



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

August 6, 1985

128 2
2)
TS

Docket Nos. 50-275/323

NOTE TO FILE:

FROM: Calvin Moon, Reactor Engineer
Technical Specification Review Group, DL

SUBJECT: DIABLO CANYON UNITS 1 AND 2 - DISPOSITION OF REGION V COMMENTS
ON COMBINED TECHNICAL SPECIFICATIONS FOR UNITS 1 AND 2

I have reviewed comments by Region V provided by a memorandum dated July 17, 1985 on Diablo Canyon Units 1 and 2 combined Technical Specifications. The changes in Items 9, 10 and 13 are necessary to correct errors in the final draft and were made in the Combined Technical Specifications transmitted to Thomas M. Novak, Assistant Director for Licensing, DL, by memorandum dated 08/05/85.

The remaining comments were reviewed to determine whether any of the proposed changes were necessary for continuing full power operation of Unit 1 or for full power licensing of Unit 2. The former would require a prenotice in addition to the prenotices already published for amending the Unit 1 license. The latter would require modification of the combined technical specifications to show different requirements for the two units.

- Item 1 No change requested
- Item 2 No change requested
- Item 3.a No change requested
- Item 3.b Region V requested that waterborne sampling be as in the existing Unit 1 Technical Specifications or as in the Standard Technical Specification/or at San Onofre.

Notes

- o There was no change from the Unit 2 low power license technical specification.

8609250094 860905
PDR FOIA
HOLMES86-197 PDR

August 6, 1985

- o I discussed this issue with Wayne Meinke, RAB
 - I understand that Diablo Canyon 2 represents RABs current practices which it expects to implement on San Onofre and on other plants, and to recommend for future STS revisions.

Item 4. Region V disagreed with the deletion of a requirement for using R. G. 4.15.

Notes

- o The deletion was made in the Unit 2 low power TS and retained in the final draft combined TS for Units 1 and 2.
 - o The deletion was in accordance with the DL position stated in a memorandum dated January 9, 1985 to John A. Olshinski, Director, Division of Reactor Projects, Region II.
- Item 5 No change requested.
- Item 6 See Item 3.a.
- Item 7 See Item 4.
- Item 8 No change requested.
- Item 11 Region V requested more specificity on radiation monitors that are applicable to technical specifications and included several specific recommendations.

Notes

- o Recommendations are contrary to current TS practice.
 - o Wayne Meinke suggests inclusion of the additional specifics in future revisions of the ODCM.
- Item 12 Region V notes that Page 3/4 5-2 item 4.5.1.1.c is not the same as the STS which require verification that power to the isolation valve is disconnected by removal of the breaker from the circuit instead of by sealing the breaker in the open position.

Notes

- o The surveillance is the same as in the Unit 1 TS and in the Unit 2 low power Ts.

August 6, 1985

- Item 14. Region V proposed that TS 6.2.2.6 be revised to explicitly state that at least one licensed operator for each unit shall be in the control room and that when either unit is Mode 1, 2, 3 or 4 at least one licensed Senior operator shall be in the control room.

Notes

- o The common TS are the same as the Unit 2 low power license TS.
- o Since the common TS are equally applicable to each unit individually the change suggested would not be an increase in requirements.

- Item 15. Region V proposed that the paragraph on the shift supervisor command function (page 6.4) be modified to incorporate the words "either" (Modes 1, 2, 3 and 4) and "both" (Modes 5 and 6)

Notes

- o The common TS are the same as for the Unit 2 low power license TS.
- o Since the common TS are equally applicable to each unit individually the change suggested would not be an increase in requirements.

Region V recommended that in Table 6.2.1 the definitions for SS and SOL specify dual unit qualification to be consistent with 50.54 (m)(ii).

Notes

- o The common TS are the same as for the Unit 2 low power license TS.
- o 50.54 (m)(ii) permits exceptions to the dual qualification requirement.

Calvin W. Moon

Calvin W. Moon, Reactor Engineer
Technical Specification Review Group
Division of Licensing

cc: H. Schierling