID: 003699106:1

Subject:
OVERSIGHT PROCESS FOR D. C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT

Body:
ADAMS DISTRIBUTION NOTIFICATION.

Electronic Recipients can RIGHT CLICK and OPEN the first Attachment to View

APR 07 2000

ACRS-1

the Document in ADAMS. The Document may also be viewed by searching for Accession Number ML003699106.

IE01 - General (50 Dkt)-Insp Rept/Notice of Violation Response (for use by HQ)

Docket: 05000315
Docket: 05000316

Public
IE01

UNION OF
CONCERNED
SCIENTISTS

February 16, 2000

Mr. John A. Grobe
Director – Division of Reactor Safety
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
801 Warrenville Road
Lisle, IL 60532-4351

SUBJECT: OVERSIGHT PROCESS FOR D C COOK

Dear Mr. Grobe

The transition to the revised reactor oversight process at the D C Cook nuclear plant was discussed on February 15, 2000, at a meeting at NRC headquarters in Rockville, Maryland. The licensee proposed to remain under the NRC Manual Chapter 0350 process for the first full year after restart of Unit 2 and then switch to full scale implementation of the revised reactor oversight process. The NRC staff counter-proposed a phased-in transition to the revised reactor oversight process with the significance determination process being used for all NRC inspection findings, some of the performance indicators being used immediately and the remainder of the performance indicators adopted as their trailing data became available.

There are advantages and disadvantages to both approaches. The licensee identified accuracy and resource burden problems associated with the historical data needed for many of the performance indicators. The NRC staff identified a problem with not having oversight data for the public following restart of the most troubled plant in the US in the past two years.

The concerns of both the licensee and the NRC staff appear sincere and valid. It would be difficult to select either approach because that would cause the concerns of the unselected party to remain unresolved. Fortunately, there seems to be a compromise available

During the past two years, the licensee's Restart Action Plan and the NRC staff's Manual Chapter 0350 process provided assurance that D C Cook Unit 2 can be restarted with adequate safety margins. It would be reasonable to assume, therefore, that all these assessments, evaluations, tests, reviews, and inspections resulted in performance in each performance indicator category being restored to the GREEN band. If not, the licensee's System Readiness Reviews or the NRC's inspections to close the confirmatory action letter would have flagged non-GREEN performance. In other words, if either the licensee or the NRC staff had any doubts that performance in any performance indicator category was not GREEN, the plant would not be ready for restart.

Accepting this assumption allows every performance indicator in the revised reactor oversight process to be artificially set to GREEN when D C Cook Unit 2 enters Mode 2. For example, the scram performance indicator could assume that there have been zero scrams in the past 7,000 critical hours and the alert and

Washington Office: 1616 P Street NW Suite 310 • Washington DC 20036-1495 • 202-332-0900 • FAX: 202-332-0905
Cambridge Headquarters: Two Brattle Square • Cambridge MA 02238-9105 • 617-547-5552 • FAX: 617-864-9405
California Office: 2397 Shattuck Avenue Suite 203 • Berkeley CA 94704-1567 • 510-843-1872 • FAX: 510-843-3785

FEB 22 2000

00369910G

notification system performance indicator could assume that 100% of the sirens have been tested successfully. By setting all of the performance indicators to GREEN, the licensee would not have to waste the resources required to collect and validate the historical data. The licensee would have to establish the data collection and reporting infrastructure necessary to report the performance indicators quarterly beginning at the end of the quarter in which D C Cook Unit 2 enters Mode 2.

This process would enable the NRC staff to demonstrate to the public that it was achieving the goal of maintaining safety. Beginning with the quarter in which the plant restarted, the performance indicators would accurately inform the licensee, the NRC staff, and the public how the plant's performance trended relative to an initial "clean slate." At the same time, the NRC staff could focus resources on verifying that D C Cook Unit 1 is ready for restart.

This compromise approach has its faults. The largest fault is that the starting point for the performance indicators is selected arbitrarily and may be non-conservatively higher than actual performance. But actual performance cannot be precisely determined for some of the performance indicators until one or more quarters after restart. The arbitrary starting point only compromises safety when the actual performance level would be low in the WHITE band, in the YELLOW band, or in the RED band. The extensive efforts by the licensee and the NRC staff over the past two years provide reason to believe that the actual performance in all of the performance indicator categories is GREEN or at worst in the high end of the WHITE band.

