



**Pacific Gas and
Electric Company®**

James R. Becker
Vice President
Diablo Canyon Operations and
Station Director

Diablo Canyon Power Plant
P. O. Box 56
Avila Beach, CA 93424

805.545.3462
Fax: 805.545.4234

April 28, 2006

PG&E Letter DCL-06-058

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Docket No. 50-275, OL-DPR-80
Docket No. 50-323, OL-DPR-82
Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2
2005 Annual Nonradiological Environmental Operating Report

Dear Commissioners and Staff:

Enclosed is the 2005 Annual Nonradiological Environmental Operating Report for Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, submitted in accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Environmental Protection Plan, Appendix B, of the Facility Operating Licenses DPR-80 and DPR-82.

Sincerely,

James R. Becker

ddm/jlk/3007/R0273566

Enclosure

cc/enc: Roger W. Briggs, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Terry W. Jackson, NRC Senior Resident
Bruce S. Mallett, NRC Region IV
Alan B. Wang, NRR Program Manager
Diablo Distribution

IE2S



Document Control Desk
April 28, 2006
Page 2

PG&E Letter DCL-06-058

bcc: A. Glenn Caruso
Bryan Cunningham
Kathleen Jones
Richard F. Locke
Arlene Versaw

Enclosure
PG&E Letter DCL-06-058

**2005 ANNUAL NONRADIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENTAL
OPERATING REPORT
DIABLO CANYON POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2**

Pacific Gas and Electric Company
April 2006

1.0 Introduction

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has prepared the 2005 Annual Nonradiological Environmental Operating Report in accordance with the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP), Appendix B, of Facility Operating Licenses DPR-80 and DPR-82 for Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP), Units 1 and 2. The report describes implementation of the EPP per the routine reporting requirements of EPP, Subsection 5.4.1. PG&E remains committed to minimizing the environmental impact of operating DCPP.

2.0 Environmental Monitoring

2.1 Aquatic Issues

Aquatic issues are addressed by the effluent limitations and receiving water monitoring/reporting requirements contained in the DCPP National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The NPDES permit includes applicable requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board's Ocean Plan and Thermal Plan.

2.1.1 Routine Influent and Effluent Monitoring

During 2005, DCPP submitted quarterly NPDES reports containing routine influent and effluent monitoring data and permit compliance summaries to the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB) during the month following the end of each quarter. DCPP also submitted an annual NPDES report to the CCRWQCB in February 2006. The annual report contained monitoring data summaries in tabular and graphical form, and a summary of permit compliance and corrective actions for 2005. Copies of the quarterly and annual reports were submitted concurrently to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

2.1.2 Receiving Water Monitoring Program

The NPDES Receiving Water Monitoring Program, required by the CCRWQCB, included the ecological monitoring, temperature measurements, and State Mussel Watch activities.

Environmental monitoring programs have recorded biological changes in the discharge area since plant start-up. These programs monitor intertidal and subtidal communities of invertebrates, algae, and fish in the discharge cove, and at stations north and south of DCPP. During 2005, environmental monitoring continued under the Receiving Water Monitoring

Program (RWMP). The RWMP continued historical monitoring tasks, including temperature monitoring, State Mussel Watch activities, and intertidal and subtidal surveys.

The NPDES permit remains under administrative extension. In 2000, DCPD reached a tentative agreement with CCRWQCB staff, which addresses current and future impacts on receiving waters from power plant effluent discharge. This agreement, and the revised NPDES permit renewal application, did not receive the expected approvals from the CCRWQCB in July 2003, and discussions are continuing with CCRWQCB staff and their consultants. Based on the tentative agreement, future receiving water monitoring requirements will be significantly reduced or eliminated upon approval of the revised NPDES permit. Effluent monitoring will continue under the revised NPDES Permit.

DCPD submitted the "Receiving Water Monitoring Program – 2004 Annual Report" (PG&E Letter No. DCL-2005-526) to the CCRWQCB and the NRC on April 29, 2005. The 2005 Receiving Water Monitoring annual report will be submitted in late April 2006.

2.1.3 Thermal Effects Study

DCPD submitted the final thermal effects comprehensive assessment report to the CCRWQCB and the NRC in 1998.

2.1.4 316(b) Studies

DCPD submitted the final 316(b) report entitled, "316(b) Demonstration Report" (PG&E Letter No. DCL-2000-514) to the CCRWQCB and the NRC on March 1, 2000.

2.2 Terrestrial Issues

2.2.1 Herbicide Application and Erosion Control

PG&E continues to implement erosion control activities at the plant site and in the transmission line corridors as part of an overall land management program. These erosion control activities consist of routine maintenance and prevention efforts performed periodically on an as-needed basis, including seasonal storm damage repair and wildfire damage repair.

Herbicides are used as one component of an overall land management program that includes transmission line corridors and rights-of-way. The company continues to use only Environmental Protection Agency and/or state-approved herbicides and applies them in accordance with all applicable regulations.

2.2.2 Preservation of Archaeological Resources

A. CA-SLO-2 Site Management

All work performed within the boundaries of CA-SLO-2 is tracked and approved per Nuclear Plant Generation Interdepartmental Administrative Procedure, EV1.ID2, "CA-SLO-2, Site Management."

