

OK

November 6, 2007

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

FROM: Michael Junge, Chief /RA/
Operator Licensing and Human Performance Branch
Division of Construction and Operational Programs
Office of New Reactors]

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW RESULTS FOR THE SOUTH TEXAS
PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION
(TAC NOS. RA 0070, RA 0071, RA 0073, RA 0074, RA 0076, RA 0077,
RA 0078 – RA 0093)

The Operator Licensing and Human Performance Branch (COLP) has completed its acceptance review of the South Texas Project (STP) Units 3 and 4 Combined Operating License application (COLA) submitted by the STP Nuclear Operating Company (STPNOC) on September 20, 2007. This review covered the following COLA final safety analysis report (FSAR) Sections for which COLP has review responsibilities, and, in addition, applicable interface documentation referenced in the FSAR:

COLA FSAR Sections

Conduct of Operation

- 13.1.1, "Management and Technical Support Organization" (primary responsibility)
- 13.1.2, "Operating Organization" (primary responsibility)
- 13.1.3, "Qualification of Nuclear Plant Personnel" (primary responsibility)
- 13.2.1, "Reactor Operator Training" (primary responsibility)
- 13.2.2, "Training for Non-Licensed Staff" (primary responsibility)
- 13.2.3, "Operating Shift Crews" (primary responsibility)
- 13.5.1, "Administrative Procedures" (primary responsibility)
- 13.5.2, "Operating and Maintenance Procedures" (primary responsibility)

Technical Specifications

- 16.0, "Technical Specifications" (secondary responsibility)

Human Performance

- 18.1, "Human Factors Engineering" (primary responsibility)
- 18.2, "Design Goals and Design Bases" (primary responsibility)

CONTACT: Michael Junge
(301) 415-7745

B/S

- 18.3, "Planning, Development, and Design" (primary responsibility)
- 18.4, "Control Room Standard Design Features" (primary responsibility)
- 18.5, "Remote Shutdown System" (primary responsibility)
- 18.6, "Systems Integration" (primary responsibility)
- 18.7, "Detailed Design of the Operator Interface System" (primary responsibility)
- 18.8, "Combined Operating License (COL) Information" (primary responsibility)

Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria (ITAAC)

- 14.3, "Tier 1 Selection Criteria and Processes"
- 14.3 S, "Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria"

Interface Documentation

- Advanced boiling-water reactor (ABWR) Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 2, Revision 0
 - Section 13.1 "Organizational Structure of Applicant,"
 - Section 13.2, "Training,"
 - Section 13.5, "Plant Procedures,"
 - Section 16.0, "Technical Specifications"
 - Section 18.1, "Human Factors Engineering"
 - Section 18.2, "Design Goals and Design Bases"
 - Section 18.3, "Planning, Development, and Design"
 - Section 18.4, "Control Room Standard Design Features"
 - Section 18.5, "Remote Shutdown System"
 - Section 18.6, "Systems Integration"
 - Section 18.7, "Detailed Design of the Operator Interface System"
 - Section 18.8, "COL Information"
- NEDO-33297, "Advanced Boiling Water Reactor (ABWR) Procedures Development Plan"
- STP 3&4 COLA
 - FSAR Sections 13.1, 13.2, and 13.5, Chapter 16.0, and Chapter 18.0
 - Plant-Specific Technical Specifications (PTS), and
 - Departures Report, Sections: 1.0 – Introduction, 2.0 – Departures Requiring Prior Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Approval, 3.0 - Departures Not Requiring Prior NRC Approval
- Regulatory Guide 1.206, "Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants"
- NUREG-0711, "Human Factors Engineering Program Review Model (Rev. 2)"
- Standard Review Plan (SRP) Chapter 13.0, "Conduct of Operations"
- SRP Chapter 18.0, "Human Factors Engineering"

Completeness and Sufficiency

Based on this review, in regard to the Conduct of Operation portion of COLP's acceptance review, I conclude that the application contains the information required by regulations and that the information related to Sections 13.1, 13.2, 13.5, and 16.0, are technically sufficient for COLP to commence the STP Units 3 and 4 COLA detailed technical review.