The artificial starting points track to actual performance levels at different rates for the performance indicators. Some PIs will revert to actual performance within a quarter or two while some can take up to three years. The key point is that all of the performance indicators will accurately trend relative performance beginning with the very first quarter. D C Cook Unit 2 will not enter Mode 2 unless both the licensee and the NRC staff believe that safety margins in all of the performance indicator categories have been adequately restored. The PIs would therefore reveal where, if any, erosions from that condition have occurred following restart.

It seems better to use the revised reactor oversight process in its entirety immediately upon restart of D C Cook Unit 2 than to postpone its use for a full year as proposed by the licensee or to only use some of the process as proposed by the NRC staff. The nuclear industry and the NRC staff have touted the revised reactor oversight process as THE monitoring program for the new millenium. The NRC should use its best tool at the worst plant.

Artificially setting all of the performance indicators to GREEN would be somewhat unfair to other licensees who have earned all GREENs through operational performance. But I doubt that any licensee would trade places with D C Cook's licensee just to earn a "free ticket" to GREEN performance indicators.

Sincerely,

David A. Lochbaum
Nuclear Safety Engineer

50-315
1/28/2000

Distribution Sheet

Priority: Normal

From: Stefanie Fountain

Action Recipients: Copies:

Internal Recipients:
FILE CENTER 01 1 Paper Copy

External Recipients:

Total Copies: 1

Item: ADAMS Document
Library: ML_ADAMS^HQNTAD01
ID: 003695620:1

Subject:
TASK ORDER NO. 074, "D. C. COOK ENGINEERING FOLLOW-UP TEAM INSPECTION" UNDER CONTRACT NO. NRC-03-98-021.

Body:
ADAMS DISTRIBUTION NOTIFICATION.

Electronic Recipients can RIGHT CLICK and OPEN the first Attachment to View the Document in ADAMS. The Document may also be viewed by searching for Accession Number ML003695620.

DF02 - Direct Flow Distribution: PDR Direct Documents

Docket: 05000315
Docket: 05000316

ACRS-1

Beverly

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 28, 2000

Beckman and Associates, Inc.
Attn: Vicki Beckman
1071 State Route 136
Belle Vernon, PA 15012

SUBJECT: TASK ORDER NO. 074, "D.C. COOK ENGINEERING FOLLOW-UP TEAM INSPECTION" UNDER CONTRACT NO. NRC-03-98-021

Dear Ms. Beckman:

In accordance with Section G.5, Task Order Procedures, of the subject contract, this letter definitizes the subject task order. The effort shall be performed in accordance with the enclosed Statement of Work.

Task Order No. 074 shall be in effect from January 28, 2000, through March 10, 2000, with a total cost ceiling of $127,385.67. The amount of $123,375.95 represents the estimated reimbursable costs and the amount of $4,009.72 represents the fixed fee.

Accounting data for Task Order No. 074 is as follows:

B&R No.:	020-15-103-105
Job Code:	J-2548
BOC:	252A
APPN No.:	31X0200.020
FFS#:	NRR98021074
Oblig. Amt.:	$127,385.67

The following individuals are considered to be essential to the successful performance of work hereunder: Mr. John Chiloyan, Mr. Raymond Cooney, Mr. Richard Ely, and Mr. Charles Jones. The Contractor agrees that such personnel shall not be removed from the effort under the task order without compliance with Contract Clause H.4, Key Personnel.

The issuance of this task order does not amend any terms or conditions of the subject contract.

ADM-001
~~ML993160330~~

DF02

~~ADM 010 ML993704102~~

003695620

Your contacts during the course of this task order are:

Technical Matters: Edmund Kleeh
Project Officer
(301) 415-2964

Contractual Matters: Mona Selden
Contract Specialist
(301) 415-7907

Acceptance of Task Order No. 074 should be made by having an official, authorized to bind your organization, execute three copies of this document in the space provided and return two copies to the Contract Specialist. You should retain the third copy for your records.

Sincerely,

Sharon D. Stewart, Contracting Officer
Contract Management Branch 2
Division of Contracts and Property Management
Office of Administration

Enclosure: Statement of Work

ACCEPTED: Task Order No. 074

Vicki Pockman
NAME

Vice President
TITLE

2-2-00
DATE

CONTRACT: NRC-03-98-021

STATEMENT OF WORK
Task Order 074

TITLE: D. C. Cook Engineering Follow-up Team Inspection

DOCKET NUMBER: 50-315/316 B&R NUMBER: 020-15-103-105 JOB CODE: J-2548
INSPECTION REPORT NUMBER: 50-336/

NRC PROJECT OFFICER: E. A. Kleeh, NRR (301) 415-2964
TECHNICAL MONITOR: Mel Holmberg, RIII (630) 829-9748

