**From:** Lynch, Steven
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 24, 2012 2:06 PM
**To:** sherry.lewis66@att.net
**Cc:** Wang, Alan
**Subject:** RE: typo? in letter to Mr. Conway, PGE

Ms. Lewis,

After further discussion with our technical staff, we would like to confirm that Item 4 of "DCPP PPS Replacement LAR Items" contained within the January 13, 2012 Acceptance Review of License Amendment Request for Digital Process Protection System Replacement is worded correctly.

The first paragraph of Item 4 refers to the Software Configuration Management guideline DCPP submitted in its License Amendment Request. The second paragraph explains to DCPP that they must submit their actual configuration management plan (not just the guideline) for NRC evaluation. The "ALS Configuration Management Plan" (6002-00002) is cited as a configuration management plan that DOES "describe the configuration management activities to be used for the development and application of the ALS platform for the DCPPS" and as such, should be described in the actual DCPP Software Configuration Management Plan requested in Item 4.

I hope that both this response and last week's meeting were useful to you.

Regards,

Steve Lynch
General Engineer
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing, Plant Licensing Branch 4

---

**From:** Sherry Lewis [mailto:sherry.lewis66@att.net]
**Sent:** Saturday, January 21, 2012 12:15 AM
**To:** Wang, Alan
**Cc:** Kemper, William; Jane Swanson
**Subject:** typo? in letter to Mr. Conway, PGE

Dear Mr. Wang:

In your letter of January 13, 2012, to Mr. John Conway at PG&E Diablo Canyon there may be a typographical error, which I would like you to address. I am a member of the San Luis Obispo Mothers For Peace and attended the meeting in San Luis Obispo as an observer on January 18th between PGE and NRC/NRR concerning the License Amendment Request for Digital Replacement of the RPS.

Your letter concerning DCPP PPS Replacement LAR Items--Item 4 [1.10] (page 3), 5th line down of 2nd paragraph, seems to omit the word "not". A colleague of mine, Jane Swanson,

asked about what appeared to be the omission and was assured by William Kempler that the sentence was correct as written.

But I looked it over again that night, paraphrased it as follows, and think the negative should be there. What do you think?

> "The NRC staff requires the actual plan to be used by the licensee for maintaining configuration control over ... software in order to evaluate against the acceptance criteria of the standard review plan (SRP). For example, the ALS plan describes ***initial design*** ***activities*** related to ALS generic boards. This plan does **< not? >** describe the ***configuration management*** ***activities*** to be used for the development and application of the ALS platform ... The NRC staff requires that configuration management for this design be described in the DCPP project-specific plan. These items will need further clarification ...."

<my bold, italics, and underline>

Jane Swanson and I agreed that the members of the panel were respectful and thoughtful of the few members of the public who attended the meeting. We appreciate how they took time to explain some of the technical language so that we could better follow the discussion. But on this one point we are not sure they thoroughly took into account the full context of the paragraph in responding to the question of a missing "not". Your opinion on this matter would be appreciated.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Sherry Lewis
Mothers For Peace