With regard to the Human Factors Engineering sections of COLP's acceptance review (18.1-18.8), I conclude that in order for COLP to accept the STP COL application for review the staff needs:

1. A detailed status of the HFE program commitments and elements contained in DCD Sections 18.8 and Appendix 18E including a schedule for completing the portions not currently finished.
2. The implementation plans and results demonstrating the completion of the COL Information Items or a schedule for when they will be available for staff review.
3. A description for any plans to modify the DCD 18.8, Appendix 18E, and Tier 1 Section 3.1 commitments, and justifications for any changes made.

Schedule

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA for (SRP) Sections 13.1 and 13.2 by COLP are generally consistent with the current pre-baseline enterprise project management (EPM) model. The resource plan that currently exists in the EPM for these sections may be retained.

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA for SRP Sections 13.5, 16.1, and 18.0 by COLP varies materially from the pre-baseline model in the EPM. Section 13.5 is not complete in that STPNOC has not provided plant and site specific information related to the plan for development and implementation of operating and administrative procedures. Section 16.1 is not complete in that STPNOC has not replaced the generic bracketed information in the plant-specific Technical Specifications with acceptable site specific information. Section 18.0 is not complete in that STPNOC has not given details on the current status of the human factors engineering program and the control room design.

For each section, I have provided an updated resource plan for these tasks in Enclosure 2. The resource plan includes the new estimated level of effort, the resource(s) assigned, and the expected start date (application accepted milestone). Revisions to the resource plans have been submitted for the following FSAR Section reviews: FSAR Section 13.5, 16.1, and 18.0.

Review Dependencies

COLP's detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA is independent of other ongoing application reviews by the staff for Sections 13.1, 13.2, 13.5, and 16.0. Sections 18.4, 18.6, 18.8 (18A – 18E, and 18G) have review dependencies as noted in Table 1 for section 18.0.

Enclosure:

1. Table 1 of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide
2. Table 2 COLP Resource Plan Revisions for STP 3&4 COLA

M. Gartman

With regard to the Human Factors Engineering sections of COLP's acceptance review (18.1-18.8), I conclude that in order for COLP to accept the STP COL application for review the staff needs:

4. A detailed status of the HFE program commitments and elements contained in DCD Sections 18.8 and Appendix 18E including a schedule for completing the portions not currently finished.
5. The implementation plans and results demonstrating the completion of the COL Information Items or a schedule for when they will be available for staff review.
6. A description for any plans to modify the DCD 18.8, Appendix 18E, and Tier 1 Section 3.1 commitments, and justifications for any changes made.

Schedule

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA for (SRP) Sections 13.1 and 13.2 by COLP are generally consistent with the current pre-baseline enterprise project management (EPM) model. The resource plan that currently exists in the EPM for these sections may be retained.

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA for SRP Sections 13.5, 16.1, and 18.0 by COLP varies materially from the pre-baseline model in the EPM. Section 13.5 is not complete in that STPNOC has not provided plant and site specific information related to the plan for development and implementation of operating and administrative procedures. Section 16.1 is not complete in that STPNOC has not replaced the generic bracketed information in the plant-specific Technical Specifications with acceptable site specific information. Section 18.0 is not complete in that STPNOC has not given details on the current status of the human factors engineering program and the control room design.

For each section, I have provided an updated resource plan for these tasks in Enclosure 2. The resource plan includes the new estimated level of effort, the resource(s) assigned, and the expected start date (application accepted milestone). Revisions to the resource plans have been submitted for the following FSAR Section reviews: FSAR Section 13.5, 16.1, and 18.0.

Review Dependencies

COLP's detailed technical review of the STP 3&4 COLA is independent of other ongoing application reviews by the staff for Sections 13.1, 13.2, 13.5, and 16.0. Sections 18.4, 18.6, 18.8 (18A – 18E, and 18G) have review dependencies as noted in Table 1 for section 18.0.

