November 9, 2007

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

FROM: Timothy Frye, Chief */RA/*
Health Physics Branch
Division of Construction Inspection
& Operational Programs
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW RESULTS FOR THE SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT UNITS 3 AND 4 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION (TAC Nos. RA0023, RA0024, RA0025, RA0026, RA0027)

The Health Physics Branch (CHPB) has completed its acceptance review of the South Texas Units 3 and 4 Combined License Application (COLA) submitted by South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company (STPNOC). This review covered the following COLA FSAR Sections for which CHPB has primary review responsibilities and, in addition, applicable interface documentation referenced in the FSAR:

- FSAR Tier 1 Sections 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 3.2 and Tier 2 Sections 12.1; 12.2; 12.3; 12.4; 12.5; 12.5S.
- ABWR Design Control Document (DCD) Tier 1/2, Revision #4, Tier 1 Sections 2.3.2, 2.3.3, 3.2, and Tier 2 Sections 12.1, 12.2, 12.3, 12.4, and 12.5.
- Technical Report NEI 07-03

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 CHPB to commence the STP units 3 and 4 COLA detailed technical review.

Schedule

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the following STPNOC COLA FSAR/SRP Sections by CHPB varies materially from the pre-baseline model in the EPM. This difference is due to the conservative nature of the pre-baseline EPM model estimates, as well as STPNOC's referencing of Technical Report NEI 07-03, which substantially shortens the review time needed. 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 (or predecessor task that controls the start date e.g., application accepted milestone). Revisions to the resource plans have been submitted for the following FSAR Section reviews:

11/14

- FSAR Section 12.1
- FSAR Section 12.3
- FSAR Section 12.4
- FSAR Section 12.5

Review Dependencies

CHPB's detailed technical review of the STPNOC COLA is dependent upon completion of the staff's ongoing review as identified in Enclosure 2.

Enclosures:
1. Table 1 (NUREG-0800 Sections 12.1- 12.5 and 14.3.8) of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide
2. Table 2 CHPB Chapter 12 Resource Plan Revisions for STP ABWR COLA

CONTACT: Timothy Frye, CHPB Chief
415-3900

- FSAR Section 12.1
- FSAR Section 12.3
- FSAR Section 12.4
- FSAR Section 12.5

Review Dependencies

CHPB's detailed technical review of the STPNOC COLA is dependent upon completion of the staff's ongoing review as identified in Enclosure 2.

Enclosures: 1. Table 1 (NUREG-0800 Sections 12.1- 12.5 and 14.3.8) of the Safety Analysis Report Review Guide
2. Table 2 CHPB Chapter 12 Resource Plan Revisions for STP ABWR COLA

CONTACT: Timothy Frye, CHPB Chief
415-3900

Distribution:
Non-Public CHPB r/f RidsNroOd
RidsNroDcip RidsNroDcipChpb

ADAMS Accession Number: ML073090664

OFFICE	NRO/DCIP/CHPB	NRO/DCIP/CHPB	NRO/DCIP/CHPB:BC
NAME	SBernal	CHinson	TFrye
DATE	11/6/07	11/08/07	11/09/07

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for South Texas ABWR COLA

SAR Section: 12.1 (ALARA) Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) Technical Reviewe Out of Scope

Branch Chief: T. Frye SRP Section: 12.1 Date: 11/06/2007

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes

Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? No Identify specific review area/topic in table below.

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR 52.79(a) (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits)	YES	YES	n/a			NO	Phase 1 and Phase 2 pre-baseline schedules are too conservative.	☐ Out of Scope	YES	
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)	n/a									

ENCLOSURE 1

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (conformal construction)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12 (Margin of Safety)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 39 /10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1101/ SAR Chp 12 (Rad Prot Program and its implementation)	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)	YES	NO	YES	Compliance with 10CFR20.1406 is addressed in Chapter 11 of the STP COLA. However, design approaches implemented to comply with 20.1406 should be described in this section.	NO					
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.B.2 (vital area access)	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.F.1 (containment hi rad monitors)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xxvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item III.D.3.3 (routine and accident in-plant radiation & airborne radioactivity monitoring)	n/a									
10 CFR 20.1101	YES	YES	n/a							
RG 8.10 (COL Item 12.1)	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.8 (COL Item 12.2)	YES	YES	n/a							
Occupational Exposures (COL Item 12.3)	YES	YES	n/a							
RG 8.8 (COL Item 12.4)	YES	YES	n/a							

*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-basline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for South Texas A[illegible]

SAR Section: 12.2 (Radiation Sources) Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary/Secondary) Technical Reviewer [illegible] Out of Scope

Branch Chief: T. Frye SRP Section: 12.2 Date: 11/06/2007

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes

Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? Yes Identify specific review area/topic in table below.

