

October 29, 2007

MEMORANDUM TO: Michael Gartman, Acting Chief
ESBWR/ABWR Projects 2
Division of New Reactor Licensing

FROM: Michael L. Marshall, Jr., Chief /RA/
Technical Specifications Branch
Division of Construction Inspection
& Operational Programs

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW RESULTS FOR THE SOUTH TEXAS
PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION (TAC
NOS. RA0104 - RA110)

The Technical Specifications Branch (CTSB) has completed its acceptance review of the South Texas Project Units 3 and 4 (STP 3&4) Combined License application (COLA) submitted by the STP Nuclear Operating Company (STPNOC) on September 20, 2007. This review covered the following COLA FSAR Sections, for which CTSB has review responsibility, and applicable interface documentation:

COLA FSAR Sections

- 11.5, "Radiation Monitoring Instrumentation & Sampling" (secondary responsibility)
- 16, "Technical Specifications" (primary responsibility)

Interface Documentation

- Advanced boiling-water reactor (ABWR) Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 2, Revision 4, Section 11.5, "Radiation Monitoring Instrumentation & Sampling" and Section 16, "Technical Specifications"
- NUREG 1503, ABWR FSER Chapter 16, "Technical Specifications"
- Licensing Topical Reports (and related standard review plan (SRP) Sections):
 - NEDO-33372, ABWR Containment Analysis (16.5)
 - NEDO-33336, ABWR Stability Evaluation (16.3)
 - NEDE-33330P, Hydrogen Recombiner Elimination (16.1, 16.3, and 16.5)
 - NEDO-33335, Medium Voltage Electrical System (16.3, 16.4, and 16.6)
 - NEDO-33310, Startup Test Specification (16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.5, and 16.6)
 - NEDO-33328, APRM Oscillation Monitoring (16.3)
 - NEDE-33299P, RCIC Pump (16.3, 16.4, 16.5, and 16.6)
- STP 3&4 COLA
 - Cover Letter, Attachment 2, "Justification For Exemption from 10 CFR 52," and Attachment 3, "Commitments"

CONTACT: C. Craig Harbuck, NRO/DCIP/CTSB
(301) 415-3140

A12

- Part 2—FSAR Chapter 16 and Section 11.5
- Part 4—Plant-Specific Technical Specifications (PTS), and
- Part 7—Departures Report

Completeness and Sufficiency

Based on this review, I conclude that the application contains the information required by regulations and that the submitted information is technically sufficient for CTSB to commence the STP 3&4 COLA detailed technical review.

Combined operating license (COL) Information Item 16-1 in Chapter 16 of the ABWR FSER requires the COL applicant to “complete the plant and site-specific portions of the technical specification (TS) on the basis of as-procured hardware and software.” This item is not complete in that STPNOC has not replaced most instances of bracketed information in the generic TS with plant-specific information in the plant-specific TS. Neither has STPNOC provided sufficient justification for not completing this COL information item. This issue represents a significant scheduler risk to the plant-specific TS review.

Schedule

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA for SRP Sections 11.5, 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.5 and 16.6 by CTSB and the following supporting technical branches is generally consistent with the pre-baseline EPM model.

- 16.1 COLP, ICE, SBPA, SBPB, SPLB, SRSB, and SBCV
- 16.2 SRSB
- 16.3 ICE
- 16.4 SRSB
- 16.5 SBCV
- 16.6 SBPA

The resource plan that currently exists in the EPM for these sections may be retained. However, the large number of bracketed values and empty brackets present a significant scheduler risk for CTSB review effort.

Review Dependencies.

CTSB’s detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA is independent of other ongoing application reviews by the staff. All technical/topical reports involving changes to Technical Specifications or Technical Specifications Bases will be reviewed on same schedule as STP 3&4 COLA.

