



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

September 29, 2010

LICENSEE: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

FACILITY: Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON AUGUST 31, 2010, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY CONCERNING RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on August 31, 2010, to obtain clarification on the applicant's response to request for additional information (RAI) regarding the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant license renewal application.

By letters dated June 18, 2010, and August 17, 2010, PG&E sent the staff a response to RAI letters dated May 24, 2010, and June 21, 2010, respectively. The staff reviewed the information contained therein, and requested a telephone conference call. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the PG&E's response. Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants. Enclosure 2 provides discussions on the RAI responses for which the staff requested clarification. PG&E will submit supplemental responses, as necessary, within 30 days of the issuance of this summary. Follow-up RAIs, determined to be necessary, will be issued separately by a formal letter.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "N. Ferrer", is positioned above the typed name.

Nathaniel Ferrer, Project Manager  
Projects Branch 2  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323

Enclosures:  
As stated

cc w/encls: Distribution via Listserv

**TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL  
DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION**

**LIST OF PARTICIPANTS  
AUGUST 31, 2010**

**PARTICIPANTS**

**AFFILIATIONS**

Nate Ferrer	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Garry Armstrong	NRC
Stan Gardocki	NRC
Greg Casto	NRC
Philippe Soenen	Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)
Kyle Duke	PG&E
Kevin Braico	PG&E
Chalmer Myer	Strategic Teaming And Resource Sharing (STARS)
David Kunsemiller	STARS
Rye Davis	STARS
Dan Shepard	STARS
Ken Bryant	STARS
James Copernicus	STARS
Randall Boyd	STARS

Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2  
License Renewal Application  
Request for Additional Information (Sets 2 and 13)  
Scoping and Screening

**RAI 2.1-1 and 2.1-2**

In its June 18, and July 28, 2010, responses to requests for additional information (RAIs) 2.1-1 and 2.1-2, the applicant added several components to the scope of license renewal under 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2). However, the staff was unclear why some fluid-filled, non safety-related components, in the turbine building were excluded from the scope of license renewal given that they were in the same space as safety-related components.

**Discussion:**

The staff will issue follow-up RAIs to clarify why certain components were excluded from the scope of license renewal.

**RAI 2.3.3.5-1**

In its August 17, 2010, response to RAI 2.3.3.5-1, the applicant added additional components to the scope of license renewal for 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2) related to the firewater tank. However, the staff was unclear why the firewater tank was not revised to be in scope under 10 CFR 54.4(a)(1).

**Discussion:**

Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E) agreed to supplement its response to RAI 2.3.3.5-1 to clarify whether the firewater tank is in scope for 10 CFR 54.4(a)(1), and provide an evaluation of piping attached to the tank to ensure appropriate endpoints are established in accordance with the applicant's stated methodology.

**RAI 2.3.3.5-4**

In its August 17, 2010, response to RAI 2.3.3.5-4, the applicant provided an explanation for their selection of endpoints for various license renewal boundaries. However, the staff was unclear how the seismic anchors for non safety-related connections to the condensate storage tank, firewater storage tank, and primary storage tank were established.

**Discussion:**

PG&E agreed to supplement its response to RAI 2.3.3.5-4 to clarify how appropriate endpoints were established based upon criteria in the applicant's stated methodology.

**RAI 2.3.3.5-5**

In its August 17, 2010, response to RAI 2.3.3.5-5, the applicant provided information on the procedural mitigation methods related to the makeup to the component cooling water surge tank. However, the response was not clear with respect to whether the makeup to the spent fuel pool is addressed with a similar method.

**Discussion:**

PG&E agreed to supplement its response to RAI 2.3.3.5-5 to clarify the procedural mitigation methods related to the makeup to the spent fuel pool.