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR 52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits)	YES	YES	n/a			YES		Out of Scope	NO	Review of COLA Sections11.1, 11.2, and11.3 must be completed first
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (conformal construction)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12 (Margin of Safety)	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 39 /10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1101/ SAR Chp 12 (Rad Prot Program and its implementation)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.B.2 (vital area access)										
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.F.1 (Safety related hi rad containment monitors)	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xxvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item III.D.3.3 (routine and accident in-plant radiation & airborne radioactivity monitoring)	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
Compliance with 10 CFR 20 and 10 CFR 50 Appendix I (COL item 12.5)	YES	NO	YES	The SAR does not identify a departure from the DCD in defining the liquid and gaseous effluent source terms. SAR Chapters 11.2 to 11.3 refer to effluent releases associated with normal operations and anticipated operational occurrences. However, SAR Section 11.1 and DCD Section 11.1 only state equivalency between the design basis source term and normal operation/AOO source term for noble gases, but not for radioiodines, tritium, other fission products, and activation	NO					

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.
Compliance with 10 CFR 20 and 10 CFR 50 Appendix I (COL item 12.5), Continued from above				and corrosion products. While the SAR refers to normal operation/AOO source term in Sections 11.2 and 11.3, it is not clear if the development of a such a source term was planned but not included in the SAR, or a departure from the DCD should have been included for the purpose of expanding the equivalency of the design basis source term to that of normal operation/AOO for radioiodines, tritium, other fission products, and activation and corrosion products.						
STD DEP 5.4-1	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 10.4-4	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 11.2-1	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 11.4-1	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
STD DEP Admin	YES	YES	n/a							

*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-basline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for South Texas ABWR COLA

SAR Section: 12.3 (Rad. Prot. Design Features) Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) Technical Reviewe Out of Scope
Branch Chief: T. Frye SRP Section: 12.3 - 4 Date: 11/06/2007
Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes
Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? No Identify specific review area/topic in table below.

	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/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, identify the change (or basis for change).	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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR 52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits)	YES	YES	n/a			NO	Phase 1 pre-baseline schedule too conservative. Phase 2 hours are fine. ****NOTE**** Total P1 hours for SRP Section 12.3-4 will be 240 hr. This worksheet only identifies COLA 12.3 review effort, which is half of what is shown in EPM for SRP section 12.3-4.	Out of Scope	YES	
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)	YES	YES	n/a					5		

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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (conformal construction)	YES	YES	n/a							
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12 (Margin of Safety)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 39 /10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1101/ SAR Chp 12 (Rad Prot Program and its implementation)	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)	YES	YES	n/a							
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.B.2 (vital area access)	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.F.1 (hi rad containment monitors)	YES	YES	n/a							
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xxvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item III.D.3.3 (routine and accident in-plant radiation & airborne radioactivity monitoring)	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
Airborne Radionuclide Concentration Calculation (COL tem 12.6)	YES	YES	n/a							
Operational Considerations (COL item 12.7)	YES	YES	n/a							
Requirements of 10 CFR 70.24 (COL item 12.8)	YES	YES	n/a							
Material Selection (Unnumbered COL item)	YES	YES	n/a							
Dose to Construction Workers	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 1.2-1	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP T1 3.4-1	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 3.8-1	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
STD DEP 9.4-1	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 12.3-1	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 12.3-2	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 12.3-3	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 12.3-4	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP Admin	YES	YES	n/a							

*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-basline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for South Texas ABWR COLA

SAR Section: 12.4 (Dose Assessment) Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: T. Frye SRP Section: 12.3 – 12.4 Date: 11/06/2007

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes

Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? No, Identify specific review area/topic in table below.

	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/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, identify the	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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR 52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits)	n/a					NO	Out-of-Scope	Out of Scope	YES	
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)	n/a									

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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (conformal construction)	n/a									
RG 1.206; C.IV.1 item 5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12 (Margin of Safety)	n/a									

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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 39 /10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1101/ SAR Chp 12 (Rad Prot Program and its implementation)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737	n/a									

	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/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, 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.
Action Plan Item II.B.2 (vital area access)										
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.F.1 (hi rad containment monitors)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xxvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item III.D.3.3 (routine and accident in-plant radiation & airborne radioactivity monitoring)	n/a									
STD DEP 9.1-1	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
STD DEP 10.4-4	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP 11.2-1	YES	YES	n/a							
STD DEP Admin	YES	YES	n/a							

*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-basline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for South Texas ABWR COLA

SAR Section: 12.5 and 12.5S Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope
Branch Chief: T. Frye SRP Section: 12.5 Date: 11/06/2007

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes

Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? Yes Identify specific review area/topic in table below.