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: January 28, 2000 - March 10, 2000

BACKGROUND

An NRC design (AE) inspection completed in September 1997, identified issues that resulted in operability concerns for safety related systems and components. The licensee voluntarily shutdown both units of the D. C. Cook plant and identified required corrective actions in a letter to the NRC. CAL 97-011 dated September 19, 1997 formalized the commitment for the licensee to remain shutdown until compensatory actions were undertaken. Subsequently the licensee by self-assessments and the NRC by additional inspections identified more performance issues that were incorporated into a pre-startup checklist attached to a letter sent from NRC to licensee on July 30, 1998. The items on that checklist had to be resolved by licensee as prerequisites to startup of either D.C. Cook unit. This inspection is being performed to determine the status of licensee corrective actions for those issues contained on that checklist and to verify their acceptability; to evaluate if licensee is maintaining its design basis; and to ensure the operability of selected safety systems in accordance with maintained design basis.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this task order is to obtain expert technical assistance in the areas of electrical and mechanical design. Four specialists (two electrical and two mechanical) are needed to assist the NRC inspection team in the resolution of design, performance, and programmatic issues identified in **Confirmative Action Letters (CALs), inspection reports, and LERs (hereafter all three referred to as inspection reference documents) and the D.C. Cook Restart Action Matrix.** Each of the four specialists (electrical and mechanical) should primarily have a design background in his area of expertise, such as from an architect-engineer firm with experience in design and system operational requirements. The specialists should also be familiar with the installation and surveillance testing of equipment; and how the engineering, operations, and corrective-action programs normally function and internally improve themselves. The specialists should be thoroughly familiar with NRC regulations, closure of CALs, resolution of engineering followup and evaluation items, and overall NRC inspection methodology.

The specialists should be familiar with the regulatory process, and should be able to determine relevant regulatory commitments from docketed licensee correspondence for their assigned review areas. The specialists should be able to verify implementation of the licensee's commitments, assess the effectiveness and adequacy of the licensee's corrective-actions which includes detailed reviews of design and facility modifications, determine if licensee is maintaining the appropriate design basis taking into account design changes and modifications, and evaluate the overall performance and acceptability of broad programmatic areas like the engineering, operations, and corrective-action programs. The inspection will be conducted in accordance with IP 37550 "Engineering," IP 37551 "Onsite Engineering," IP 37700 "Design Changes and Modifications," IP 37701 "Facility Modifications;" IP 37702 "Design Changes and Modifications Program," IP 37828 "Installation and Testing of Modifications," 40500 "Effectiveness of Licensee Process to Identify, Resolve, and Prevent Problems," IP 92700 " Onsite Followup of Written Reports of Nonroutine Events At Power Reactor Facilities," and IP 92903 "Followup - Engineering."

It shall be the responsibility of the contractor to assign technical staff, employees, and subcontractors, who have the required combination of educational background and experience to meet both the technical and regulatory objectives of the work specified in this Statement Of Work (SOW). The NRC will rely on representation made by the contractor

concerning the qualifications of the personnel proposed for assignment to this task order including assurance that all information contained in the technical and cost proposals, including resumes and conflict of interest disclosures, is accurate and truthful.

WORK REQUIREMENTS AND SCHEDULE

The contractor shall provide the qualified specialists, and the necessary facilities, materials, and services to assist the NRC staff in preparing for, conducting, and documenting the inspection activities and findings. The contractor shall provide the latest rad-worker training and MMPI test dates of the specialists to the Project Officer. The Technical Monitor/Team Leader for this task is Mel Holmberg. The Technical Monitor may issue technical instructions during the duration of this task order that are in accordance with the SOW; and they shall not constitute new assignments of work, or changes in cost or period of performance. The contractor shall refer to the basic contract for further information and guidance on any technical directions issued under this task order.

Modifications to the scope of work, costs, or period of performance of this task order must be issued by the Contracting Officer and will be coordinated with the NRR Project Officer.

