

DeM...
Rids

Docket No. 50-315
Docket No. 50-316

Indiana Michigan Power Company
ATTN: Mr. E. E. Fitzpatrick
Vice President
Nuclear Operations Division
1 Riverside Plaza
Columbus, OH 43216

Dear Mr. Fitzpatrick:

This refers to the NRC's Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) 10 Report for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant; our meeting of March 26, 1992, which discussed in detail the contents of the report; and your written comments, dated April 21, 1992, relative to the report.

Your written response appeared accurate and the staff did not disagree with any of your comments. In the area of Radiological Controls, where you requested that we reconsider your SALP rating, we acknowledge that improvements have been made over recent years in this area. Your performance in Radiological Controls is considered to be good, as evidenced by your relatively low collective station dose and personnel contaminations, as well as other improvements noted in the SALP.

We reconvened the SALP Board to consider your request to change the Radiological Controls rating to a Category 2 with an improving trend. The Board concluded the information provided in your response had been considered in the initial board deliberations and there was no clear basis to change the initial SALP rating. While the SALP Board acknowledged that your performance in the Radiological Controls area was strong, they concluded that the "improving trend" criteria had not been met. As stated in NRC Manual Chapter 0516, an "improving trend" is specifically defined as a clearly discernable trend which, if continued, will likely result in an increased rating in the next SALP assessment period. While the Board recognized that several improvements were made during this assessment period, they concluded that the criteria for an improving trend were not satisfied. Additionally, it should be noted that the category rating and the assignment of a trend are two separate deliberations by the SALP Board. A Category 2 improving is not necessarily a higher rating than a Category 2.

Based on our discussions during the meeting and our review and evaluation of your letter of response, we have reached the conclusion presented in the enclosed meeting summary. With the incorporation of the revised pages from Enclosure 3, the Initial SALP Report should be considered to be the Final SALP Report.

JE40

Distribution (Cont.)

State Liaison Officer, State
of Michigan

Chief, NRR/LPEB (2 copies)

L. B. Marsh, NRR Director, Project Directorate III-1

J. Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement

C. D. Pederson, RIII

J. A. Isom, SRI

L. L. Cox, RIII (2 copies)

TSS, RIII

RIII Files

RIII PRR

MAY 07 1992

Indiana Michigan Power Company

2

In accordance with Section 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter with the referenced enclosures, will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room.

No reply to this letter is required; however, should you have questions regarding the Final SALP Report, please let us know and we will be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,
Original signed by Charles E. Norelius for
A. Bert Davis
Regional Administrator

Enclosures:

- 1. Final SALP 10 Report
No. 50-315/92001; 50-316/92001
(Meeting Summary)
- 2. Revision sheet(s)
- 3. Revised Pages to SALP Report
- 4. Licensee Response Ltr,
dtd 04/21/91

cc w/enclosures:

A. A. Blind, Plant Manager
DCD/DCB (RIDS)
OC/LFDCB
Resident Inspector, RIII
James R. Padgett, Michigan Public
Service Commission
EIS Coordinator, USEPA
Region 5 Office
Michigan Department of
Public Health
D. C. Cook, LPM, NRR
INPO

The Chairman

K. C. Rogers, Commissioner
J. R. Curtiss, Commissioner
F. J. Remick, Commissioner
E. G. de Planque, Commissioner
J. H. Sniezek, DEDR
T. E. Murley, Director, NRR

Distribution (Continued)

(SEE ATTACHED CONCURRENCES)

| | | | | |
|---------------|-----------|------------|------------------------------------|---------|
| RIII | RIII | RIII | RIII | RIII |
| Schweibinz/bt | Jorgensen | Brown | Hasse | Schafer |
| RIII | RIII | RIII | RIII | |
| Greenman | Norelius | Paperiello | <i>ADN</i> for Davis 5/17/92 | |

No reply to this letter is required; however, should you have questions regarding the Final SALP Report, please let us know and we will be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

A. Bert Davis
Regional Administrator

Enclosures:

- 1. Final SALP 10 Report
No. 50-315/92001;50-316/92001
(Meeting Summary)
- 2. Revision sheet(s)
- 3. Revised Pages to SALP Report
- 4. Licensee Response Ltr,
dtd 04/21/91

cc w/enclosures:

A. A. Blind, Plant Manager
DCD/DCB (RIDS)
OC/LFDCB
Resident Inspector, RIII
James R. Padgett, Michigan Public
Service Commission
EIS Coordinator, USEPA
Region 5 Office
Michigan Department of
Public Health
D. C. Cook, LPM, NRR
INPO

