REGU	JLATORY INTERMATION I	DISTRIBUTION S ERIAL	YST (RIDS) 50-275/323)
REC: STOLZ J F NRC	ORG: CR PACIF	ANE P A IC GAS & ELEC	DOCDATE: 04/1 DATE RCVD: 04	1/78 1/78 1/17/78
DOCTYPE: LETTER SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO NRC I BASIS EARTHQUAKE	NOTARIZED: NO INFORMAL REQUESTF(FOR SUBJECT FACILIT	ORWARDING INFO Y.	COPIES RECE LTR 1 END CONCERNING AN OPERATING	IIVED L 40
PLANT NAME: DIABLO DIABLO)'CANYON - UNIT 1) CANYON - UNIT 2	¥	REVIEWER INITIAL: X. DISTRIBUTER INITIAL:	IM
- 4+ 45 45 47 47 45 45 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47 47	* DISTRIBUTION OF TH	IS MATERIAL IS	AS FOLLOWS **********	*****
NOTES: J HANCHETT W/1 CY F HEBDON W/1 CY 4	ALL MATERIAL ALL SAFETY MATERIAL			
PSAR/FSAR AND (DISTRIBUTION	IS AND RELATED CORESP CODE BOOI)	PONDENCE		
FOR ACTION:	ASST DIR VASSALLO: PROJ MGR ALLISON*:	**LTR ONLY *W∕ENCL	BR CHIEF STOLZ**LTR ONLY LIC ASST HYLTON**LTR ONL	, . .Y
FOR INFO: FOR INFO:	MOORE**W/ENCL J JACKSON**W/ENCL		KNIGHTON**W/ENCL SLATEŔ**W/ENCL	
INTERNAL:	REG FILE**W/ENCL I <u>& E**W/2</u> =ENCL P. COLLINS**W/ENCL HELTEMES**W/ENCL HIFC**LTR ONLY BOSNAK**W/ENCL PAWLICKI**W/2 ENCL NOVAK**W/ENCL CHECK**W/ENCL BENAROYA**W/ENCL IPPOLITO**W/ENCL GAMMILL**W/4 ENCL BUNCH**W/ENCL KREGER**W/ENCL	}	NRC PDR**W/ENCL DELD**LTR ONLY HOUSTON**W/ENCL CASE**LTR ONLY KNIGHT**LTR ONLY SIHWEIL**W/ENCL ROSS**LTR ONLY ROSZTOCZY**W/ENCL TEDESCO**LTR ONLY LAINAS**W/ENCL F: ROSA**W/ENCL VOLLMER**LTR ONLY J. COLLINS**W/ENCL KIRKWOOD**W/ENCL	
EXTERNAL:	LPDR'S SAN LUIS OBISPO TIC**W/ENCL NSIC**W/ENCL' ACRS CAT A**W/16), CA**W/ENCL ENCL	u B	
DISTRIBUTION: L SIZE: 1P+2P	.TR 60 ENCL 50		CONTROL NBR: 781070	MA 4
**************************************	********	THE END ****	**********	. 9 0

A A .

.

• •

, , ,



PACIFIC GAS AND ELECTRIC COMPANY

PGWE

77 BEALE STREET, 31ST FLOOR . SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94106 . (415) 781-4211

JOHN C. MORRISSEY VICE PRESIDENT AND GENERAL COUNSEL MALCOLM H. FURBUSH

April 11, 1978

GILBERT L. MARRICK GLENN WEST, JR. OAN GRAVEON LUBBGCK JACK F. FALLIN, JR. EDWARD J. MCGANNEY DANIEL C. GIBSON JOSEPH I. KELLY MOWARD V. GOLUS AFMIDE COUNSEL

ATTORNEYS

- 3

J. PETER BA STEVEN R. B PAMELA CHA BRIAN B. DE

NAPPELLE DENTON CNCINA

ERICKBON

AARIS

BITZ Lincserg. jr, Icke 10, jr,

CKETT

INUA BAR-LEV IRAT L. BORDON JN S. CASEION INASO J. OELLASATA INT S. CASEION INCASE RECENSED INCASE RECENSED INCASE RECENSED INCASE RECENSED INCASE RECENSED INCASEION

ASSOCIATE GENERAL COUNSEL CHARLES T. VAN DEUSEN PHILIP A. CRANE, JR. HENRY J. LAPLANTE RICHARD A. CLARKE JOHN 8. GIBSON ARTHUR L. HILLMAN, JR. ROBERT OHLBACH CHARLES W. THISSELL ASSISTANT GENERAL COUNSEL

Mr. John F. Stolz, Chief Light Water Reactors Branch No. 1 Division of Project Management U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission							773 APR 1/	211, 1152S	
Masining con,		. 20333					223		
	Re:	Docket	No. 5	0-275-0L			EVIC	10	110
		Diablo	Canyo	n Units	1&	2	ES	55	Ĩ

Dear Mr. Stolz:

The attached information responds to an informal request by the Regulatory Staff for information concerning an Operating Basis Earthquake for the Diablo Canyon Site.

Kindly acknowledge receipt of the above material on the enclosed copy of this letter and return it to me in the enclosed addressed envelope.

Very truly yours,

Attachment (40 copies)

CC w/attachment: Service List

Bool 5E,;; IAU

781070051

•

.