Specific Tasks	Schedule Completion
1. Prepare for the Engineering Corrective Action Team Inspection a. Each specialist will review the CALs issued to the licensee, NRC inspection reports, and LERs for the last thirty months; and the D. C. Cook Restart Action Matrix for the inspection area assigned to him by the Technical Monitor. b. Determine the documents associated with the specific design problems identified in inspection reference documents relevant to specialist's assigned area of review or assigned by Technical Monitor. c. Request copies of all inspection reference documents for the last 30 months for the assigned inspection area; licensee's programmatic requirements for identifying and addressing problems; and documents that indicate corrective actions taken for design problems stated in any inspection reference documents including those self-identified by licensee in determining the true scope of conditions.	1. Prepare for the inspection of D.C. Cook at Region III headquarters in Lisle, Illinois on or about January 31 - February 04, 2000.
2. Perform the inspection a. Make queries to the licensee on design and programmatic issues stated in inspection reference documents consistent with the intent of the inspection and assigned inspection area.	2. Specialists will perform on-site inspection at D. C. Cook on or about February 07 - 11, 2000 and on or about February 22 - 25, 2000. Review of documentation, licensee inquiries, and other inspection-related activities will be conducted in specialist's home offices during

b. Review design change packages, facility modifications, and setpoint change packages to determine if licensee's corrective actions for specific design problems are appropriate and resolve the issues.

c. Monitor the performance of actual design modifications and setpoint changes including the functional testing of hardware changes.

d. Evaluate thoroughly licensee corrective actions for design and programmatic issues outlined in inspection reference documents in assigned area of review.

1.) Effectiveness of corrective actions overall.
2.) Adequacy of root-cause analyses.
3.) Determine if licensee's analyses have effectively identified and addressed all similar issues.
4.) Has licensee performed functional tests where corrective actions involved hardware changes or additions. 5.)Has design requirements been translated correctly into vendor/design specifications for post modification testing.
6.) Refer to IPs 37550, 37551, 37700, 37701, 37702, 37828, 40500, 92700, and 92903 for additional insights.

e. Respond in a timely manner to licensee's responses to queries made in 2.a.

f. Identify and develop findings or concerns as appropriate in accordance with the intent of inspection and IPs 37550, 37551, 37700, 37701, 37702, 37828, 40500, 92700, and 92903.

g. Evaluate that any licensee corrective actions undertaken indicate corresponding changes in plants' design basis and even licensing basis dependent on the relevance of the issues involved.

h. Assess the effectiveness of licensee's controls for engineering program in approving plant design modifications; revising design and licensing basis; determining relevant preventive maintenance; and declaring the systems in which design changes were incorporated as operational.

i. Each specialist should verify that licensee has appropriately addressed all items in inspection reference documents and most especially any design problems identified in the D.C. Cook Restart Action Matrix for his assigned inspection area during the course of the inspection.

3. Prepare the inspection report.

a. Follow the guidelines of NRC INSPECTION MANUAL , Manual Chapter 0610, "Inspection Reports." unless otherwise directed by Technical Monitor.

b. Feeder report should discuss inspection activities, be concise, and focus on safety significant findings based on facts and regulatory requirements.

3. Documentation of inspection will take place on or about February 28 - March 03, 2000, in specialists' home offices. Final feeder report input is due on or about March 06, 2000.

NOTE: Prior to the start of either in-office inspection preparation in Region III headquarters or on-site inspection activities, the contractor's staff is required to be available to coordinate inspection aspects, such as travel logistics, with the Team Leader/Technical Monitor.

REPORT REQUIREMENTS

Technical Report

At the completion of Task 1, the contractor's specialists shall provide an inspection plan to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope of this input shall be as directed by the NRC Team Leader. .

During Task 2 , the contractor's specialists shall provide daily reports to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope of this report shall be as directed by the NRC Team Leader.

At the completion of Task 2 (prior to the inspection team's debriefing the licensee), the contractor's specialists shall provide a summary of their inspection findings to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope shall be as directed by the NRC Team Leader. Typically, this input will consist of an electronic version (WordPerfect file on diskette) of the specialist's inspection findings.

At the completion of Tasks 3, the contractor shall send a copy of the final inspection report input (feeder report)

to the NRC Project Officer and the original and one computer diskette version (WordPerfect 6.1 or other IBM PC compatible software acceptable) to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope of the final report inputs shall be in accordance with the guidance in NRC Inspection Manual Chapter 0610 or as directed by the NRC Team Leader.

A specialist's feeder report will serve as documentation of the specialist's inspection activities, effort, and findings, and will be used by the NRC Team Leader for the preparation of the NRC's inspection report. The form and scope of the final report input shall be in accordance with the guidance in NRC Inspection Manual Chapter 0610 or as directed by the NRC Team Leader. As a minimum, each specialist's report input shall include the following:

- Identity of the individuals (name, company, and title) that provided information to the specialists during the inspection.
- For each area inspected, a description of the activities and general findings and conclusions reached regarding the adequacy of the area.
- For each area with a concern or findings, a discussion of the concerns or findings with technical bases.

