

APR 15 1985

Docket No. 50-323

Mr. J. D. Shiffer, Vice President  
Nuclear Power Generation  
c/o Nuclear Power Generation, Licensing  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
77 Beale Street, Room 1451  
San Francisco, California 94106

Dear Mr: Shiffer:

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION IN REGARD TO DIABLO CANYON,  
UNIT 2 TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS

As a result of our continuing evaluation of the Diablo Canyon, Unit 2  
Technical Specifications, we find that additional information, identified in  
the enclosure, is required to complete our review. The items in the enclosure  
are numbered as additions to the items in the enclosure to our letter of  
March 14, 1985.

Sincerely,

ORIGINAL SIGNED BY

George W. Knighton, Chief  
Licensing Branch No. 3  
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:  
As stated

cc: See next page

**DISTRIBUTION**

Docket File 50-323

NRC PDR  
Local PDR  
NSIC  
PRC System  
LB#3 Reading  
BBuckley  
HSchierling  
JLee  
JPartlow  
BGrimes  
EJordan  
Attorney, OELD  
ACRS (16)

DL:LB#3  
BBuckley  
04/12/85

DL:LB#3  
GWKnighton  
04/12/85

8505020114 850415  
PDR ADDCK 05000323  
A PDR

1944

1. The first part of the report deals with the general situation of the country and the progress of the war.

2. The second part of the report deals with the economic situation and the progress of the war.

3. The third part of the report deals with the political situation and the progress of the war.

4. The fourth part of the report deals with the military situation and the progress of the war.

5. The fifth part of the report deals with the cultural situation and the progress of the war.

Diablo Canyon

Mr. J. D. Shiffer, Vice President  
Nuclear Power Generation  
c/o Nuclear Power Generation, Licensing  
Pacific Gas and Electric Company  
77 Beale Street, Room 1451  
San Francisco, California 94106

Philip A. Crane, Jr., Esq.  
Pacific Gas & Electric Company  
Post Office Box 7442  
San Francisco, California 94120

Mr. Malcolm H. Furbush  
Vice President - General Counsel  
Pacific Gas & Electric Company  
Post Office Box 7442  
San Francisco, California 94120

Janice E. Kerr, Esq.  
California Public Utilities Commission  
350 McAllister Street  
San Francisco, California 94102

Mr. Frederick Eissler, President  
Scenic Shoreline Preservation  
Conference, Inc.  
4623 More Mesa Drive  
Santa Barbara, California 93105

Ms. Elizabeth Apfelberg  
1415 Cozadero  
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Mr. Gordon A. Silver  
Ms. Sandra A. Silver  
1760 Alisal Street  
San Luis Obispo, California 93401

Harry M. Willis, Esq.  
Seymour & Willis  
601 California Street, Suite 2100  
San Francisco, California 94108

Mr. Richard Hubbard  
MHB Technical Associates  
Suite K  
1725 Hamilton Avenue  
San Jose, California 95125

Mr. John Marrs, Managing Editor  
San Luis Obispo County Telegram Tribune  
1321 Johnson Avenue  
P. O. Box 112  
San Luis Obispo, California 93406

Resident Inspector/Diablo Canyon NPS  
c/o US Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
P. O. Box 369  
Avila Beach, California 93424

Ms. Raye Fleming  
1920 Mattie Road  
Shell Beach, California 93440

Joel Reynolds, Esq.  
John R. Phillips, Esq.  
Center for Law in the Public Interest  
10951 West Pico Boulevard  
Third Floor  
Los Angeles, California 90064

Mr. Dick Blankenburg  
Editor & Co-Publisher  
South County Publishing Company  
P. O. Box 460  
Arroyo Grande, California 93420

Bruce Norton, Esq.  
Norton, Burke, Berry & French, P.C.  
202 E. Osborn Road  
P. O. Box 10569  
Phoenix, Arizona 85064

Mr. W. C. Gangloff  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
P. O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

David F. Fleischaker, Esq.  
P. O. Box 1178  
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73101



Arthur C. Gehr, Esq.  
Snell & Wilmer  
3100 Valley Center  
Phoenix, Arizona 85073