**RAI 2.3.3.6-1**

In its August 17, 2010, response to RAI 2.3.3.6-1 the applicant indicated that the heat exchangers of concern were revised to be within scope of license renewal under 10 CFR 54.4(a)(2). However, the staff was unclear on the basis for why the heat exchangers were no longer designated as safety-related components which would require them to be in the scope of license renewal under 10 CFR 54.4(a)(1).

**Discussion:**

PG&E agreed to supplement its response to RAI 2.3.3.6-1 to clarify why the heat exchangers were no longer designated as safety-related components.

**RAI 2.3.3.7-1**

In its August 17, 2010, response to RAI 2.3.3.7-1, the applicant provided details for why solenoid valves and the tubing between both sets of solenoid valves were excluded from scope of license renewal. However the staff made the following observations:

1. The staff was unclear why both valves 1-PCV-19 and 1-PCV-20 were discussed in the description.

**Discussion:**

The applicant indicated that the reference to 1-PCV-19, in the response, should have been 1-PCV-20. Based on the discussion, this portion of the response is clear.

2. The staff was unclear how appropriate endpoints were established on the non safety-related piping connecting to safety-related solenoid valves. The existing license renewal boundary did not include the non safety-related piping past the safety-related/non safety-related interface to a seismic anchor in accordance with the applicant's stated methodology.

Discussion:

PG&E agreed to supplement its response to RAI 2.3.3.7-1 to clarify how the seismic endpoints were established.

September 29, 2010

LICENSEE: Pacific Gas and Electric Company

FACILITY: Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant, Units 1 and 2

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON AUGUST 31, 2010, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY CONCERNING RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff) and representatives of Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E or the applicant) held a telephone conference call on August 31, 2010, to obtain clarification on the applicant's response to request for additional information (RAI) regarding the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant license renewal application.

By letters dated June 18, 2010, and August 17, 2010, PG&E sent the staff a response to RAI letters dated May 24, 2010, and June 21, 2010, respectively. The staff reviewed the information contained therein, and requested a telephone conference call. The telephone conference call was useful in clarifying the intent of the PG&E's response. Enclosure 1 provides a listing of the participants. Enclosure 2 provides discussions on the RAI responses for which the staff requested clarification. PG&E will submit supplemental responses, as necessary, within 30 days of the issuance of this summary. Follow-up RAIs, determined to be necessary, will be issued separately by a formal letter.

The applicant had an opportunity to comment on this summary.

**/RA/**

Nathaniel Ferrer, Project Manager  
Projects Branch 2  
Division of License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket Nos. 50-275 and 50-323

Enclosures:

As stated

cc w/encls: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

See next page

ADAMS Accession No.: ML102450755

OFFICE	LA:DLR	PM:RPB2:DLR	BC:RPB2:DLR	PM:RPB2:DLR
NAME	YEdmonds	NFerrer w/edits	DWrona	NFerrer
DATE	9/15/10	9/16/10	9/29/10	9/29/10

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Memorandum To PG&E Company from N. Ferrer dated September 29, 2010

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL HELD ON AUGUST 31, 2010, BETWEEN THE U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION AND PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY CONCERNING RESPONSES TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION RELATED TO THE DIABLO CANYON NUCLEAR POWER PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

DISTRIBUTION:

**HARD COPY:**

DLR RF

**E-MAIL:**

PUBLIC [or NON-PUBLIC, if appropriate]

RidsNrrDlr Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb1 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpb2 Resource

RidsNrrDlrRarb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRapb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRasb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRerb Resource

RidsNrrDlrRpob Resource

RidsOgcMailRoom Resource

-----  
N. Ferrer  
K. Green  
A. Stuyvenberg  
D. Wrona  
A. Wang  
M. Peck, RIV  
T. Brown, RI  
G. Miller, RIV  
N. O'Keefe, RIV  
I. Couret, OPA  
V. Dricks, OPA  
W. Maier, RIV  
J. Weil, OCA  
E. Williamson, OGC  
S. Uttal, OGC  
R. Rihm, EDO