NOTE: The contractor is not required to undertake any further efforts toward report finalization except as directed by Technical Monitor and as stated in the SOW. For example, management review of the feeder report beyond its submittal to the NRC Team Leader and Project Officer is not needed.

Business Letter Report

The contractor shall provide monthly progress reports in accordance with the requirements of the basic contract.

MEETINGS AND TRAVEL

For estimating purposes, the following meetings and travel are anticipated:

One, four-person, 5 day trip to Region III headquarters in Lisle, Illinois to prepare for the inspection on or about January 31 - February 04, 2000.

Two, four-person, 5 day trips to the D. C. Cook site near Benton Harbor, Michigan to conduct the onsite phase of the inspection on or about February 07-11, 2000 and February 22 -25, 2000.

NOTE: The contractor's staff shall coordinate all travel arrangements in advance with the NRC Team Leader.

NRC FURNISHED MATERIAL

Documents required to prepare for the inspection will be provided by the NRC Team Leader.

OTHER APPLICABLE INFORMATION

The work specified in this SOW is 100% licensee fee recoverable. The contractor shall provide fee recovery information in the monthly progress reports in accordance with the requirements of the basic contract.

The contractor's specialists assigned to this task order will have to be badged for unescorted access privilege at the plant site. The contractor shall provide all documentation required for badging (as identified by the NRC Team Leader) at the plant site. Questions concerning badging and the plant site access shall be addressed to the NRC Technical Monitor.

50-315
1/28/2000

Distribution Sheet

Priority: Normal

From: Esperanza Lomosbog

Action Recipients: Copies:

Internal Recipients:
FILE CENTER 01 1 Paper Copy

External Recipients:

Total Copies: 1

Item: ADAMS Document
Library: ML_ADAMS^HQNTAD01
ID: 003695780:1

Subject:
TASK ORDER NO. 074, "D.C. COOK ENGINEERING FOLLOW-UP TEAM INSPECTION" U
NDER CONTRACT NO. NRC- 03-98-021

Body:
ADAMS DISTRIBUTION NOTIFICATION.

Electronic Recipients can RIGHT CLICK and OPEN the first Attachment to View the Document in ADAMS. The Document may also be viewed by searching for Accession Number ML003695780.

DF02 - Direct Flow Distribution: PDR Direct Documents

Docket: 05000315
Docket: 05000316

APR 0 4 2000

ACRS-1

DCD

UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 28, 2000

Beckman and Associates, Inc.
Attn: Vicki Beckman
1071 State Route 136
Belle Vernon, PA 15012

SUBJECT: TASK ORDER NO. 074, "D.C. COOK ENGINEERING FOLLOW-UP TEAM INSPECTION" UNDER CONTRACT NO. NRC-03-98-021

Dear Ms. Beckman:

In accordance with Section G.5, Task Order Procedures, of the subject contract, this letter definitizes the subject task order. The effort shall be performed in accordance with the enclosed Statement of Work.

Task Order No. 074 shall be in effect from January 28, 2000, through March 10, 2000, with a total cost ceiling of $127,385.67. The amount of $123,375.95 represents the estimated reimbursable costs and the amount of $4,009.72 represents the fixed fee.

Accounting data for Task Order No. 074 is as follows:

B&R No.:	020-15-103-105
Job Code:	J-2548
BOC:	252A
APPN No.:	31X0200.020
FFS#:	NRR98021074
Oblig. Amt.:	$127,385.67

The following individuals are considered to be essential to the successful performance of work hereunder: Mr. John Chiloyan, Mr. Raymond Cooney, Mr. Richard Ely, and Mr. Charles Jones. The Contractor agrees that such personnel shall not be removed from the effort under the task order without compliance with Contract Clause H.4, Key Personnel.

The issuance of this task order does not amend any terms or conditions of the subject contract.

ADM-001
~~ML99316033O~~
00369578O DF02

Your contacts during the course of this task order are:

Technical Matters: Edmund Kleeh
Project Officer
(301) 415-2964

Contractual Matters: Mona Selden
Contract Specialist
(301) 415-7907

Acceptance of Task Order No. 074 should be made by having an official, authorized to bind your organization, execute three copies of this document in the space provided and return two copies to the Contract Specialist. You should retain the third copy for your records.