In October 2005, the PG&E Senior Cultural Resources Specialist (senior archaeologist) reviewed the 23 SLO-2 photo-monitoring stations. The photo monitoring was conducted in accordance with the Building and Land Service Department's (now Corporate Real Estate), "Cultural Resources Management Procedures for Archaeological Site CA-SLO-2," which implements policies of the Archaeological Resource Management Plan. No new areas of erosion or impacts to SLO-2 were noted.

The DCPD staff contacted PG&E's senior archaeologist regarding one project within the SLO-2 site during the course of the year. The activity consisted of the removal of pampas grass, a non-native and very invasive plant, in an area of SLO-2 which had been used as a sandblast area during the construction of DCPD. The pampas grass was cut by a small crew of workers using hand and power tools (chainsaws). The pampas grass was cut slightly above the ground level so as to not disturb the site. Since chemical removal of these plants was not authorized by PG&E's senior archaeologist (use of chemicals can alter radiocarbon dating and other analyses), the root mass of the pampas grass was covered with dark plastic sheeting to prevent the plants regrowth. Crews were tailboarded prior to the beginning of the project and the project was periodically monitored. This project was successful in its completion with no disturbance to SLO-2.

B. Chumash Indian Correspondence

There was no communication between PG&E and the Northern Chumash Indians during 2005 concerning CA-SLO-2.

3.0 Unusual or Important Environmental Events

No unusual or important events that would indicate, or could result in, a significant environmental impact causally related to station operations occurred in 2005.

4.0 Plant Reporting Requirements

4.1 EPP Noncompliance

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2005.

4.2 Changes in Station Design

There were no changes in plant design or operation, tests, or experiments that involved an unreviewed environmental question or a change to the EPP.

During 2005, DCPD completed low pressure rotor replacement work that increased the output of the Unit 1 turbine. This was done by increasing the thermal efficiency of the Unit 1 turbine and rejecting less heat to the environment through the main seawater cooled condensers. Therefore, DCPD improved Unit 1 efficiency with no negative impact on the environment and no change in reactor power output.

4.3 Nonroutine Reports

There were no nonroutine events during 2005 per the EPP and, therefore, no nonroutine reports were submitted to the NRC.



**Pacific Gas and
Electric Company***

James R. Becker
Vice President
Diablo Canyon Operations and
Station Director

Diablo Canyon Power Plant
P. O. Box 56
Avila Beach, CA 93424

805.545.3482
Fax: 805.545.4234

April 28, 2006

PG&E Letter DCL-06-058

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
ATTN: Document Control Desk
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Docket No. 50-275, OL-DPR-80
Docket No. 50-323, OL-DPR-82
Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2
2005 Annual Nonradiological Environmental Operating Report

Dear Commissioners and Staff:

Enclosed is the 2005 Annual Nonradiological Environmental Operating Report for Diablo Canyon Power Plant, Units 1 and 2, submitted in accordance with Subsection 5.4.1 of the Environmental Protection Plan, Appendix B, of the Facility Operating Licenses DPR-80 and DPR-82.

Sincerely,



James R. Becker

ddm/jlk/3007/R0273566

Enclosure

cc/enc: Roger W. Briggs, Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board
Terry W. Jackson, NRC Senior Resident
Bruce S. Mallett, NRC Region IV
Alan B. Wang, NRR Program Manager
Diablo Distribution

A member of the STARS (Strategic Teaming and Resource Sharing) Alliance

Callaway • Comanche Peak • Diablo Canyon • Palo Verde • South Texas Project • Wolf Creek



Document Control Desk
April 28, 2006
Page 2

PG&E Letter DCL-06-058

bcc: A. Glenn Caruso
Bryan Cunningham
Kathleen Jones
Richard F. Locke
Arlene Versaw

Enclosure
PG&E Letter DCL-06-058

**2005 ANNUAL NONRADIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENTAL
OPERATING REPORT
DIABLO CANYON POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2**

**Pacific Gas and Electric Company
April 2006**

1.0 Introduction

Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E) has prepared the 2005 Annual Nonradiological Environmental Operating Report in accordance with the Environmental Protection Plan (EPP), Appendix B, of Facility Operating Licenses DPR-80 and DPR-82 for Diablo Canyon Power Plant (DCPP), Units 1 and 2. The report describes implementation of the EPP per the routine reporting requirements of EPP, Subsection 5.4.1. PG&E remains committed to minimizing the environmental impact of operating DCPP.

2.0 Environmental Monitoring

2.1 Aquatic Issues

Aquatic issues are addressed by the effluent limitations and receiving water monitoring/reporting requirements contained in the DCPP National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The NPDES permit includes applicable requirements of the State Water Resources Control Board's Ocean Plan and Thermal Plan.

