December 12, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Marsha Gamberoni, Deputy Director
New Reactor Licensing Project Office
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Lawrence J. Burkhart, AP1000 Project Manager ***/RA/***
New Reactor Licensing Project Office
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: NOVEMBER 20, 2002, TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY

On Wednesday, November 20, 2002, a telephone conference call was held with Westinghouse Electric Company (Westinghouse) representatives and the NRC staff to discuss responses to requests for additional information (RAIs) 720.009, 720.010, 720.017, 720.026, and 440.014. Westinghouse submitted its responses to RAIs 720.009, 720.010, and 720.026 on October 18, 2002 (ADAMS Accession No. ML022980577), to RAI 720.017 on November 8, 2002 (ADAMS Accession No. ML023110249), and to RAI 440.014 on October 2, 2002 (ADAMS Accession No. ML022810450). The purpose of the telephone conference call was to follow up with Westinghouse representatives on those RAIs that require further clarification. A list of participants is included in Attachment 1.

After discussing the issues raised in RAIs 720.009 and 720.017, it was agreed that the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) would await submission of Westinghouse's responses to RAIs 720.012 and 720.013 which are planned to be submitted by December 2, 2002. The staff will then determine if those RAI responses resolve the issues.

With respect to RAI 720.010, the NRC staff offered the comment that there appears to be some inconsistency between the RAI response and the AP1000 probabilistic risk assessment (PRA) regarding the definition of Case 1 and whether the case includes the spurious actuation of the automatic depressurization system stage 4 (ADS-4). Westinghouse stated that they would review the RAI response and the PRA and would resolve any inconsistencies.

With respect to RAI 720.026, the NRC offered the comment that the last paragraph of the RAI response states a conclusion for the AP600 but does not specifically draw a conclusion for the AP1000. Westinghouse representatives stated that they would review the RAI response and other pertinent data and provide an appropriate clarification for the AP1000.

With respect to RAI 440.014, the NRC staff had the following comments/questions:

(1) Why is the loss of normal feedwater considered the worst case for anticipated transient without scram (ATWS) (as it was for AP600)?

(2) Could you provide any quantitative analysis supporting your conclusion regarding the effects resulting from the removal of the three conservatisms for the first cycle unfavorable exposure time (UET) evaluation?

(3) On Page A-25 the comment is made that during an ATWS, the maximum allowable pressure may be exceeded. The staff requested supplemental information that would shed light on the extent that the pressure is exceeded.

Westinghouse stated that they would evaluate the questions and comments and provide an appropriate response.

Docket No. 52-006

Attachment: As stated

(3) On Page A-25 the comment is made that during an ATWS, the maximum allowable pressure may be exceeded. The staff requested supplemental information that would shed light on the extent that the pressure is exceeded.

Westinghouse stated that they would evaluate the questions and comments and provide an appropriate response.

Docket No. 52-006

Attachment: As stated

ACCESSION NUMBER: ML023370461

OFFICE	NRLPO/PM	SPSB/BC	NRLPO/DD
NAME	LBurkhart:cn	JWermiel	MGamberoni
DATE	12/10/02	12/10/02	12/11/02

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Distribution for Memorandum to M. Gamberoni dated December 12, 2002

Hard Copy
NRLPO R/F
LBurkhart
JLyons
MGamberoni

E-mail
PUBLIC
R. Borchardt
J. Williams
J. Moore, OGC
R. Weisman, OGC
J. Wermiel
R. Caruso
F. Akstulewicz
Y. Hsii
W. Jensen
S. Sun
A. Attard

NOVEMBER 20, 2002
TELEPHONE CONFERENCE CALL SUMMARY
LIST OF PARTICIPANTS

Nuclear Regulatory Commission	Westinghouse
Larry Burkhart	Mike Corletti
Gene Hsii	Ed Carlin
Summer Sun	Rick Wright
Walt Jensen	
Tony Attard	
Belkys Sosa	

Attachment