Sincerely,

Sharon D. Stewart, Contracting Officer
Contract Management Branch 2
Division of Contracts and Property Management
Office of Administration

Enclosure: Statement of Work

ACCEPTED: Task Order No. 074

Vicki Cockman
NAME

Vice President
TITLE

2-2-00
DATE

CONTRACT NRC-03-98-021

STATEMENT OF WORK
Task Order 074

TITLE: D. C. Cook Engineering Follow-up Team Inspection

DOCKET NUMBER: 50-315/316 B&R NUMBER: 020-15-103-105 JOB CODE: J-2548
INSPECTION REPORT NUMBER: 50-336/

NRC PROJECT OFFICER: E. A. Kleeh, NRR (301) 415-2964
TECHNICAL MONITOR: Mel Holmberg, RIII (630) 829-9748

PERFORMANCE PERIOD: January 28, 2000 - March 10, 2000

BACKGROUND

An NRC design (AE) inspection completed in September 1997, identified issues that resulted in operability concerns for safety related systems and components. The licensee voluntarily shutdown both units of the D. C. Cook plant and identified required corrective actions in a letter to the NRC. CAL 97-011 dated September 19, 1997 formalized the commitment for the licensee to remain shutdown until compensatory actions were undertaken. Subsequently the licensee by self-assessments and the NRC by additional inspections identified more performance issues that were incorporated into a pre-startup checklist attached to a letter sent from NRC to licensee on July 30, 1998. The items on that checklist had to be resolved by licensee as prerequisites to startup of either D.C. Cook unit. This inspection is being performed to determine the status of licensee corrective actions for those issues contained on that checklist and to verify their acceptability; to evaluate if licensee is maintaining its design basis; and to ensure the operability of selected safety systems in accordance with maintained design basis.

OBJECTIVE

The objective of this task order is to obtain expert technical assistance in the areas of electrical and mechanical design. Four specialists (two electrical and two mechanical) are needed to assist the NRC inspection team in the resolution of design, performance, and programmatic issues identified in**Confirmative Action Letters (CALs), inspection reports, and LERs (hereafter all three referred to as inspection reference documents) and the D.C. Cook Restart Action Matrix.** Each of the four specialists (electrical and mechanical) should primarily have a design background in his area of expertise, such as from an architect-engineer firm with experience in design and system operational requirements. The specialists should also be familiar with the installation and surveillance testing of equipment; and how the engineering, operations, and corrective-action programs normally function and internally improve themselves. The specialists should be thoroughly familiar with NRC regulations, closure of CALs, resolution of engineering followup and evaluation items, and overall NRC inspection methodology.

The specialists should be familiar with the regulatory process, and should be able to determine relevant regulatory commitments from docketed licensee correspondence for their assigned review areas. The specialists should be able to verify implementation of the licensee's commitments, assess the effectiveness and adequacy of the licensee's corrective-actions which includes detailed reviews of design and facility modifications, determine if licensee is maintaining the appropriate design basis taking into account design changes and modifications, and evaluate the overall performance and acceptability of broad programmatic areas like the engineering, operations, and corrective-action programs. The inspection will be conducted in accordance with IP 37550 "Engineering," IP 37551 "Onsite Engineering," IP 37700 "Design Changes and Modifications," IP 37701 "Facility Modifications," IP 37702 "Design Changes and Modifications Program," IP 37828 "Installation and Testing of Modifications," 40500 "Effectiveness of Licensee Process to Identify, Resolve, and Prevent Problems," IP 92700 " Onsite Followup of Written Reports of Nonroutine Events At Power Reactor Facilities," and IP 92903 "Followup - Engineering."

It shall be the responsibility of the contractor to assign technical staff, employees, and subcontractors, who have the required combination of educational background and experience to meet both the technical and regulatory objectives of the work specified in this Statement Of Work (SOW). The NRC will rely on representation made by the contractor

concerning the qualifications of the personnel proposed for assignment to this task order including assurance that all information contained in the technical and cost proposals, including resumes and conflict of interest disclosures, is accurate and truthful.

WORK REQUIREMENTS AND SCHEDULE

The contractor shall provide the qualified specialists, and the necessary facilities, materials, and services to assist the NRC staff in preparing for, conducting, and documenting the inspection activities and findings. The contractor shall provide the latest rad-worker training and MMPI test dates of the specialists to the Project Officer. The Technical Monitor/Team Leader for this task is Mel Holmberg. The Technical Monitor may issue technical instructions during the duration of this task order that are in accordance with the SOW, and they shall not constitute new assignments of work, or changes in cost or period of performance. The contractor shall refer to the basic contract for further information and guidance on any technical directions issued under this task order.

Modifications to the scope of work, costs, or period of performance of this task order must be issued by the Contracting Officer and will be coordinated with the NRR Project Officer.