2.1.1 Routine Influent and Effluent Monitoring

During 2005, DCPP submitted quarterly NPDES reports containing routine influent and effluent monitoring data and permit compliance summaries to the Central Coast Regional Water Quality Control Board (CCRWQCB) during the month following the end of each quarter. DCPP also submitted an annual NPDES report to the CCRWQCB in February 2006. The annual report contained monitoring data summaries in tabular and graphical form, and a summary of permit compliance and corrective actions for 2005. Copies of the quarterly and annual reports were submitted concurrently to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

2.1.2 Receiving Water Monitoring Program

The NPDES Receiving Water Monitoring Program, required by the CCRWQCB, included the ecological monitoring, temperature measurements, and State Mussel Watch activities.

Environmental monitoring programs have recorded biological changes in the discharge area since plant start-up. These programs monitor intertidal and subtidal communities of invertebrates, algae, and fish in the discharge cove, and at stations north and south of DCPP. During 2005, environmental monitoring continued under the Receiving Water Monitoring

Program (RWMP). The RWMP continued historical monitoring tasks, including temperature monitoring, State Mussel Watch activities, and intertidal and subtidal surveys.

The NPDES permit remains under administrative extension. In 2000, DCPD reached a tentative agreement with CCRWQCB staff, which addresses current and future impacts on receiving waters from power plant effluent discharge. This agreement, and the revised NPDES permit renewal application, did not receive the expected approvals from the CCRWQCB in July 2003, and discussions are continuing with CCRWQCB staff and their consultants. Based on the tentative agreement, future receiving water monitoring requirements will be significantly reduced or eliminated upon approval of the revised NPDES permit. Effluent monitoring will continue under the revised NPDES Permit.

DCPD submitted the "Receiving Water Monitoring Program – 2004 Annual Report" (PG&E Letter No. DCL-2005-526) to the CCRWQCB and the NRC on April 29, 2005. The 2005 Receiving Water Monitoring annual report will be submitted in late April 2006.

2.1.3 Thermal Effects Study

DCPD submitted the final thermal effects comprehensive assessment report to the CCRWQCB and the NRC in 1998.

2.1.4 316(b) Studies

DCPD submitted the final 316(b) report entitled, "316(b) Demonstration Report" (PG&E Letter No. DCL-2000-514) to the CCRWQCB and the NRC on March 1, 2000.

2.2 Terrestrial Issues

2.2.1 Herbicide Application and Erosion Control

PG&E continues to implement erosion control activities at the plant site and in the transmission line corridors as part of an overall land management program. These erosion control activities consist of routine maintenance and prevention efforts performed periodically on an as-needed basis, including seasonal storm damage repair and wildfire damage repair.

Herbicides are used as one component of an overall land management program that includes transmission line corridors and rights-of-way. The company continues to use only Environmental Protection Agency and/or state-approved herbicides and applies them in accordance with all applicable regulations.

2.2.2 Preservation of Archaeological Resources

A. CA-SLO-2 Site Management

All work performed within the boundaries of CA-SLO-2 is tracked and approved per Nuclear Plant Generation Interdepartmental Administrative Procedure, EV1.ID2, "CA-SLO-2, Site Management."

In October 2005, the PG&E Senior Cultural Resources Specialist (senior archaeologist) reviewed the 23 SLO-2 photo-monitoring stations. The photo monitoring was conducted in accordance with the Building and Land Service Department's (now Corporate Real Estate), "Cultural Resources Management Procedures for Archaeological Site CA-SLO-2," which implements policies of the Archaeological Resource Management Plan. No new areas of erosion or impacts to SLO-2 were noted.

The DCPD staff contacted PG&E's senior archaeologist regarding one project within the SLO-2 site during the course of the year. The activity consisted of the removal of pampas grass, a non-native and very invasive plant, in an area of SLO-2 which had been used as a sandblast area during the construction of DCPD. The pampas grass was cut by a small crew of workers using hand and power tools (chainsaws). The pampas grass was cut slightly above the ground level so as to not disturb the site. Since chemical removal of these plants was not authorized by PG&E's senior archaeologist (use of chemicals can alter radiocarbon dating and other analyses), the root mass of the pampas grass was covered with dark plastic sheeting to prevent the plants regrowth. Crews were tailboarded prior to the beginning of the project and the project was periodically monitored. This project was successful in its completion with no disturbance to SLO-2.

B. Chumash Indian Correspondence

There was no communication between PG&E and the Northern Chumash Indians during 2005 concerning CA-SLO-2.

3.0 Unusual or Important Environmental Events

No unusual or important events that would indicate, or could result in, a significant environmental impact causally related to station operations occurred in 2005.

4.0 Plant Reporting Requirements

4.1 EPP Noncompliance

There were no EPP noncompliances during 2005.

4.2 Changes in Station Design

There were no changes in plant design or operation, tests, or experiments that involved an unreviewed environmental question or a change to the EPP.

During 2005, DCPD completed low pressure rotor replacement work that increased the output of the Unit 1 turbine. This was done by increasing the thermal efficiency of the Unit 1 turbine and rejecting less heat to the environment through the main seawater cooled condensers. Therefore, DCPD improved Unit 1 efficiency with no negative impact on the environment and no change in reactor power output.

4.3 Nonroutine Reports

There were no nonroutine events during 2005 per the EPP and, therefore, no nonroutine reports were submitted to the NRC.