November 16, 2007

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

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

SUBJECT: ACCEPTANCE REVIEW RESULTS FOR CHAPTER 11 OF THE SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

The Construction Health Physics Branch (CHPB) has completed the acceptance review of the South Texas Project (STP) Combined License application (COLA) submitted by NRG Energy. 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 Sections 11.1 through 11.5
FSAR Section 12.2.1

The review was structured using the guidance in Regulatory Guide 1.206.

Completeness and Sufficiency

Based on this review, we conclude that, in general, the application contains the information required by regulations, and that the submitted information is technically sufficient for CHPB to commence the STP COLA detailed technical review.

Schedule

The estimated effort for the detailed technical review of the STP COLA section by CHPB was compared with the current pre-baseline EPM model, and it was determined that the technical review effort will likely take fewer resources than is captured in the current estimate. This includes areas for which CHPB has both primary and supporting review responsibilities. An updated resource plan for these tasks is included in Enclosure 2. The resource plan includes the new estimated level of effort and the resources assigned. No change to the expected start or end dates are needed, as projected. Revisions to the resource plans have been submitted for the following FSAR/SRP Section reviews:

FSAR Section 1.8
FSAR Section 1.9
FSAR Section 2.4.13
FSAR Section 2.4S.13
FSAR Section 7.5
FSAR Section 7.6
FSAR Section 9.2

B715

FSAR Section 9.3
FSAR Section 9.4
FSAR Section 10.4
FSAR Section 11.1
FSAR Section 11.2
FSAR Section 11.3
FSAR Section 11.4
FSAR Section 11.5
FSAR Section 12.2
FSAR Section 13.4S
FSAR Section 14.0
FSAR Section 14.3.8
FSAR Section 15.7
FSAR Section 16.5

Review Dependencies

CHPB's detailed technical review of the STP COLA is dependent on the staff's review and approval of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Topical Report 07-11, "Generic FSAR Template Guidance for Cost-Benefit Analysis for Radwaste Systems for Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Reactors [Revision 0]."

Enclosures: 1. Table 1 of Attachment D to NRO-REG-100, Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results

2.Table 2 of Attachment D to NRO-REG-100, Resource Plan Revisions.

CONTACT: George Cicotte,
301-415-0672

FSAR Section 9.3
FSAR Section 9.4
FSAR Section 10.4
FSAR Section 11.1
FSAR Section 11.2
FSAR Section 11.3
FSAR Section 11.4
FSAR Section 11.5
FSAR Section 12.2
FSAR Section 13.4S
FSAR Section 14.0
FSAR Section 14.3.8
FSAR Section 15.7
FSAR Section 16.5

Review Dependencies

CHPB's detailed technical review of the STP COLA is dependent on the staff's review and approval of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Topical Report 07-11, "Generic FSAR Template Guidance for Cost-Benefit Analysis for Radwaste Systems for Light-Water-Cooled Nuclear Power Reactors [Revision 0]."

Enclosures: 1. Table 1 of Attachment D to NRO-REG-100, Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results

2.Table 2 of Attachment D to NRO-REG-100, Resource Plan Revisions.

CONTACT: George Cicotte, 301-415-0672

DISTRIBUTION: Non-Public CHPB R/F RIDS/NRO/OD RIDS/NRO/DCIP RIDS/NRO/DCIP/CHPB

ADAMS Accession No.:ML073180321 26 pages NRR-106

| OFFICE | NRO/DCIP/CHPB | NRO/DCIP/CHPB | NRO/DCIP/CHPB:BC |
|---|---|---|---|
| NAME | GCicotte | J-CDehmel | TFrye |
| DATE | 11/ 15 /07 | 11/ 15 /07 | 11/ 16 /07 |

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.1 Technical Branch: CHPB/Secondary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.1 Date: 11/01/07

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 2 CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2 (i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | Only in the context of radioactive waste handling systems. See review comments for SAR sections 11.2, 11.3, and 12.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

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

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

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

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

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

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.1 Technical Branch: CHPB/Secondary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.1 Date: 11/01/07

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 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | Means for controlling and limiting radioactive effluents addressed under SAR Section 11.5. Kind and quantity of radioactive material addressed in SAR 12.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(i) CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5 CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.1 Technical Branch: CHPB/Secondary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.1 Date: 11/01/07

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 16(i) CFR 52.79(a), 50.34a(d) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Applicant identified following departure in SAR Section 11.2: Tier 2 STD DEP T2 11.2-1. | N/A | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 16(ii) CFR 52.79(a), 50 App. I | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 37 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | N/A | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 item 2(viii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.1 Technical Branch: CHPB/Secondary Technical Reviewer: George Cicotte