Specific Tasks	Schedule Completion
1. Prepare for the Engineering Corrective Action Team Inspection a. Each specialist will review the CALs issued to the licensee, NRC inspection reports, and LERs for the last thirty months; and the D. C. Cook Restart Action Matrix for the inspection area assigned to him by the Technical Monitor. b. Determine the documents associated with the specific design problems identified in inspection reference documents relevant to specialist's assigned area of review or assigned by Technical Monitor. c. Request copies of all inspection reference documents for the last 30 months for the assigned inspection area; licensee's programmatic requirements for identifying and addressing problems; and documents that indicate corrective actions taken for design problems stated in any inspection reference documents including those self-identified by licensee in determining the true scope of conditions.	1. Prepare for the inspection of D.C. Cook at Region III headquarters in Lisle, Illinois on or about January 31 - February 04, 2000.
2. Perform the inspection a. Make queries to the licensee on design and programmatic issues stated in inspection reference documents consistent with the intent of the inspection and assigned inspection area.	2. Specialists will perform on-site inspection at D. C. Cook on or about February 07 - 11, 2000 and on or about February 22 - 25, 2000. Review of documentation, licensee inquiries, and other inspection-related activities will be conducted in specialist's home offices during

b. Review design change packages, facility modifications, and setpoint change packages to determine if licensee's corrective actions for specific design problems are appropriate and resolve the issues.

c. Monitor the performance of actual design modifications and setpoint changes including the functional testing of hardware changes.

d. Evaluate thoroughly licensee corrective actions for design and programmatic issues outlined in inspection reference documents in assigned area of review.

1.) Effectiveness of corrective actions overall.
2.) Adequacy of root-cause analyses.
3.) Determine if licensee's analyses have effectively identified and addressed all similar issues.
4.) Has licensee performed functional tests where corrective actions involved hardware changes or additions. 5.)Has design requirements been translated correctly into vendor/design specifications for post modification testing.
6.) Refer to IPs 37550, 37551, 37700, 37701, 37702, 37828, 40500, 92700, and 92903 for additional insights.

e. Respond in a timely manner to licensee's responses to queries made in 2.a.

f. Identify and develop findings or concerns as appropriate in accordance with the intent of inspection and IPs 37550, 37551, 37700, 37701, 37702, 37828, 40500, 92700, and 92903.

g. Evaluate that any licensee corrective actions undertaken indicate corresponding changes in plants' design basis and even licensing basis dependent on the relevance of the issues involved.

h. Assess the effectiveness of licensee's controls for engineering program in approving plant design modifications; revising design and licensing basis; determining relevant preventive maintenance; and declaring the systems in which design changes were incorporated as operational.

i. Each specialist should verify that licensee has appropriately addressed all items in inspection reference documents and most especially any design problems identified in the D.C. Cook Restart Action Matrix for his assigned inspection area during the course of the inspection.

3. Prepare the inspection report.

a. Follow the guidelines of NRC INSPECTION MANUAL , Manual Chapter 0610, "Inspection Reports." unless otherwise directed by Technical Monitor.

b. Feeder report should discuss inspection activities, be concise, and focus on safety significant findings based on facts and regulatory requirements.

3. Documentation of inspection will take place on or about February 28 - March 03, 2000, in specialists' home offices. Final feeder report input is due on or about March 06, 2000.

NOTE: Prior to the start of either in-office inspection preparation in Region III headquarters or on-site inspection activities, the contractor's staff is required to be available to coordinate inspection aspects, such as travel logistics, with the Team Leader/Technical Monitor.

REPORT REQUIREMENTS

Technical Report

At the completion of Task 1, the contractor's specialists shall provide an inspection plan to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope of this input shall be as directed by the NRC Team Leader. .

During Task 2 , the contractor's specialists shall provide daily reports to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope of this report shall be as directed by the NRC Team Leader.

At the completion of Task 2 (prior to the inspection team's debriefing the licensee), the contractor's specialists shall provide a summary of their inspection findings to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope shall be as directed by the NRC Team Leader. Typically, this input will consist of an electronic version (WordPerfect file on diskette) of the specialist's inspection findings.

At the completion of Tasks 3, the contractor shall send a copy of the final inspection report input (feeder report)

to the NRC Project Officer and the original and one computer diskette version (WordPerfect 6.1 or other IBM PC compatible software acceptable) to the NRC Team Leader. The format and scope of the final report inputs shall be in accordance with the guidance in NRC Inspection Manual Chapter 0610 or as directed by the NRC Team Leader.

