

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

REGION V

Report No. 50-275/82-17
Docket No. 50-275 License No. CPPR-39 Safeguards Group _____
Licensee: Pacific Gas and Electric Company
P. O. Box 7442
San Francisco, California 94120

Facility Name: Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant

Meeting Location: Pacific Gas and Electric Company Corporate Office,
San Francisco, California

Meeting Conducted: May 15, 1982

Report by: *T. W. Morrill* for 5/21/82
P. J. Morrill, Reactor Inspector Date Signed

Approved by: *T. W. Bishop* 5/21/82
T. W. Bishop, Chief, Reactor Construction Projects Date Signed
Branch

Summary: A meeting was held with representatives of Pacific Gas and Electric Company, Teledyne Engineering Services, R. L. Cloud and Associates, Consultants for the Governor of California, the Joint Intervenors, and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission on May 15, 1982.

The meeting was requested by Teledyne for the purpose of developing a schedule for the Verification Program managed by Teledyne Engineering Services. The schedule was to be included in a proposed Teledyne Engineering Services Interim Technical Report.

DETAILS

1. Meeting Attendees

- a. Teledyne Engineering Services (TES)
W. E. Cooper, Verification Project Manager
- b. Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E)
J. B. Hoch, Project Manager
R. F. Locke, Council
R. R. Fray, Verification Coordinator
B. S. Lew, Project Licensing Engineer
- c. Bechtel
H. B. Friend, Project Completion Manager
R. C. Anderson, Engineering Manager
J. R. Leahy, Project Cost and Scheduling Engineer
- d. R. L. Cloud and Associates (RLCA)
R. L. Cloud, President
E. Dension, Verification Project Manager
- e. MHB Associates
R. B. Hubbard, Consultant to Governor of California
- f. Center for Law in the Public Interest
J. R. Reynolds, Representative for Joint Intervenors
- g. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
P. J. Morrill, Reactor Inspector

2. Meeting Objectives

The purpose of the meeting was to establish a schedule for completion of the verification program to be included in a TES interim technical report.

3. Background and Introduction

On May 8, 1982, TES sent a letter to PG&E proposing a joint meeting between PG&E, TES, and RLCA to obtain an indication of the PG&E schedule for the verification program. The TES letter also stated that some discussion of the additional sampling and verification of

the Independent Design Verification Program (IDVP) would be necessary to improve the clarity of presentation and refine the draft schedule, but would not substantially change the engineering plan. Since TES representatives would be in San Francisco on May 13, 14, and 15, 1982, the meeting was set up to occur on the morning of May 15, 1982. The NRC was invited on May 13, 1982, and subsequently invited representatives of the Governor of California and the Joint Inter-venors. The NRC was represented by an inspector from Region V. Bechtel personnel were present at the meeting in their capacity as part of the PG&E joint Project Organization which was discussed at a previous meeting with the NRC on April 30, 1982. (Meeting minutes dated May 18, 1982.)

4. TES Presentation

TES representatives explained the purpose and scope of the meeting. Dr. Cooper outlined isolated portions of the TES draft Interim Technical Report currently being worked on by TES and RCLA (see TES 13th Status Report). Dr. Cooper expected the interim report to be issued in early June 1982. TES requires some help from PG&E on schedule development for completeness in the report and scheduling their own work. After examining the items identified to date, TES had grouped each of them in one of nine groups. TES suggested that completion of the IDVP will run into August 1982 with current manning levels. This general schedule is also based on a one week turn around time for information from PG&E. The nine groups and additional work required by the IDVP are outlined below:

Buildings - TES is concerned with Design Control of Changes (including field changes).

Piping - TES feels that piping isometric drawings must be updated and that the weight and orientation of valves must be checked. Five additional piping analyses will be independently verified.

Piping Supports - TES is checking the two piping codes used (Adelpipe and Pipisd). They may compute support loads differently.

Small Bore Piping - Five additional samples of axial pipe runs and lug design will be reviewed to assess lug stress. The spacing criteria for supports do not appear to be all inclusive. Five samples of small pipe will be rigorously analyzed to verify engineering judgement used in the field.

Equipment - Frequency calculations for electrical equipment in the main control board will be reviewed. An additional sample of tanks will be analyzed for buckling of the skirt and sloshing loads on the roof. Two additional pump qualifications will be examined. Two additional samples of HVAC equipment will be examined.

Shake Tested Equipment - Confirm assumptions (location, test procedure, mounting, spectra, etc.) for all equipment seismically qualified by shake table testing excluding NSSS.

Conduit Supports - RLCA will verify PG&E corrective actions after PG&E has completed field changes. TES will also check seismic inputs (PG&E Task 7100) after PG&E is finished. PG&E is to respond to criteria deficiencies (RLCA File 930).

HVAC Ducting - No additional sampling.

Hosgri Spectra - Hosgri and Blume spectra must be reconciled and controlled. Spectra must be developed for certain areas. Where preliminary or compromised spectra were used for equipment qualification, the spectra and qualification must be evaluated. PG&E must confirm that the correct spectra were used for all Hosgri qualification. TES will selectively verify new spectra.

5. PG&E/Bechtel

Bechtel personnel stated that the proposed finishing date for this work (August 31, 1982) did not look good to them. After a brief discussion of the additional sampling required by TES, the parties took a break. Upon return, the discussion started again dealing with scheduling. It was finally agreed that TES should issue the Interim Report without the inclusion of a schedule or without dates on the schedule. After a review and an opportunity for discussion, the PG&E/Bechtel personnel felt they could better derive a meaningful schedule.

6. NRC

The NRC representative asked how the licensee expected to improve the schedule. The licensee's representative stated that this could be accomplished by adding more resources (people) to the various organizations. The NRC representative stated that the notification time for this meeting had been very short and that, for future meetings, a week would be much more appropriate to allow notification and travel time.

7. MHB Associates

The Governor's consultant stated that the notification for the meeting had been too short and stated that it was taking too long to get copies of reports and letters from the NRC in Bethesda. In the ensuing discussion, PG&E states that they would serve all the parties for documents generated by PG&E, but TES was not under such a requirement and should not be, since it would divert them from their primary task. The Governor's representative stated that they would probably bring this problem to NRR's (Harold Denton) attention since they were not satisfied.

8. Center for Law in the Public Interest

The intervenor's representative generally supported the Governor's consultant and also requested a prompter distribution of documents generated by the IDVP.

The meeting adjourned with the understanding that TES would issue an Interim Technical Report in the near future without a schedule. PG&E/Bechtel would then be able to discuss the findings with TES and RLCA to establish a schedule.