Enclosure:

1. Table 1 of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide
2. Table 2 COLP Resource Plan Revisions for STP 3&4 COLA

DISTRIBUTION:

COLP r/f
RidsNroDcipColp

GWunder
RidsNroDcipCtsb

DHabib.
JWalker

ADAMS Accession No.: ML072980439

OFFICE	NRO/DCIP/COLP	NRO/DCIP/COLP	NRO/DCIP/COLP:BC
NAME	RPelton	JBongarra	MJunge
DATE	11/6/2007	11/05/2007	11/6/2007

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

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

SER Section: 13.0
 Technical Branch: COLP (Primary)
 Branch Chief: Michael Junge
 Technical Reviewers: Out of Scope 3.1, 13.2, 13.5
 SRP Sections: 13.1, 13.2, 13.5
 Date: 10/31/07

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.

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
13.1.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.1.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.1.1.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.1.1.2	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.1.1.3	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.2	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.2.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.2.2	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.2.3	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.3	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
13.1.3.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.1.3.2	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.2.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.2.1.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.2.1.1.1	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.2.1.1.2	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.2.1.2	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.2.2	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
13.5.1.1	Yes	No	Yes	Lack of site specific details		No	Lack of site specific details	Out of Scope	Yes	
13.5.2.1	Yes	No	Yes	Lack of site specific details		No	Lack of site specific details		Yes	

*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.

**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.

***Significant deficiencies are those review area/topic which impact the staff's ability to begin the detailed technical review or complete its review within a predictable timeframe.

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

*****Identification of new review time is on a 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.

SER Section: 16.1
 Technical Branch: COLP (Secondary)
 Branch Chief: Michael Junge
 Technical Reviewers: Out of Scope
 SRP Sections: 16.1 (related to TS Section 5.5)
 Date: 10/31/07

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.

1. Review Area/Topic*	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	
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
16.1	Yes	Yes				No	RAIs will need to be submitted for portions of the Admin section of TS	Out of Scope	Yes	COLA

*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.

**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.

***Significant deficiencies are those review area/topic which impact the staff's ability to begin the detailed technical review or complete its review within a predictable timeframe.

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

*****Identification of new review time is on a 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.

SER Section: Chapter 18.0
 Technical Branch: COLP
 Branch Chief: Michael Junge
 Technical Reviewers: Out of Scope
 SRP Sections: 18.1 - 18.8
 Date: 10/31/07

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.

1. Review Area/Topic*	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	
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
18.1	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		Yes	
18.2	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		Yes	
18.3	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		Yes	
18.4	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		No	COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departures STP DEP T1 3.4-1, STD DEP 7.5-1, STD DEP 18.4-1
18.5	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		Yes	
18.6	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		No	COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departures STP DEP T1 3.4-1
18.7	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		Yes	

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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 RAJ 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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
18.8	Yes	No	No	See column 5 entry for Item 18E	Yes	No	See estimate for 18E		No	COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departures STP DEP T1 3.4-1; COLA, Operational Program - Staffing; COLA, Operational Program - Procedures; COLA, Operational Program - Training
18A	Yes	No	Yes	COLA, Chapter 15 Accident Analysis - review the EPGs for continued acceptability; COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departure STP DEP T1 2.14-1	Yes	No	See estimate for 18E		No	COLA, Chapter 15, Accident Analysis; COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls
18B	Yes	No	Yes	COLA, Chapter 15 Accident Analysis - review the EPGs for continued acceptability; COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departure STP DEP T1 2.14-1	Yes	No	See estimate for 18E		No	COLA, Chapter 15, Accident Analysis; COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
18C	Yes	No	Yes	COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departure STP DEP T1 2.14-1	Yes	No	See estimate for 18E		No	Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls
18D	Yes	Yes				No	See estimate for 18E		No	COLA, Chapter 15, Accident Analysis
18E	Yes	No	No	<p><u>Technical Deficiencies:</u> The applicant has not satisfied the COL License information Items because they have not provided as part of their COLA:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> A detailed status of the HFE program commitments and elements contained in DCD Sections 18.8 and Appendix 18E. 	Yes	No	Estimated change: Additional 174 Staff hours plus 120 contractor hours to complete acceptance review.	Out of Scope	No	Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls; COLA, Chapter 15, Accident Analysis; COLA, Chapter 13, Organization, Staffing, Training Procedures, Emergency Preparedness