Enclosure:

1. Table 1 of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide for SRP Sections 16
2. Table 1 of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide for SRP Sections 11.5

- Part 2—FSAR Chapter 16 and Section 11.5
- Part 4—Plant-Specific Technical Specifications (PTS), and
- Part 7—Departures Report

Completeness and Sufficiency

Based on this review, I conclude that the application contains the information required by regulations and that the submitted information is technically sufficient for CTSB to commence the STP 3&4 COLA detailed technical review.

Combined operating license (COL) Information Item 16-1 in Chapter 16 of the ABWR FSER requires the COL applicant to "complete the plant and site-specific portions of the technical specification (TS) on the basis of as-procured hardware and software." This item is not complete in that STPNOC has not replaced most instances of bracketed information in the generic TS with plant-specific information in the plant-specific TS. Neither has STPNOC provided sufficient justification for not completing this COL information item. This issue represents a significant scheduler risk to the plant-specific TS review.

Schedule

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA for SRP Sections 11.5, 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.5 and 16.6 by CTSB and the following supporting technical branches is generally consistent with the pre-baseline EPM model.

- 16.1 COLP, ICE, SBPA, SBPB, SPLB, SRSB, and SBCV
- 16.2 SRSB
- 16.3 ICE
- 16.4 SRSB
- 16.5 SBCV
- 16.6 SBPA

The resource plan that currently exists in the EPM for these sections may be retained. However, the large number of bracketed values and empty brackets present a significant scheduler risk for CTSB review effort.

Review Dependencies.

CTSB's detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA is independent of other ongoing application reviews by the staff. All technical/topical reports involving changes to Technical Specifications or Technical Specifications Bases will be reviewed on same schedule as STP 364 COLA.

Enclosure:

1. Table 1 of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide for SRP Sections 16
2. Table 1 of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide for SRP Sections 11.5

Distribution:

CTSB r/f	GWunder	Don Habib
RidsNroDcipColp,	RidsNroDelce1	RidsNroDelce2
RidsNroDsraSbpa	RidsNroDsraSbpb	RidsNroDsraSplb
RidsNroDSRSB	RidsNroDsarSbcv	

ADAMS Accession #: ML072960399

OFFICE	NRO/DCIP/CTSB	NRO/DCIP/CTSB	NRO/DCIP/CTSB	NRO/DCIP/CTSB:BC
NAME	CHarbuck	TBeltz	TTjader	MMarshall
DATE	10/24/2007	10/25/2007	10/25/2007	10/29/2007

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for STP 3&4 ABWR Reference COL Application

SER Section: 16
Technical Branch: CTSB (Primary)
Branch Chief: Michael Marshall
Technical Reviewers: C. Craig Harbuck (16.1, 16.3, 16.6), Theodore R. Tjader (16.2), Terry Beltz (16.4, 16.5)
SRP Sections: 16.1, 16.2, 16.3, 16.4, 16.5, 16.6
Date: October 19, 2007

Do these sections address the applicable regulations: **Yes**
Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? **Yes**
Specific review areas or topics are identified in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Notes

* 1. Review Area/Topic: Item identified in RG 1.206 or the regulations; for a COLA referencing a DC, this includes COL information items and departures from the design certification.

** 3. Technical Sufficiency: The application is compared against the SRP acceptance criteria. Note: New safety features, alternate regulatory compliance approaches, and/or deviations from DCs, should not be treated as deficiencies and factored into the basis for rejecting the application, unless staff determines that there is insufficient technical information associated with the respective item. These items are factored into confirmation of planning assumptions.

*** 4. Significant deficiencies are those review areas or topics which impact the staff's ability to begin the detailed technical review or complete its review within a predictable time frame.

