NRC FORM 195 (2-76)

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

DOCKET NUMBER 50-315/316

FILE NUMBER

NRC DISTRIBUTION FOR PART 50 DOCKET MATERIAL

TO: MR B RUSCHE

FROM: INDIANA & MICHIGAN POWER CO
NEW YORK, NY
G V PATERSON

DATE OF DOCUMENT 8-27-76

DATE RECEIVED 9-8-76

☑ LETTER ☒ NOTORIZED
☑ ORIGINAL ☑ UNCLASSIFIED
☐ COPY

PROP

INPUT FORM

NUMBER OF COPIES RECEIVED 1 SIGNED

DESCRIPTION
LTR REF OUR 7-30-76 LTR.....FURN INFO CONCERNING REACTOR PRESSURE VESSEL SUPPORTS.....

ENCLOSURE

PLANT NAME: DONALD C. COOK 1 & 2

DISTRIBUTION FOR REACTOR VESSEL SUPPORT INFO FOR OPERATING REACTORS PER MR. TRAMMELL 7-12-76

SAFETY — FOR ACTION/INFORMATION 9-15-76 RB

✓	ASSIGNED AD:	VASSALLO
✓	BRANCH CHIEF:	KNIEL - ZIEMANN
✓	PROJECT MANAGER:	FLETCHER - BENEDICT
✓	LIC. ASST:	DIGGS - LEE

INTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

✓	REG FILE
✓	NRC PDR
✓	KNIGHT
✓	ROSZTOCZY
✓	CHECK
✓	C. TRAMMELL
✓	SHAO
✓	P. BARANOWSKY
✓	P. NORIAN
✓	R. BOSNAK
✓	V. NOONAN

EXTERNAL DISTRIBUTION

✓ LPDR: St. Joseph, MI.

CONTROL NUMBER 9158

NRC FORM 195 (2-76)

D. Crutchfield
pys routine docket mail

INDIANA & MICHIGAN POWER COMPANY

P. O. BOX 18
BOWLING GREEN STATION
NEW YORK, N. Y. 10004

Regulatory Docket File

August 27, 1976

Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant
Unit Nos. 1 and 2
Docket Nos. 50-315 and 50-316
DPR No. 58 and CPPR No. 61

Mr. Benard Rusche, Director
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D.C. 20555

Dear Mr. Rusche:

Mr. Karl Kniel's letter of July 30, 1976, received August 4, 1976, requested that we provide the NRC with a schedule for submitting an evaluation of the adequacy of the reactor pressure vessel supports. This evaluation was to include answers to the Request For Additional Information which was enclosed with Mr. Kniel's letter. That letter was an outcome of Mr. Kniel's earlier letter of November 26, 1975, which informed us of a generic evaluation of reactor pressure vessel supports.

Since the end of 1975, Indiana & Michigan Power Company representatives as well as those from other utilities with operating Westinghouse PWR's have met jointly to investigate the several options available to us to address the adequacy of reactor pressure vessel supports. The owners group has considered the performance of analyses similar to those suggested in your Request For Additional Information for each individual plant or for several typical designs which would envelope most of the plants in the owners group. Discussions with Westinghouse Electric Corporation, as well as with other organizations potentially capable of performing such analyses, have indicated that a significant amount of effort would be required, and in fact such analyses would probably take from one to three years to complete.

9158

Plants that are not in operation or not well along in construction can include design features which reduce the amount of any analysis needed to demonstrate acceptable consequences from postulated events. Operating plants, on the other hand, cannot change structural configurations without severe economic penalties, if at all. Thus, events which were previously analyzed in accordance with approved techniques and found acceptable are now, because of recently developed methods of analyses, facing the potential burden of costly state-of-the-art techniques to demonstrate that the consequences remain within acceptable limits.

We have, therefore, concluded that the most prudent course of action in response to your questions is to propose implementation of an augmented in-service inspection program to preclude a reactor coolant pipe break near the reactor vessel nozzles. This program will have a positive impact on plant safety and eliminate the need to perform extensive and lengthy analyses which have minimal impact on the real margin of safety existing in these plants.

Representatives of the owners group and the Westinghouse Electric Corporation met with members of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission Staff on May 25, 1976 to discuss our efforts to that date including justification of our intention to submit an augmented program and the technical merits of such a program. Preparation of a report detailing the discussion at that meeting has been completed and is under review. This document shall be formally transmitted to you in September 1976 as technical justification for selection of the augmented in-service inspection program.

Very truly yours,

G. V. Patterson

G. V. Patterson
Vice President

GVP:mam

Sworn to and subscribed to before me this 27th day of August 1976 in New York County, New York

Kathleen Barry

Notary Public

KATHLEEN BARRY
NOTARY PUBLIC, State of New York
No. 41-4606792
Qualified in Queens County
Certificate filed in New York County
Commission Expires March 30, 1977

cc: see next page

cc: G. Charnoff
D. D. Comey
R. C. Callen
P. W. Steketee
R. Walsh
R. S. Hunter
R. W. Jurgensen - Bridgman