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:

18/14

- 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	
Branch Chief: T. Frye	SRP Section: 12.1	Date: 11/06/2007	
December 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	t 11 N -		

Does the section add Ar <u>e there any</u> techni					or depe	ndencies	on concurrent reviews? No	<u>lde</u> nt	ify specific re	eview area/topic in table below.
		letenes	s and Te	echnical Sufficiency Whicl ceptability for Docketing	h Form	Cha	nges to Planning Assumptions ered in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be	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)	 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) (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.		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									

Comp	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Whic ceptability for Docketing	,	Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baseline Schedule	to be e Review	•	Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
2. Tooss COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	 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****	 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.
							·		
n/a						·			•
n/a									
	2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	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)**	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)***	Basis for Acceptability for Docketing 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)** through the RAI process? (yes/no)** 1. Is col section technically sufficient for this intormation will be needed for technical will be needed for technical review. 1. Is col section technically sufficient for this intormation will be needed for technical review. 1. Is col section technically sufficient for this intormation will be needed for technical review.	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)*** 4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** (Separation of the process of the control of through the RAI process of the control of t	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Mylich Form (Yes/No) (Yes	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing Positive General Page 2012 Section C. IV. 1) A Mean area of topics of Vesting Schedule and Febrical deficiency feels and process of technical sufficient for the technical morphism of technical feeling fee	Basis for Acceptability for Docketing by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? Section and Section and Section and Section C.IV.1)? Section and Section and Section C.IV.1)? Section C.IV.1)? Section and Section and Section C.IV.1)? Section C.IV.1)?	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability of Celes COT section address the Remarks and Considered in Development of Basis for Acceptability of Celes COT (2 1.7) and the Rechological Considered in Development of Basis for Acceptability of Considered in Development of Basis for Considered in Development of Con

	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	chnical Sufficiency Which eptability for Docketing	Form		nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule		Review	Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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)***	 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*****	 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									

	. Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Whic ceptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baseline Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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)****	 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*****	 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	n/a	,						·		
and accident in- plant radiation & airborne radioactivity monitoring)			,			,				
10 CFR 20.1101 RG 8.10 (COL	YES	YES	n/a							
Item 12.1)	YES	YES	n/a							

	Compl	eteness	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Which	h Form	Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin	to be e Review	Review	Dependencies Among Concurrent
•				eptability for Docketing			Schedule	Reviews		
1. Review Area/Topic* RG 1.8 (COL	 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****	 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.
Item 12.2)	YES	YES	n/a							
Occupational Exposures (COL Item 12.3)	YES	YES	п/а							
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

SAR Section: 12.2 (Radiation Sources)	Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary/Secondary)	Technical Reviewer
Branch Chief: T. Frve	SRP Section: 12.2	Date: 11/06/2007

Branch Chief: T. Frye

Does the section address the applicable regulati

Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in

ations: Yes in planning assumptions, or depe	ndencies on concurrer	t reviews? Yes	Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews			
chnical Sufficiency Which Form eptability for Docketing	Changes to Plan Considered in Devel	ning Assumptions to be opment of Baseline Review ichedule				
deficiency related to a	w schedule and riate? (yes/no)	ıe in staff-hours****	aa/topic be completed oncurrent review?			

١		Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	chnical Sufficiency Which eptability for Docketing	Form		red in Development of Baselin Schedule		Review	Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
		 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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			NO Out of Scope	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							

	Compl			echnical Sufficiency Whic ceptability for Docketing			nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule		Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
Area/Topic*	Z. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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****	 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						1				
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12 (Margin of Safety)	n/a										

	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Whic ceptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1 Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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)****	 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****	 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						,			

	Compl			echnical Sufficiency Whic ceptability for Docketing			nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule		Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
	Z. Does CUL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1,206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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*****	 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	n/a										
related hi rad containment monitors)				i							

							<u> </u>			
	Comp			echnical Sufficiency Which ceptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 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)****	 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****	 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									

	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	chnical Sufficiency Which eptability for Docketing	Form		nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule		Review	Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	 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*****	 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					

	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Which eptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
Compliance with 10 CFR 20 and 10 CFR 50 Appendix I (COL item 12.5), Continued from above	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. 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.	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 5.4-1	YES	YES	n/a		_	-				<u> </u>		
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				·					

12 .