**** 6. DSRA will provide risk significance information at time of review, if available.

***** 9. Identification of **new** review time is on an FSAR section basis and consistent with the review phases within the EPM. Changes from the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 1 Acronyms

TS — Technical Specifications
STS — Standard TS (NUREG-1431, Rev 3.1)
LCO — Limiting Condition for Operation
SL — Safety Limit

GTS — Generic TS (ABWR DCD Chapter 16, Rev. 4)
PTS — Plant-Specific (proposed) TS (STP 3&4 COL Application, Part 4, Rev 0)
SR — Surveillance Requirement
SRP — Standard Review Plan Section
COL Item — COL Information (or Action) Item
STD DEP — Standard Departure from ABWR DCD

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****				Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
COL Item 16-1 ABWR FSER Ch16 COLA Letter Attachment 3; COLA Part 2; COLA Part 4 All SRP Ch 16 sections	No	No	Yes	"Complete the plant and site-specific portions of the [P]TS on the basis of as procured hardware and software." (I.e., bracketed information.) This COL Item is not completed. List of commitments does not include PTS items to remain bracketed post COL issuance.	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	
SRP 16.1 PTS Section 1.0	Yes	Yes	N/A	PTS Section 1.0 missing from non-proprietary version of COLA Part 4	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.1 PTS Section 3.0	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing					Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews	
1. Review Area or Topic	2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****					7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
SRP 16.1 PTS Section 3.7	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.1 PTS Section 3.9	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.1 PTS Section 4.0	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.1 PTS Section 5.0	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****				Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
COL Item 16-2 ABWR FSER Ch16 COLA Letter Attachment 3; COLA Part 2; COLA Part 4 SRP 16.1 PTS Section 5.0	No	No	Yes	"COL applicants will have to ensure that the portions of Section 5.0 relocated to licensee-controlled documents are controlled in accordance with an administrative control system acceptable to the staff." List of commitments does not include an acceptable administrative control system for administrative controls previously included in operating plant TS, but no longer included in STS.	No	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****					Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	
SRP 16.2 PTS Section 2.0 STD DEP 16.2-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Change to GTS SL conforming to STS	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	
SRP 16.2 PTS 3.1.1 PTS 3.10.7 STD DEP 16.3-4	Yes	Yes	Yes	GTS LCO 3.10.7 and GTS SR 3.1.1.1 reworded	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	
SRP 16.2 PTS 3.10.12 STD DEP 16.3-17	Yes	Yes	Yes	GTS 3.10.12 Word added (editorial change)	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	
SRP 16.2 PTS 3.10.5 STD DEP 16.3-21	Yes	Yes	Yes	GTS LCO 3.10.5 revised	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	
SRP 16.2 PTS 3.1.4 COL Item 16-1	Yes	No	Yes	Bracketed information not included	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****				Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
SRP 16.2 PTS 3.10.7 PTS 3.10.7 Bases STD DEP 16.3-4	No	Yes	Yes	SR 3.10.7.1 revised SR 3.10.7.2 added Rewrite Bases consistent with PTS changes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.2 PTS 5.7.1.5 COL Item 16-1	No	No	Yes	Bracketed information (topical report list) not included	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.2 LCO 3.1.7 Bases STD DEP 6.3-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Bases 3.1.7 LCO section incorrect	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.3 PTS Section 3.3 COL Item 16-1	No	No	Yes	Bracketed information (allowable values) not included	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.3 PTS Section 3.3 STD DEP T1 3.4-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Change in I&C architecture needs to be evaluated for impact on PTS. Requires ICE2 assistance	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****				Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
SRP 16.3 PTS 3.3.1.1 STD DEP 4.4-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	Change to GTS 3.3.1.1 requires approval of LTR NEDO-33336. Requires ICE2 assistance.	Yes	Yes	N/A.	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.3 PTS SR 3.3.1.1.10 - Note 2 PTS 3.3.1.1.14 PTS 3.3.1.1.15 STD DEP T1 2.2-1	Yes	Yes	N/A	Change to GTS SR 3.3.1.1.10 Note 2 requires approval of design change to replace turbine first stage pressure with NMS simulated thermal power for SSLC Sensor Instrumentation thermal power input to RPS to enable a reactor trip on turbine trip. Requires ICE2 assistance.	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.4 PTS Section 3.4	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****				Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
SRP 16.4 PTS Section 3.5 COL Item 16-1	No	Yes	Yes	"Bracketed" items still require resolution	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A
SRP 16.4 PTS 3.5.1 Actions STD DEP 8.3-1, Plant Medium Voltage Electrical System Design	Yes	Yes	Yes	Departure from GTS 3.5.1 Required Action B.1.1. The CTG 2-minute start time is changed to 10 minutes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	No	LTR NEDO-33335
SRP 16.4 PTS 3.5.1 Actions STD DEP 8.3-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	PTS 3.5.1 Required Action B.1.1 requires approval of NEDO-33335 regarding start time requirement for CTG.	Yes	Yes	N/A	0	No	LTR NEDO-33335
SRP 16.5 PTS Section 3.6 COL Item 16-1	No	Yes	Yes	Bracketed items still require resolution	Yes	Yes	N/A	0	Yes	