Mr. Lee M. Gustafson, Director  
Federal Agency Relations  
Pacific Gas & Electric Company  
1050 17th Street, N.W.  
Suite 1180  
Washington, DC 20036

Regional Administrator - Region V  
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
1450 Maria Lane  
Suite 210  
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Michael J. Strumwasser, Esq.  
Special Counsel to the Attorney General  
State of California  
3580 Wilshire Boulevard, Suite 800  
Los Angeles, California 90010

Mr. Tom Harris  
Sacramento Bee  
21st and O Streets  
Sacramento, California 95814

Mr. H. Daniel Nix  
California Energy Commission  
1516 9th Street, MS 18  
Sacramento, California 95814

Lewis Shollenberger, Esq.  
US Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
Region V  
1450 Maria Lane  
Suite 210  
Walnut Creek, California 94596

Mr. Thomas Devine  
Government Accountability  
Project  
Institute for Policy Studies  
1901 Que Street, NW  
Washington, DC 20009



7. Table 3.8-2, Reactor Trip System Instrumentation Response Times

(Page 3/4-3 and Page B2-4)

In table 3.3-2, it is stated that the need to specify a response time for both the Intermediate Range and Source Range Neutron Flux Trip is

"not applicable." Based on previous reviews, we understand that this is because they are claimed not to be taken credit for in safety analyses.

However, on page B2-4, it is stated that they are relied upon. Therefore, provide response times, consistent with the need for a power range neutron flux response time.

8. Table 3.3-3, Engineered Safety Features Actuation Systems Instrumentation

(Pages 3/4-15 to 3/4 3-17)

a). We understand that Item 1.C, Automatic Safety Injection is required in Mode 4 on high containment pressure in order to protect the core in the event of a LOCA. The same comment applies to table 4.3-2, item 1.C.

b). Item 4.a, manual steam line isolation capability should be required in Mode 4 to enable isolation of the faulted steam generator in case of a steam line break or a steam generator tube rupture.

9. Section 3.4.4, Relief Valves (Page 3/4 4-10)

We understand that Diablo Canyon Unit 2 relies on the PORVs to be operable and available in order to meet the 10 CFR 100 guideline values. However, the proposed technical specifications would allow them to be taken out of





service and put in an inoperable mode. It is unclear if the action statements (a) through (e) of this section ensure that a PORV relief path will always be operable assuming a single failure. In particular, if a plant lost 2 PORVs, one can not be taken out of service and rendered inoperable, since a single failure of a PORV would result in no pressure relief path and a violation of the FSAR assumptions for the postulated steam generator tube rupture event. Clarify the action statements to ensure that licensing bases are met or otherwise provide a basis for a conclusion that the licensing bases will be met.

10. Section 3/4 10.3, Special Test Exceptions, Reactor Coolant Loops

(Page 3/4 10-4)

This technical specification permits plant operation without any reactor coolant pumps operating up to 10% thermal power on fission heat for startup or physics tests. The staff is unaware of any safety analysis that demonstrates that this operating condition would be acceptable.

Provide a basis for the acceptability of steady state operation at 10% thermal power on fission heat that includes an assessment of reactor coolant system temperature profiles, margins to saturation, and core DNBR.



## DIABLO CANYON UNIT 2

## INFORMATION REQUEST

6. Table 3.3-1, Reactor Trip System Instrumentation (Page 3/4 3-2)

Item 6.c on this table specifies that only one Source Range Monitor (SRM) channel is required to be operable during Modes 3, 4, and 5. During these modes, the SRM does not provide a reactor trip function. However, it provides a boron dilution mitigation function by sensing the neutron flux increase and actuating alarms alerting the operator. One operable SRM represents a single point of vulnerability for the boron dilution mitigation system (BDMS). During the FSAR review stage, the staff reviewed and the BDMS on the premise that it is single failure proof. Therefore, this item represents an apparent deviation from the boron dilution analysis assumptions as approved by the staff.

We note that the BDMS as reflected in the Diablo Canyon Unit 2 Technical Specifications does not meet the single failure criterion.

Either (a) propose appropriate changes to rendering the BDMS single failure proof, or (b) provide justification for not meeting the single failure criterion.

