



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

June 14, 1983

NOTE TO: George Knighton

FROM: Annette Vietti

SUBJECT: STATUS OF DIABLO CANYON COMPONENT COOLING WATER SYSTEM (CCWS)

In the course of the past six months, January through June, the NRC staff has had numerous conference calls and meetings with PG&E concerning Diablo Canyon's CCWS. During this time we have been able to resolve virtually all of the issues on the acceptability of the CCWS except for one, the appropriate intake temperature to be used in the CCWS post accident heat removal analysis for assuring acceptable equipment operation. Very little progress has been made mainly because of the lack of completely responsive information from PG&E to questions asked by the staff. As a result, on June 9, 1983, Mike Fliegel, and Ron Ballard of EHEB, Jerry Wermiel and Olan Parr of ASB, and Annette Vietti and George Knighton of DL met in an effort to bring about resolution of this concern.

In the meeting we discussed four options, any one of which would resolve the above issue. These options were then relayed to PG&E in a conference call on June 9, 1983. Participants included:

NRC

G. Knighton, BC, DL
A. Vietti, PM, DL

PG&E

C. Dick, Project Management
E. Connel, Mechanical Engineering
Group Supervisor
C. Coffey, Project Contact
B. Lew, Project Contact
G. Tidrick, Mechanical Engineer, Hydrology
H. Friend, Bechtel Representative
(only attended end of call)

The options presented were as follows:

- 1) Using an FSAR value of 70°F maximum ocean water intake temperature, provide an analysis for the CCWS which verifies an acceptable post-accident heat removal capability; or discussion and justification for the capability to shed heat loads from the CCWS in order to maintain an acceptable CCWS operating temperature (i.e. possible operator action).

8703200236 870318
PDR FOIA
DEVINE84-741 PDR

D/15

08

- 2) Provide additional justification for the proposed 64°F maximum ocean water intake temperature by providing complete responses to detailed staff questions. Questions include justifying the validity of current data presented to be intake temperatures, presenting a probabilistic evaluation for the observed anomaly where temperatures reached 68.36°F for a period of five days during thirteen years of data collection (as an argument for not designing to the worst historical data per Reg. Guide 1.27).

Utilizing this approach would require that PG&E accept a tech spec on monitoring, and taking appropriate action such as derating the plant if temperatures exceeded 64°F for a specified time period.

- 3) Using a 68.36°F maximum ocean water temperature, provide an analysis for the CCWS post-accident heat removal capability, and respond to the questions identified in approach (2) regarding the validity of current data presented. However, PG&E would not have to justify a deviation from the criteria of Reg. Guide 1.27 as the CCWS safety function would be shown to be assured for the worst historical data recorded over a thirteen year period. Further, the ocean water temperature tech spec would not be required.
- 4) A tech spec including appropriate surveillance, limiting condition for operation and action statements if the temperature of the intake water exceeds 64°F. PG&E would propose a continuous water temperature monitoring program.

Options 2,3, or 4 would also require PG&E submit an affirmation that using a proposed ocean water temperature other than 70°F would not adversely affect any of the accident analyses previously approved. We asked PG&E for a decision on which option they would propose by June 10, 1983.

In a conference call on June 10, 1983, participants included:

NRC

A. Vietti
J. Wermiel, ASB
R. Ballard, BC, EHEB

PG&E

W. Scott
C. Coffey
J. Hoak, Project Manager
G. Tidrick
E. Connel

PG&E discussed with the staff proposing a tech spec which would require valving in the second (normally isolated) CCW heat exchanger (and/or) derate the plant if temperatures in the intake cove should ever exceed 64°F for a specified period of time. This would also require PG&E to propose a satisfactory program for monitoring the intake cove temperature.

We agreed to send PG&E a letter to include:

- 1) A list of information needed by the staff to assure that the temperature monitoring equipment and procedures will reflect an accurate temperature.
- 2) A request for confirmation that proper CCWS operation is provided with two heat exchangers in operation.
- 3) A request for affirmation that a 64°F ocean temperature will not affect any of the accident analyses previously approved with an assumed FSAR value of 70°F maximum ocean water intake temperature.
- 4) A request to provide a tech spec for a 64°F ocean temperature limit including appropriate surveillance, limiting conditions for operation, action statement and a basis for the tech spec.

PG&E stated they would provide the above information by July 1, 1983 and will work with the staff to assure a satisfactory response.

On June 14, 1983 T. Novak made the recommendation to L. Rubenstein that his staff submit the CCWS SER to DL with the above items as confirmatory issues. ASB agreed to make their submittal to DL on June 20, 1983. I am estimating it will take another three weeks for editing, cross, levels of review, changes, concurrence and printing. Therefore, I plan to issue the SER on July 11, 1983.

A. Vietti

A. Vietti, Project Manager
Licensing Branch #3
Division of Licensing

cc: D. Eisenhut
M. Williams
T. Novak
R. Ballard
O. Parr
J. Wermiel
M. Fliegel