

UNITED STATES ATOMIC ENERGY COMMISSION

DIVISION OF COMPLIANCE REGION V 2111 BANCROFT WAY BERKELEY, CALIFORNIA 94704

TELEPHONE: 841-5121 Ext. 651

May 13, 1969

G. S. Spencer, Senior Reactor Inspector Region V, Division of Compliance

PACIFIC GAS & ELECTRIC COMPANY (DIABLO CANYON UNIT NO. I)

The attached report contains the details of my recent visit to PG&E's home offices in San Francisco, California on April 30, 1969.

In view of the absence of significant construction activities to date, the applicant's quality assurance efforts have primarily been directed toward design activities and vendor inspections. You will note that PG&E has not yet formulated and implemented a formal QA-QC program to be followed for the construction of the Diablo Canyon No. I nuclear plant. However, PG&E plans to implement such a plan prior to start of construction of the major civil structures for the unit, currently scheduled for the last week of June, 1969.

Although it appears that PG&E personnel have evaluated the changes made to the containment building design from that described in the PSAR and have found the changes not to be detrimental, DRL may wish to review the changes and confirm or deny PG&E's evaluation. You will also note that PG&E has not and does not intend to have Westinghouse approve the containment building design as indicated in the PSAR.

Concerning the question raised during the vendor inspection at ESCO Corporation relative to disposition of the radiograph films of the pipe fittings manufactured by ESCO, PG&E does not intend to secure and retain the radiographs.

A. D. Johnson Reactor Inspector Based on a preliminary review of the proposed contract specifications for the Class one structures of the facility, three variances were identified between the description supplied for the containment building in the PSAR and those contained in the proposed contract specifications. PG&E believes the specifications, as written, are adequate to meet the design criteria prescribed for the structures. PG&E indicated the changes would be documented in the FD&SAR. (See Section B. of the report for details.)

Concerning final film disposition of code required radiographs performed by and at vendor shops, PG&E currently does not intend to secure and retain the film. (See Section C. of the report for details.)

Although the wording in the PSAR indicates that Westinghouse review and approval was required for the containment building design change, Westinghouse's role was limited to review and comment on the design. PG&E indicated that this was all that was intended by the language used in the PSAR. (See Section B. of the report for details.)

DETAILS

A. Persons Co .tacted

- D. V. Kelley Project Engineer-Chief Mechanical Engineer
- J. L. Schuyler Senior Mechanical Engineer
- W. J. Lindblad Design Engineer
- M. H. Chandler Station Construction Manager
- A. J. Plewes Construction Engineer
- J. B. Hoch Engineer R. V. Bettinger - Engineer
- W. R. Forbes Supervising Inspection Engineer