A specialist's feeder report will serve as documentation of the specialist's inspection activities, effort, and findings, and will be used by the NRC Team Leader for the preparation of the NRC's inspection report. The form and scope of the final report input shall be in accordance with the guidance in NRC Inspection Manual Chapter 0610 or as directed by the NRC Team Leader. As a minimum, each specialist's report input shall include the following:

- Identity of the individuals (name, company, and title) that provided information to the specialists during the inspection.
- For each area inspected, a description of the activities and general findings and conclusions reached regarding the adequacy of the area.
- For each area with a concern or findings, a discussion of the concerns or findings with technical bases.

NOTE: The contractor is not required to undertake any further efforts toward report finalization except as directed by Technical Monitor and as stated in the SOW. For example, management review of the feeder report beyond its submittal to the NRC Team Leader and Project Officer is not needed.

Business Letter Report

The contractor shall provide monthly progress reports in accordance with the requirements of the basic contract.

MEETINGS AND TRAVEL

For estimating purposes, the following meetings and travel are anticipated:

One, four-person, 5 day trip to Region III headquarters in Lisle, Illinois to prepare for the inspection on or about January 31 - February 04, 2000.

Two, four-person, 5 day trips to the D. C. Cook site near Benton Harbor, Michigan to conduct the onsite phase of the inspection on or about February 07-11, 2000 and February 22 -25, 2000.

NOTE: The contractor's staff shall coordinate all travel arrangements in advance with the NRC Team Leader.

NRC FURNISHED MATERIAL

Documents required to prepare for the inspection will be provided by the NRC Team Leader.

OTHER APPLICABLE INFORMATION

The work specified in this SOW is 100% licensee fee recoverable. The contractor shall provide fee recovery information in the monthly progress reports in accordance with the requirements of the basic contract.

The contractor's specialists assigned to this task order will have to be badged for unescorted access privilege at the plant site. The contractor shall provide all documentation required for badging (as identified by the NRC Team Leader) at the plant site. Questions concerning badging and the plant site access shall be addressed to the NRC Technical Monitor.

DISTRIBUTION:

File Center
PD3-1 r/f
JStang
THarris

December 1, 1999

DOCKET NO(S). 50-315/316

Mike Murphy
Radiation Program Manager
US EPA Region 5 (AE-17J)
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604-3507

SUBJECT: DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS, UNITS 1 AND 2

The following documents concerning our review of the subject facility are transmitted for your information.

✔	DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT	DATED
	Notice of Receipt of Application	
	Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No. _____	
	Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact	
	Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment	
	Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License	
	Biweekly Notice: Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Conditions See Page(s) _____	
	Exemption	
	Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____	
	Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____	
	Order	
	Monthly Operating Report for _____ Transmitted by Letter	
X	Annual/Semi-Annual Report: 1998 Annual Operating Rpt _____ Transmitted by Letter	
	Other _____	

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Enclosures: As stated

Toni L.Harris

cc:

DOCUMENT NAME:

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

ACRS-1

OFFICE	LA/PD3-1									
NAME	THarris									
DATE	12/1 /99									

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DISTRIBUTION:

File Center
PD3-1 r/f
JStang
THarris

November 23, 1999

DOCKET NO(S). 50-315/16

Mike Murphy
Radiation Program Manager
US EPA Region 5 (AE-17J)
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604-3507

SUBJECT: DONALD C. COOK NUCLEAR PLANT UNITS 1 AND 2

The following documents concerning our review of the subject facility are transmitted for your information.

✔	DESCRIPTION OF DOCUMENT	DATED
X	Notice of Receipt of Application	
	Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Notice of Availability of Draft/Final Environmental Statement	
	Safety Evaluation Report, or Supplement No. _____	
	Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact	
	Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment	
	Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Facility Operating License or Amendment to Facility Operating License	
	Biweekly Notice; Applications and Amendments to Operating Licenses Involving No Significant Hazards Conditions See Page(s) _____	
	Exemption	
	Construction Permit No. CPPR-_____, Amendment No. _____	
	Facility Operating License No. _____, Amendment No. _____	
	Order	
	Monthly Operating Report for _____ Transmitted by Letter	
X	Annual/Semi-Annual Report: Correction to 1998 Annual Environmental Operating Rpt _____ Transmitted by Letter	
	Other _____	

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Toni L. Harris

Enclosures: As stated

cc:

DOCUMENT NAME:

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

ACRS

OFFICE	LA/PD3-1								
NAME	THarris								
DATE	11/23/99								

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY