



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

OCT 3 1984

Docket No.: 50-323

MEMORANDUM FOR: Robert M. Bernero, Director
Division of Systems Integration

Nelson J. Grace, Director
Division of Quality Assurance,
Safeguards and Inspection Programs

Themis P. Speis, Director
Division of Safety Technology

Hugh L. Thompson, Director
Division of Human Factors Safety

Richard H. Vollmer, Director
Division of Engineering

FROM: Darrell Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: DIABLO CANYON UNIT 2 REVIEW

As a result of the Diablo Canyon Unit 2 meeting with PG&E on September 13, 1984, the following matters need to be included in one or more SER supplements to be issued prior to a Commission meeting regarding the OL for Unit 2:

- (1) Application and Implementation of Unit 1 IDVP and ITP to Unit 2
- (2) Allegations
- (3) Piping and Supports
- (4) Programmatic Aspects
- (5) Unit 1 Items and Routine OL Items

In Enclosure 1, we have described briefly the scope of the review and evaluation and have recommended individuals, based on their earlier involvement, who should participate. Because of the tight schedule, as shown in Enclosure 2, our evaluation will be based on audits and inspections of the PG&E activities as well as on submittals from PG&E. Regarding the audits and inspections, summaries should be prepared which identify the material that was audited. It is requested that the Project Manager be informed of all planned audits and inspections, as well as telephone discussions (i.e. each subject, not necessarily each call).

8410240369 XA
EPP
B/19

ENCLOSURE 1

Diablo Canyon Unit 2 SSER Subjects

Application and Implementation of Unit 1 IDVP and ITP to Unit 2

Review to include NRC concerns and their resolution as presented in SSERs 18, 19, 20 and 24 and consideration of PG&E IRP program details (Letter of July 31, 1984) as discussed in meeting; audit/inspection of selected review packages at PG&E offices or site; evaluation of PG&E final submittal on activity. The following four separate review activities will be included:

- (a) civil/structural area, e.g. containment annulus steel structure;
P.T. Kuo, H. Polk, consultants (BNL)
- (b) piping and mechanical equipment, e.g. jet impingement analysis;
M. Hartzman
- (c) mechanical and electrical systems, e.g. CCW; J. Wermiel
- (d) equipment qualification; H. Walker

2. Allegations

All allegations, regardless of unit, will be considered for Unit 2 (there are in excess of 1400 allegations total). Piping and Support allegations will be considered under item (3). If the previous resolution for Unit 1 applies equally to Unit 2 we must provide the basis for the finding (e.g. allegation unfounded for Unit 1; allegation was not Unit 1 specific and resolution is equally applicable to Unit 2; allegation and resolution were programmatic). If the allegation and

ed to

sure 1.
ght
ing,

ed to
sure 1.
ght
ing,

solution is Unit 1 specific we must also evaluate the allegation with respect to Unit 2 (e.g. allegation on a system for Unit 1 must be evaluated for same system in Unit 2). If an allegation was made specifically for Unit 2, the allegation must be evaluated. Whatever the determination/resolution is, it must be documented. The PM will issue a list of allegations in NRR scope. Previous allegation SSERs 21, 22, and 26 should be considered. PG&E stated at the meeting that they also are reviewing allegations with respect to Unit 2. If possible, their effort should be audited while ongoing. We have requested PG&E to submit results of their effort. We recommend that the evaluation be performed by the same staff that performed the effort on Unit 1. Any request for outside assistance should be identified.

3. Piping and Supports

Review should consider same elements as for recently completed effort on Unit 1 (SSER 25) and include: allegations as listed in Section 5.6 of SSER 26, concerns raised by NRC staff, PG&E effort regarding 7 license conditions on Unit 1 (note: we do not expect at this time to issue them also for Unit 2 but instead resolve the concerns during the review process prior to OL issuance). We have requested PG&E to submit a description of how they perform the piping and support effort and final results. Hot walkdowns by the licensee of piping systems are scheduled for October. Our overall Unit 2 effort is not expected to be as detailed as for Unit 1, but must be comprehensive enough to permit conclusion to be drawn. Our evaluation should be based on audits and inspections of ongoing PG&E effort as well as review of submittals by PG&E.

4. Programmatic Aspects

The programmatic aspects of onsite training, control of procedures, corrective actions and design responsibility and authority will be evaluated. During the staff review of piping and support concerns were raised by the staff and allegations were made regarding these matters for Unit 1 (NRC letter to PG&E of June 20, 1984). The engineering activities for both units are performed under essentially the same programs which were recently audited by the NRC. The implementation of the programs, in particular any revisions to the programs, should be audited for Unit 2.

5. Unit 1 Items and Routine OL Items

Issues raised during the low power and full power licensing of Unit 1 (other than in items (1) through (3)) must be considered for Unit 2. Routine OL items must be addressed. The PM will contact individual reviewers. The effort will include:

- (a) SSER items: SSERs will be reviewed for Unit 2 open item, specifically SSER 27 (DL)
- (b) TMI Items: must develop list of items requiring resolution prior to OL (DL)
- (c) Unit 1 License Conditions: must review Unit 1 license and all amendments (including No. 10 which was not issued) to determine status for Unit 2 draft license (DL)

- (d) Masonry Walls: evaluation to be done by SGE Branch, including site inspection (N. Chokshi)
- (e) Fire Protection: status on Unit 2 (D. Kubicki)
- (f) Systems Interaction: status on Unit 2, also covered under allegations (D. Lasher, F. Coffman)
- (g) Tech. Specs.: PG&E has submitted on 9/25/84 a request for a complete update of Tech. Specs. for Unit 2, i.e. not only those currently proposed for Unit 1 full power update, but complete update as had been intended earlier for Unit 1 (F. Anderson).

It is further recommended that a review of the Tech Specs with respect to the FSAR, SER and the as-built conditions be performed (note: PG&E submitted a complete FSAR update on September 22, 1984). This effort would be performed under the direction of Region V as have been performed at other NTOL plants since Grand Gulf.

- (h) Shift Advisors, Reactor Operators evaluate qualification and training for Unit 2 (DHFS)
- (i) Others

ENCLOSURE 2

Diablo Canyon Unit 2 Review Schedule

1. Request PG&E to (a) describe efforts for items (2) and (3) in memo; (b) provide results (or status) for items (1), (2) and (3). 09/26/84 (C)
2. NRC review of all matters start 09/26/84
complete 11/14/84
3. Start NRC Audits and Inspections 10/01/84
on (1), (2) and (3)
4. PG&E response to item (1.a) above 10/08/84
5. PG&E response to item (1.b) above 10/23/84
6. All SSER input to Licensing, including identification of open items 10/26/84
7. PG&E final response to (1.b) above 11/05/84
8. Draft SSER complete by Licensing for review by Divisions 11/09/84
9. Resolution of Open Items Complete 11/14/84
10. SSER issued 11/19/84
11. Commission Meeting and OL decision 11/23/84
12. Issue OL 11/26/84

DIABLO CANYON ALLEGATIONS

ALLEG #	ATS #	KEYPHRASE	RESP	DUPL OF	CHARACTERIZATION	SOURCE	ATTACHMENT	REFERENCE LTR #	CLOSE FILE
1451	RV84A091	REBUTTAL	NRR		THE ALLEGER DISAGREES WITH PG&E'S RESPONSE TO HIS EARLIER ALLEGATION THAT EXCESSIVE CARBON ON STAINLESS STEEL MAY CAUSE INTERGRANULAR STRESS CORROSION CRACKING	7/31/84GAP	AFFIDAVIT		PAGE 1-5
1452	RV84A091	REBUTTAL	NRR		THE ALLEGER DISAGREES WITH PG&E'S RESPONSE TO HIS EARLIER ALLEGATION THAT WELDING HAS BEEN APPROPRIATELY CONTROLLED FOR HEAT INPUT AND INTERPASS TEMPERATURES (IGSCC)	7/31/84GAP	AFFIDAVIT		PAGES 6-8
1453	RV84A091	REBUTTAL	NRR		THE ALLEGER DISAGREES WITH PG&E'S RESPONSE THAT THERE WERE ONLY A FEW CASES OF STAINLESS STEEL PIPE DREAKAGES AT SAN ONOFRE (IGSCC)	7/31/84GAP	AFFIDAVIT		PAGE 8
1454	RV84A091	REBUTTAL	NRR		PG&E'S RESPONSE APPLIES ONLY TO RCS IT DOES NOT ADDRESS THE ALLEGER'S CONCERN ABOUT THE SECONDARY LINES (IGSCC)	7/31/84GAP	AFFIDAVIT		PAGE 9
1461	RV84A091	REBUTTAL	NRR		THE ALLEGER DISAGREES WITH PG&E'S RESPONSE THAT SUPPORTS GENERALLY ARE NOT HIGHLY RESTRAINED	7/31/84GAP	AFFIDAVIT		PAGE 18
1466	RV84A091	QUICK FIX	NRR		QUICK FIXES WERE USED TO ACCEPT BLATENT WORKMANSHIP DEFICIENCIES ON OLD AND IN PROCESS WORK. NRC'S INVESTIGATION IS STILL NOT COMPLETED	7/31/84GAP	AFFIDAVIT		
1469	RV84A091	QUICK FIX	NRR		ANYTHING ANYBODY CAN WRITE ON THE QUICK FIX BECOMES A DESIGN DRAWING IF THEY CAN GET SOMEBODY'S SIGNATURE ON IT	7/31/84GAP	5/22 TRANSCRIPT PG 6		
1472	RV84A096	SEISMIC DESIGN REVIEW	NRR		CONCERN REGARDING HELB CALCULATIONS FOR DCNPP. ALLEGER REFUTES FINDINGS OF ALLEGATION NUMBER 222 AND 223	ADF 9/12/84			