· ·

ا ۹ محمد - معید ۱

Operating Basis Earthquake for Diablo Canyon, Units 1 & 2

12 40

The seismic design basis for Diablo Canyon, Units 1 & 2, was established in connection with proceedings leading to the issuance of construction permits for the units. The seismic design basis included consideration of a Design Earthquake (DE) having a maximum vibratory ground acceleration of 0.2g and a Double Design Earthquake (DDE) having a maximum vibratory ground acceleration of 0.4g. The Design Earthquake and Double Design Earthquake are equivalent to the Operating Basis Earthquake (OBE) and the Safe Shutdown Earthquake (SSE) as currently defined in Appendix A to 10 CFR 100.

Following the identification of the offshore zone of geologic faulting generally referred to as the "Hosgri Fault," the USNRC Regulatory Staff required that PG&E consider a postulated earthquake on the Hosgri fault in addition to those earthquakes considered in the seismic design basis. PG&E was required to evaluate the plant's capability to withstand such an earthquake using an effective zero period horizontal ground acceleration of 0.75g for the development of response spectra. This evaluation has been conducted using procedures and criteria analogous to those appropriate for a Safe Shutdown Earthquake. The evaluation is essentially complete and is under review by the USNRC Regulatory Staff. The evaluation shows that the plant, with some modifications which are now in progress, meets the established acceptance criteria.

A question has now arisen concerning the justification for the use of the Design Earthquake as the Operating Basis Earthquake for the plant, given the requirement that the plant be evaluated for the postulated earthquake on the Hosgri Fault. This concern appears to be rooted in the wording of Appendix A to 10 CFR 100, Section V(a)(2), which states that "...The maximum vibratory ground acceleration of the Operating Basis Earthquake shall be at least one half the maximum vibratory ground acceleration of the Safe Shutdown Earthquake."

It is PG&E's position that the appropriate Safe Shutdown Earthquake for the plant, as currently defined in Appendix A to 10 GFR 100, is the Double Design Earthquake included in the plant's seismic design basis. Since the maximum vibratory ground motion of the Design Earthquake is one-half of the maximum vibratory ground motion of the Double Design Earthquake, the Design Earthquake meets the requirements for an Operating Basis Earthquake contained in the above cited section of Appendix A to 10 CFR 100.

Furthermore, the USNRC Regulatory Staff, in licensing actions for a number of plants, has clearly established the Staff position that the intent of the Regulations concerning requirements for the severity of the Operating Basis Earthquake is adequately described in Section III(d) of 10 CFR 100, Appendix A, which defines the Operating Basis Earthquake as "...that earthquake which, considering the regional and local geology and seismology and specific characteristics of local subsurface material, could reasonably be expected to affect the plant site during the operating life of the plant...". The Regulatory Staff has recognized that the wording of Section V(a)(2) of 10 CFR 100, Appendix A, is not necessarily consistent with the intent of the Regulations and has accepted for a number of plants (e.g. Byron-Braidwood, Clinton, Koshkonong, Marble Hill and Phipps Bend)

, · • • • • • . · · х Х .

, 8 .

, , . • •

-

÷ ч. т. т.

.

ı

an Operating Basis Earthquake having a maximum vibratory ground acceleration less than one-half of the Safe Shutdown Earthquake. The basis for establishing the Operating Basis Earthquake for these plants was a probabilistic analysis estimating the exceedance probability and return period. In licensing actions for at least one of these plants, the Regulatory Staff stated its acceptance criteria for an Operating Basis Earthquake. These criteria are given below, as reported in the transcript of the 205th General Meeting of the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Thursday, 5 May 1977, Page 67, Lines 16 through 25:

> "The Operating basis earthquake as defined by Appendix A is an earthquake which could reasonably be expected to affect the plant site during the operating life of the plant. Based on this definition, the Staff considers that an earthquake that exhibits an exceedance probability of no more than 30 percent and a return period of approximately 110 years to represent an event which could reasonably be expected to affect the plant site and produces a conservative acceleraection developerating basis earthquake."

Several analyses have been made by PG&E and its consultants which estimate exceedance probabilities and average return periods for various values of peak instrumental and peak effective acceleration at the Diablo Canyon site. The results of these analyses have been submitted by PG&E in support of its operating license application for Diablo Canyon and are included as reports D-LL 11, D-LL 28, D-LL 41 and D-LL 45 in Appendix D to PG&E's "Seismic Evaluation for Postulated 7.5M Hosgri Earthquake." The analyses consider the factors of regional and local geology and specific characteristics of local subsurface material as required by Section III(d) of Appendix A to 10 CFR 100. Since the analyses employed a number of variations in methodology, the results show a range of exceedance probabilities and average return periods for a given site acceleration. For a peak instrumental acceleration (maximum vibratory ground acceleration) at the site of 0.20g, the lowest average return period computed by any of the methods used in the analyses is 275 years. The corresponding exceedance probability for a 40 year plant lifetime is approximately 14.5 percent. PG&E believes that 275 years is a very conservative estimate of the average return period associated with the Design Earthquake for Diablo Canyon. Since this average return period is more than twice the 110 year period specified in the Regulatory Staff's stated acceptance criteria, it is clear that the Design Earthquake should be acceptable to the Regulatory Staff as the Operating Basis Earthquake for the Diablo Canyon Units.

-2-

•

Ċ

.

٩

,

.

9

.

4

•

•