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC? (yes/no)****				Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no [answer], identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no [answer], identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.		
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
SRP 16.6 PTS Section 3.8 STD DEP 8.3-1	Yes	Yes	Yes	PTS 3.8.1, 3.8.4, 3.8.9, 3.8.11 require approval of NEDO-33335 regarding Action and Surveillance requirements for CTG, DGs, and electrical distribution.	Yes	Yes	N/A	0	No	LTR NEDO-33335

Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for STP 3&4 ABWR Reference COL Application

SER Section: 11
Technical Branch: CTSB (Secondary)
Branch Chief: Michael Marshall
Technical Reviewer: Terry Beltz
SRP Section: 11.5 (related to TS Section 5.5 in DCD Tier 2, Ch 16, and SRP Section 16.1)
Date: October 19, 2007

Do these sections address the applicable regulations: **Yes**
Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? **Yes**
Specific review areas or topics are identified in Table 1 below.

Table 1 Notes

* 1. Review Area/Topic: Item identified in RG 1.206 or the regulations; for a COLA referencing a DC, this includes COL information items and departures from the design certification.

** 3. Technical Sufficiency: The application is compared against the SRP acceptance criteria. Note: New safety features, alternate regulatory compliance approaches, and/or deviations from DCs, should not be treated as deficiencies and factored into the basis for rejecting the application, unless staff determines that there is insufficient technical information associated with the respective item. These items are factored into confirmation of planning assumptions.

*** 4. Significant deficiencies are those review areas or topics which impact the staff's ability to begin the detailed technical review or complete its review within a predictable time frame.

**** 6. DSRA will provide risk significance information at time of review, if available.

***** 9. Identification of **new** review time is on an FSAR section basis and consistent with the review phases within the EPM. Changes from the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 1 Acronyms

TS — Technical Specifications	GTS — Generic TS (ABWR DCD Chapter 16, Rev. 4)	
STS — Standard TS (NUREG-1431, Rev 3.1)	PTS — Plant-Specific (proposed) TS (STP 3&4 COL Application, Part 4, Rev 0)	
LCO — Limiting Condition for Operation	SR — Surveillance Requirement	COL Item — COL Information (or Action) Item
SL — Safety Limit	SRP — Standard Review Plan Section	STD DEP — Standard Departure from ABWR DCD

Table 1 - SAR Acceptance Review 1. Review Area or Topic	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 5. If no, for either completeness or technical sufficiency, identify deficiency(ies). This information will be needed for technical review. 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a risk-significant SSC)? (yes/no)****					Changes to Planning Assumptions to be Considered in Development of Baseline Review Schedule 7. Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 8. For each no, identify the change (or basis for change). 9. Identify the total new review time in staff-hours*****			Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews 10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 11. For each no, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
SRP 11.5	Yes	Yes	Yes	N/A	N/A	Yes	N/A	0	Yes	STP 3&4 COLA