	Compl			echnical Sufficiency Whicleptability for Docketing	•	Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baseline Schedule	to be e Review	Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does CUL 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****	 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	<u> </u>	L	L			L	<u> </u>	

^{*}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) Branch Chief: T. Frye

Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) SRP Section: 12.3 - 4

Technical Reviewe 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.

"r	there any technic	ai delicie	ncies, c	Hanges	in planning assumptions,	or deper		on concurrent reviews? No		I	eview area/topic in table below.	
1		Compl	etoness	and To	chnical Sufficiency Which	Form		nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baseline		Review Dependencies Among Concurrent		
1		Compi			eptability for Docketing		Conside	Schedule	CITOTICI	, action	Reviews	
	1. Review Area/Topic* RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 /	Z. Does COL section address the items required A by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	A 1s COL section technically sufficient for this or review area/ topic? (yes/no)**	4. Can the technical deficiency be resolved 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)****	Z 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). Phase 1 pre-baseline schedule too conservative.	Identify the total review time in staff-hours*****	10. Can the review of the area/topic be completed mwithout the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no)	11. For each no, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.	
	10 CFR 52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits) RG 1.206,	YES	YES	n/a				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.	de la compresión de la	5		
	C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)					`						

	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing					Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review	Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 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)***	 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****	 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										

	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Whic eptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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)****	 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****	 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							

1)?	1				red in Development of Baselina Schedule	Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
A 3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this	or 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*****	 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.
YES YE	S n/a				•			
`	YES YE	ÆS YES n/a	/ES YES n/a	/ES YES n/a	/ES YES n/a	YES YES n/a	YES YES n/a	(Yes/No) Yes/No) Yes/No)

	Completeness and Technical Sufficiency Which Form Basis for Acceptability for Docketing						nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/⊺opic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 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)****	 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****	 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						4	
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 STD DEP T1 3.4-1	YES YES	YES	n/a n/a						,	
STD DEP 3.8-1	YES	YES	n/a							

·	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Which ceptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review	Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 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)****	 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****	 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						i		
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		·				v		
STD DEP 12.3-4	YES	YES	n/a			-					
STD DEP Admin	YES	YES	n/a		Ĺ		DO #5 5-1-4 001		<u> </u>		

^{*}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) SRP Section: 12.3 – 12.4

Technical Reviewer

Date: 11/06/2007

Branch Chief: T. Frye SRF

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes

Are there any technical deficiencies,	, changes in planning assumptions, or	r dependencies on concurr	ent reviews? No, I	Identify specific review	v area/topic in table below.
		0 1 5	* * *		

		eteness	and Te	chnical Sufficiency Which		Cha	nges to Planning Assumptions to ered in Development of Baseline Schedule	to be		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1: Review Area/Topic* 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)	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)****	Z 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	11. For each no, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
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									

	Compl			chnical Sufficiency Whick eptability for Docketing			nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule			Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	Z. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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)****	 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****	 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									

	Compl	leteness Basis	and Te	echnical Suffice	ciency Whic Docketing		Cha Conside	red in Develo	ning Assumption opment of Basel chedule	s to be ine Review		Dependencie Revi		oncurrent
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 Can the technical deficiency be resolved through the RAI process? (yes/no)*** 	5. If no, for completenes technical suidentify deficiency(is information needed for treview.	ss or fficiency, es). This will be	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 eacl change (or change).	n no, identify the basis for	9. Identify the total review time in staff-hours*****	 Can the review of the area/topic be completed without the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no) 	11. For eac application (section.	h no, identi DCD or CC	ify which DLA) and
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	0, 2		TOTION.		Ų L		ondingo).						
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam.	n/a						,							
minimized) RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and NUREG 0737	n/a		,											

	Comp			echnical Sufficiency Whi ceptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning red in Developn Sche	nent of Baselin	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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)****	 Are the pre-baseline review schedule and estimated staff-hours appropriate? (yes/no) 	8. For each non change (or base change).		9. Identify the total review time in staff-hours*****	 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									. 0,		
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		<u> </u>]					

1	Compl			echnical Sufficiency Which		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review	 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 areal 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****	 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 a	and	12.	.၁၁
---------------------	-----	-----	-----

Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) SRP Section: 12.5

Technical Reviewer
Date: 11/06/2007

Branch Chief: T. Frye

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes

Are there any techni	cal deficie	ncies, c	hanges	in planning assumptions,	or deper	ndencies (on concurrent reviews? Yes		tify specific	eview area/topic in table below.
	Comp			echnical Sufficiency Which			nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule			Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic* RG 1.206,	2. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	43. Is COL section technically sufficient for this preview 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). Applicant references NEI	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. Review of NEI 07-03 must be
C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR 52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10 CFR 20 limits)	123		194	·			07-03, which significantly reduces review time needed for both Phase 1 and Phase 2.			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									

	Compl			echnical Sufficiency Whicleptability for Docketing	_	Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 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****	 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	n/a					, •				
52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (conformal construction)				·			1)		
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item	n/a								٠	
5/ 10 CFR 52.79(a)/ SAR Chap. 12		•		· -	·	1				
(Margin of Safety)										
RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 39	YES	YES	n/a	·				,		
/10 CFR -52.79(a),				` &						
20.1101/ SAR Chp 12 (Rad Prot Program			,							·
and its implementation)							·			

	Compl			chnical Sufficiency Which		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic* RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 / 10 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)	Z. Does COL section address the items required A by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? Ø (Yes/No)	3. Is COL section technically sufficient for this Oreview 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. 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.	Z 6. Is the identified technical deficiency related to a Orisk-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****	 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(vii) / 10 CFR	n/a						, X.			·
50.34(f) and NUREG 0737 Action Plan Item II.B.2 (vital area access)						-				

	Comp	eteness	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Which	h Form	Cha: Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions ared in Development of Baseline	to be e Review	Review	Dependencies Among Concurrent
1. Review Area/Topic* 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)	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****	 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 &	YES	YES	n/a)			
airborne radioactivity monitoring)										

	Compl			echnical Sufficiency Whicleptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baseline Schedule	to be e Review	Review	Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic*	Z. Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	 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****	 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				point a DC, this includes COL			·

^{*}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) Branch Chief: T. Frye

Technical Branch: CHPB (Primary) SRP Section: 14.3.8

Technical Reviewe Date: 10/19/2007

Does the section address the applicable regulations: Yes Are there any technical deficiencies, changes in planning as

<u>e there any technic</u>	cal deficie	ncies, c	hanges	in planning assumptions,	or deper	ndencies (on concurrent reviews? No	ident	ify specific r	eview area/topic in table below.
	Comp			echnical Sufficiency Whic ceptability for Docketing			nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be		Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic* RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 / 10 CFR	Z. Does COL section address the items required has regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)?	43. Is COL section technically sufficient for this or preview 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)****	A7. 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 mywithout the completion of a concurrent review? (yes/no)	11. For each no, identify which application (DCD or COLA) and section.
52.79(a) 10 CFR 20 (means of controlling and limiting rad exposure to w/in 10CFR20 limits) RG 1.206,	YES	YES	n/a						. ,	
C.IV.1 item 4(ii) / 10 CFR 52.79(a) and SAR Chap. 12 (design basis and principal design criteria)						į	·			

	Compi			echnical Sufficiency Which ceptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselind Schedule	to be e Review	Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
Area/Topic*	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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)**** 	 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**** 	 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						9		

	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Which	n Form	Chai Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baseline Schedule	to be e Review	Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
1. Review Area/Topic*	Z Does CUL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No)	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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),	n/a					:.		-		· .	
20.1406, SAR Chapter 12 (waste / contam. minimized)											
RG 1,206, C.IV.1 item 2(vii) / 10 CFR 50.34(f) and	YES	YES	n/a								

1	Compl	eteness Basis	and Te	echnical Sufficiency Whick ceptability for Docketing		Chai Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baseline Schedule	to be e Review		Review Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews		
	 Does COL section address the items required by regulation (refer to RG 1.206, Section C.IV.1)? (Yes/No) 	 Is COL section technically sufficient for this review area/ topic? (yes/no)** 	 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****	 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										

	Comp			echnical Sufficiency Whic ceptability for Docketing		Cha Conside	nges to Planning Assumptions red in Development of Baselin Schedule	to be e Review	Review	Dependencies Among Concurrent Reviews
1. Review Area/Topic* monitoring)	Z. 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****	 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 T1 2.14-1	YES	YES	n/a				DO this is all the COL			

^{*}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

		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

Revised – For an existing task, if a currently assigned resource is staying the same, but the hours or dates are being changed.

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.