

SEP 7 1982

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

American Electric Power Service  
Corporation  
Indiana and Michigan Electric Company  
ATTN: Mr. John E. Dolan  
Vice Chairman  
Engineering  
2 Broadway  
New York, NY 10004

Gentlemen:

This is in response to your letter dated July 23, 1982, regarding the noncompliances which we brought to your attention in Inspection Report Nos. 50-315/82-10, 50-316/82-10 forwarded by our letter dated June 23, 1982. A meeting between Messrs. M. P. Alexich, B. Svenson, W. G. Smith, Jr., and E. Smarrella of your staff and Messrs. J. Streeter, D. Hayes and E. Swanson of our office was held on August 17, 1982, at the D. C. Cook plant to discuss the items of noncompliance and your responses to them. Additional information was obtained later by the NRC resident inspector at the plant. The results and conclusions reached are documented below, numbered as in the original Notice of Violation.

Item 1

The initial evaluation by plant personnel was that the release in question was caused by maintenance associated with the Clean and Dirty Sump System. This maintenance had been unsuccessful, and resulted in the Dirty Sump Tank overflowing several hours after initial maintenance activities had been completed. There was no maintenance activity in progress on the Clean and Dirty Sump System at the time of the release. It is our position that such accidental, unplanned releases attributed to unsuccessful maintenance are not normal or expected and are therefore reportable under the provisions of 10 CFR 50.72(a)(8).

We understand that although you believe your judgment in not initially reporting this release was correct, you will report such matters in the future in accordance with our position on 10 CFR 50.72(a)(8). We also understand plant personnel have been instructed on the need to report such matters and that additional guidance is being developed by the Plant Manager.

8209130193 820907  
PDR ADOCK 05000315  
Q PDR

IE01

OFFICE	RIII	RIII	RIII	RIII		
SURNAME	Holzner/rl	Streeter	Spessard	Keppler		
DATE	9/2/82	9/7	9/7	9/7/82		

Item 2

Based on the information presented in your response, we agree that this matter was not a test or experiment requiring a safety evaluation in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59. The fundamental problem was an inadequate Job Order procedure which allowed maintenance to progress without an adequate review to address possible safety consequences. Therefore, to more accurately reflect the fundamental issue, Item 2 of the enclosed Supplemental Notice of Violation replaces Item 2 of our original Notice of Violation. We also note that you have agreed to revise PMI-2290 within 30 days from our August 17, 1982 meeting to insure that it provides maintenance preplanning and review guidance consistent with Section 5.2.7.1 of ANSI N-18.7-1976.

Item 3.a

Based on the information presented in your response, we agree that this matter is not an example of an item of noncompliance and our records will be revised accordingly. However, there are some actions related to this matter which you have agreed to take as follows:

- . Technical Specification Clarification No. 21 which appears to be inconsistent with Unit 1 Technical Specification 4.5.4.1.a will be revised to clearly agree with that Unit 1 Technical Specification.
- . Procedure 1-OHP 4030.STP.030 will be revised to require recirculation prior to taking a boron sample for determining concentration.
- . Procedure 12-THP 6020.LAB.037 has been revised to clarify the requirement to verify Unit 1 boron injection tank water level by a recirculation flow test.

Item 3.b

Your response to this item appears to be acceptable.

Item 3.c

Based on the information provided in your response and discussions of this item on August 17, 1982, we agree that a step-by-step procedure is not necessary for this type of activity. However, administrative controls are needed to establish initial and final conditions, to outline precautions and methodology for the activity, and to provide a safety assessment. To more accurately reflect the issue, Item 3.c of the enclosed Supplemental Notice of Violation replaces Item 3.c of our original Notice of Violation. We also note that during our meeting on August 17, 1982, you indicated that you may control activities of this nature in the future by development of a generic procedure.

OFFICE ▶							
SURNAME ▶							
DATE ▶							

SEP 7 1982

We agree that maintaining records of activities of this type is not required by Technical Specification 6.8.1. The reference in the original Notice of Violation to maintaining records was a comment and not part of the citation. Please note that records of "principal maintenance activities" are required by Technical Specification 6.10.1.b. Our intent in this matter, however, is to focus on the administrative controls used in maintenance and trouble-shooting activities. We will review maintenance activities including the maintaining of proper records during future inspections.

Item 4

As discussed on August 17, 1982, we believe that your response to this item is incongruous with your response to Item I.C.6 of NUREG 0737. Your procedure controlling Clearance Permits was presented to the NRC in your January 8, 1981, letter as fulfilling the requirements for verification of operating activities. Your original intent was that the controls of this procedure be applicable to the removal from service and return to service of any equipment required to be operable by Technical Specifications, unless controls for such equipment were specifically provided by other written procedures. This understanding was amplified by discussions with your staff. It is evident that these procedural changes were not understood by some plant personnel who should have been aware of them and that the training conducted on this matter was not sufficient.

We understand that the Clearance Permit System has been revised to clearly include equipment control provisions which are consistent with your original intent in complying with Item I.C.6. of NUREG 0737 and that you are assuring that this revision is understood by all appropriate plant personnel.

We will examine these matters during a subsequent inspection.

Your cooperation with us is appreciated. No response to this letter is necessary unless your understanding of these matters differs from those stated above.

Sincerely,

James G. Keppler  
Regional Administrator

Enclosure: Appendix, Supplemental  
Notice of Violation

cc w/encl:

W. G. Smith, Jr., Plant Manager  
DMB/Document Control Desk (RIDS)  
Resident Inspector, RIII  
Ronald Callen, Michigan  
Public Service Commission

EIS Coordinator, USEPA  
Region 5 Office

OFFICE				
SURNAME				
DATE				