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR 52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits)	YES	YES	n/a			NO	Applicant references NEI 07-03, which significantly reduces review time needed for both Phase 1 and Phase 2.	Out of Scope	NO	Review of NEI 07-03 must be completed first
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)	n/a									

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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (conformal construction)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12 (Margin of Safety)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 39 /10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1101/ SAR Chp 12 (Rad Prot Program and its implementation)	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)	YES	NO	YES	Compliance with 10CFR20.1406 is addressed in Chapter 11 of the STP COLA. However, operating procedures implemented to comply with 20.1406 should be described in this section.	NO					
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.B.2 (vital area access)	n/a									

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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.F.1 (hi rad containment monitors)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xxvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item III.D.3.3 (routine and accident in-plant radiation & airborne radioactivity monitoring)	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
10 CFR 20.1101	YES	YES	n/a							
Rad Prot Program (COL item 12.9)	YES	YES	n/a							
Compliance with 10 CFR 50.34(f)(2)(xxvii) and NUREG-0737 Item III.D.3.3 (COL Item 12.10)	YES	YES	n/a							

*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-basline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 14.3.8: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for South Texas ABWR COLA

SAR Section: T1 2.3.2, 2.3.3 and 3.2 (ITAAC) Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) Technical Reviewe
Branch Chief: T. Frye SRP Section: 14.3.8 Date: 10/19/2007

Out of Scope

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes
Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning assumptions, or dependencies on concurrent reviews? No Identify specific review area/topic in table below.

	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/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, identify the change (or basis for change).	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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR 52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits)	YES	YES	n/a			YES		Out of Scope	YES	
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)	YES	YES	n/a							

	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/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, 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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (conformal construction)	YES	YES	n/a							
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12 (Margin of Safety)	YES	YES	n/a							

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.
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 39 /10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1101/ SAR Chp 12 (Rad Prot Program and its implementation)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)	n/a									
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and	YES	YES	n/a							

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.
NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.B.2 (vital area access)										
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.F.1 (hi rad containment monitors)	YES	YES	n/a							
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(xxvii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item III.D.3.3 (routine and accident in-plant radiation & airborne radioactivity	n/a	n/a								

	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/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, 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.
monitoring)										
STD DEP T1 2.14-1	YES	YES	n/a							

*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-basline review schedule and estimated hours should be on that basis.

Table 2: CHPB Chapter 12 Resource Plan Revisions for South Texas ABWR COLA

Task Changes						Resource Changes		
SAR Section No.	**SAR Section Title**	**Task ***	**Concurrent Dependent Review Activity ****	**Revised Start Date**	**Revised Finish Date**	**Name of Resource**	**Change Type *****	**Revised Hours**
12.1	ALARA	SER Section 12.1 Phase 1	n/a	n/a	n/a	Out of Scope	Revised	Out of Scope
12.1	ALARA	SER Section 12.1 Phase 2	n/a	n/a	n/a		Revised	
12.3	Rad. Prot. Design Features	SER Section 12.3-4 Phase 1	n/a	n/a	n/a		Revised	
12.4	Dose Assessment	SER Section 12.3-4 Phase 1	n/a	n/a	n/a		Revised	
12.5	Health Physics Program	SER Section 12.5 Phase1	Review of NEI 07-03	n/a	n/a		Revised	
12.5	Health Physics Program	SER Section 12.5 Phase 2	Review of NEI 07-03	n/a	n/a		Revised	

This template is to be used to facilitate management of revised planning data resulting from application acceptance reviews. Changes in planning data resulting from acceptance reviews may include identifying dependencies to concurrent activities in other projects, new or deleted tasks, or revisions to task durations, staffing, labor estimates, or start/finish dates.

* Specify the task being revised:
SER Phase 1 – PSER and RAIs Prepared
SER Phase 2 – Evaluation Completed
Other – Give task name
Indicate if this task or SER section is new (not yet in the schedule).

** Concurrent Dependent Review Activity: Identify, if any, the project and activity that precedes the affected task in this schedule (e.g., Task in a design certification review that precedes a COL review).

*** Change Type indicates how the resource is being changed:
Revised – For an existing task, if a currently assigned resource is staying the same, but the hours or dates are being changed.
New – For an existing task or a new task, if a new resource is being added to the task.
Deleted – For an existing task and a currently assigned resource, if the resource is being removed from the task.