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
18E (continuation)				<p>1. The implementation plans and results demonstrating the completion of COL Information Items</p> <p>2. A schedule for completing portions not currently finished,</p> <p>Also, in a public meeting with the Staff on October 11, 2007, the Applicant indicated that they were developing an STP 3&4-specific HFE plan to be ready, sometime in the future. The Staff is unclear whether this Plan will be submitted for review as part of the COLA and if so, when.</p>						

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
18E (continuation)				<p>The Applicant also indicated in the October 11, 2007 meeting, that the COLA will not close-out DAC. The Staff requests further explanation of this position as part of the Applicant's COLA.</p> <p>In addition to the information requested above, the Applicant should describe, in their COLA submittal, any plans to modify the DCD 18.8, Appendix 18E, and Tier 1 Section 3.1 commitments, including justification for the changes.</p> <p>The Staff does not support the applicant's proposed approach of not submitting, as part of the COLA acceptance review,</p>						

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
18E (continuation)				information necessary to successfully complete HFE Program Elements that were not resolved as part of the DCD (e.g., Appendix 18E). The Staff's position is that for those elements that the COL does not complete in its combined license application, the COL should provide implementation plans including schedules. The implementation plans should be developed with a level of detail that will allow the COL (and the Staff) to ensure that ITAAC can be successfully completed and verified.						
18F	Yes	No	Yes		Yes	No			No	COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departure STP DEP T1 2.14-1

1. Review Area/Topic*	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		
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
18G	Yes	Yes				No			Yes	
18H	Yes	No	Yes	COLA, Chapter 7, Instrumentation and Controls, to address the I&C-related departure STP DEP T1 2.14-1 and continued acceptability of Inventory	Yes	No			No	COLA, Chapter 7 Instrumentation and Controls

*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.

**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.

***Significant deficiencies are those review area/topic which impact the staff's ability to begin the detailed technical review or complete its review within a predictable timeframe.

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

*****Identification of new review time is on a 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.

SER Section: 14.3
 Technical Branch: COLP (Primary)
 Branch Chief:
 Technical Reviewers:
 SRP Sections:
 Date: 10/31/07

	Out of Scope
--	--------------

Do these sections address the applicable regulations: **Yes**
 Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? **No**
 Specific review areas or topics are identified in Table 1 below.

1. Review Area/Topic*	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	
	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, identify the change (or basis for change).	9. Identify the total 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, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
14.3	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	
14.3 S	Yes	Yes				Yes			Yes	

*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.

**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.

***Significant deficiencies are those review area/topic which impact the staff's ability to begin the detailed technical review or complete its review within a predictable timeframe.

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

*****Identification of new review time is on a 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 2: COLP Resource Plan Revisions for STP 3 & 4 COLA

Task Changes						Resource Changes		
SER Section No.	SER Section Title	Task *	Concurrent Dependent Review Activity **	Revised Start Date	Revised Finish Date	Name of Resource	Change Type ***	Revised Hours
13.5.1.1	Administrative Procedures - General	PSER and RAIs prepared	N/A	N/A	N/A	Out of Scope	Revise	Out of Scope
13.5.2.1	Operating and Emergency Operating Procedures	PSER and RAIs prepared	N/A	N/A	N/A		Revise	
14.3	Tier 1 Selection Criteria and Processes	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	
14.3 S	Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A		N/A	
16.1	Technical Specifications	PSER and RAIs prepared	N/A	N/A	6/5/08		Revise	
18.0	Human Factors Engineering	COLA Acceptance Review	N/A	N/A	~12/01/08		Revise	
18.0	Human Factors Engineering	SER Phase 1 - PSER and RAIs prepared	N/A	~3/30/08*	10/31/08		Revise	

Legend:

* Dates predicated on applicant's submission of STP 3&4- specific HFE Program Plans on a schedule that is undetermined at this time but expected to begin in early 2008.