The Chairman

K. C. Rogers, Commissioner
J. R. Curtiss, Commissioner
F. J. Remick, Commissioner
E. G. de Planque, Commissioner
J. H. Sniezek, DEDR
T. E. Murley, Director, NRR

Distribution (Continued)

| | | | | | |
|--|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| YES | YES | yes | | | |
| RIII EAS Schweibinz/jaw 4-30-92 | RIII EAS for Jorgensen 4-30-92 | RIII Brown 4/30/92 | RIII Hagse 6/30/92 | RIII RWD Schafer 7/30 | RIII WCA Greenman 5/10/92 |
| RIII Miller 4/30/92 | RIII Norelius 5/1/92 | RIII CXP Paperiello 5/1/92 | RIII Davis | | |



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION III
799 ROOSEVELT ROAD
GLEN ELLYN, ILLINOIS 60137

MAY 3 1992

Docket No. 50-315
Docket No. 50-316

Indiana Michigan Power Company
ATTN: Mr. E. E. Fitzpatrick
Vice President
Nuclear Operations Division
1 Riverside Plaza
Columbus, OH 43216

Dear Mr. Fitzpatrick:

This refers to the NRC's Systematic Assessment of Licensee Performance (SALP) 10 Report for the Donald C. Cook Nuclear Plant; our meeting of March 26, 1992, which discussed in detail the contents of the report; and your written comments, dated April 21, 1992, relative to the report.

Your written response appeared accurate and the staff did not disagree with any of your comments. In the area of Radiological Controls, where you requested that we reconsider your SALP rating, we acknowledge that improvements have been made over recent years in this area. Your performance in Radiological Controls is considered to be good, as evidenced by your relatively low collective station dose and personnel contaminations, as well as other improvements noted in the SALP.

We reconvened the SALP Board to consider your request to change the Radiological Controls rating to a Category 2 with an improving trend. The Board concluded the information provided in your response had been considered in the initial board deliberations and there was no clear basis to change the initial SALP rating. While the SALP Board acknowledged that your performance in the Radiological Controls area was strong, they concluded that the "improving trend" criteria had not been met. As stated in NRC Manual Chapter 0516, an "improving trend" is specifically defined as a clearly discernable trend which, if continued, will likely result in an increased rating in the next SALP assessment period. While the Board recognized that several improvements were made during this assessment period, they concluded that the criteria for an improving trend were not satisfied. Additionally, it should be noted that the category rating and the assignment of a trend are two separate deliberations by the SALP Board. A Category 2 improving is not necessarily a higher rating than a Category 2.

Based on our discussions during the meeting and our review and evaluation of your letter of response, we have reached the conclusion presented in the enclosed meeting summary. With the incorporation of the revised pages from Enclosure 3, the Initial SALP Report should be considered to be the Final SALP Report.

In accordance with Section 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," Part 2, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, a copy of this letter with the referenced enclosures, will be placed in the NRC's Public Document Room.

No reply to this letter is required; however, should you have questions regarding the Final SALP Report, please let us know and we will be pleased to discuss them with you.

Sincerely,

Charles E. Noeline
for
A. Bert Davis
Regional Administrator

Enclosures:

1. Final SALP 10 Report
No. 50-315/92001;50-316/92001
(Meeting Summary)
2. Revision sheet(s)
3. Revised Pages to SALP Report
4. Licensee Response Ltr,
dtd 04/21/91

cc w/enclosures:

A. A. Blind, Plant Manager
DCD/DCB (RIDS)
OC/LFDCB
Resident Inspector, RIII
James R. Padgett, Michigan Public
Service Commission
EIS Coordinator, USEPA
Region 5 Office
Michigan Department of
Public Health
D. C. Cook, LPM, NRR
INPO

The Chairman

K. C. Rogers, Commissioner
J. R. Curtiss, Commissioner
F. J. Remick, Commissioner
E. G. de Planque, Commissioner
J. H. Sniezek, DEDR
T. E. Murley, Director, NRR

Distribution (Continued)

Distribution (Cont.)

State Liaison Officer, State
of Michigan

Chief, LPEB/NRR (2 copies)

L. B. Marsh, NRR Director, Project Directorate III-1

J. Lieberman, Director, Office of Enforcement

C. D. Pederson, RIII

J. A. Isom, SRI

L. L. Cox, RIII (2 copies)

TSS, RIII

RIII Files

RIII PRR