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.1 Date: 11/01/07

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 2(xvii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxvii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxviii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| Total Review this Section | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No | Re-evaluation of original estimate resulted in reduction in estimated total hours, with no change in schedule. | Out of Scope | N/A | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.2 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.2 Date: 11/01/07

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 2 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | No | Yes | With respect to radioactive waste handling systems, T2 STD DEP 11.2-1 and SAR page 11.2-26 refer to drawings in SAR Chapter 21, which are not contained therein. The missing drawings are for SAR Figure 11.2-2, sheets 14 of 36, and from 18 of 36 to 36 of 36, inclusive. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2 (i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | Only in the context of systems provided to contain expected inventories of radioactive materials, which are addressed in SAR Section12.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.2 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: [redacted]

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.2 Date: 11/01/07

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 4 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | No | Yes | In departure from the DCD, T2 STD DEP 11.2-1, "Liquid Radwaste Process Equipment," the applicant states that this section of the DCD is replaced in its' entirety, and generally describes mobile systems to replace installed systems. However, the departure does not fully describe the new configuration and design. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | No | Yes | In SAR Section 11.2, the applicant replaced the section by stating in part "This section of the reference ABWR DCD including all subsections, figures, and tables (except for P & IDs) is replaced completely. . . ." In STD DEP 11.2-1, "Liquid Radwaste Process Equipment," the applicant does not address criteria in the DCD. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | No | Yes | In departure from the DCD, T2 STD DEP 11.2-1, "Liquid Radwaste Process Equipment," the applicant does not describe the proposed systems in sufficient detail to determine what constitutes conformance. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.2 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.2 Date: 11/01/07

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 4(iii) CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 16(i) CFR 52.79(a), 50.34a(d) | Yes | Yes | N/A | Inventories of radioactive materials released during operations are addressed in SAR Section 12.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.2 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.2 Date: 11/01/07

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 16(ii) CFR 52.79(a), 50 App. I | Yes | No | Yes | SAR does not include an analysis of population doses associated with liquid effluent releases. The SAR misconstrues the purpose and application of Draft NEI Template 07-11. The NEI template presents a bounding envelope which, if met, demonstrates compliance with ALARA cost-benefit requirements under Part 50, App. I, Section II.D. Process and effluent monitoring and controls are addressed in SAR Section 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 37 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | No | Yes | Incomplete discussions of assumptions and methods used in deriving the source terms for effluent releases, given differences with DCD. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 CFR 52.79(a),. 20.1406 | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.2 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Revi[redacted] Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.2 Date: [redacted]

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 2(viii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | No | Yes | In the context of sampling and sample analyses, see review comments associated with SAR Sections 9.3.2 and 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xvii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | Not applicable to liquid radwaste systems. | | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxvii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | Not applicable to liquid radwaste systems. | | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxviii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | Not applicable to liquid radwaste systems. | | N/A | | | N/A | |
| Total Review this Section | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No | Re-evaluation of original estimate resulted in reduction in estimated total hours, with no change in schedule. | Out of Scope | N/A | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.3 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.3 Date: 11/01/07

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 2 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2 (i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | Only in the context of systems provided to contain expected inventories of radioactive materials, which are addressed in SAR Section 12.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.3 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.3 Date: 11/01/07

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 4(ii) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | Yes | SAR does not address SRP Section 11.3, BTP 11-5 acceptance criteria on the radiological consequences of an offgas system component failure. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 16(i) CFR 52.79(a), 50.34a(d) | Yes | Yes | Yes | Inventories of radioactive materials released during operations are addressed in SAR Section 12.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.3 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.3 Date: 11/01/07

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 16(ii) CFR 52.79(a), 50 App. I | Yes | No | Yes | SAR does not include an analysis of population doses associated with gaseous effluent releases. The SAR misconstrues the purpose and application of Draft NEI Template 07-11. The NEI template presents a bounding envelope which, if met, demonstrates compliance with ALARA cost-benefit requirements under Part 50, App. I, Section II.D. Process and effluent monitoring and controls are addressed in SAR Section 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 37 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406 | Yes | Yes | N/A | See related review comments for SAR Section 12. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.3 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.3 Date: 11/01/07

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 2(viii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | In the context of sampling and sample analyses, see review comments associated with SAR Sections 9.3.2 and 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xvii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | See related review comments for SAR Section 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxvii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | See related review comments for SAR Section 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxviii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | See related review comments for SAR Section 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| Total Review this Section | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No | Re-evaluation of original estimate resulted in reduction in estimated total hours, with no change in schedule. | Out of Scope | N/A | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.4 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.4 Date: 11/01/07

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 2 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2 (i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | Only in the context of systems provided to contain expected inventories of radioactive materials, which are addressed in SAR Section 12.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.4 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.4 Date: 11/01/07

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 4(ii) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(iii) CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | No direct liquid or gaseous effluent releases occur from the radwaste System. See review comments associated with SAR Sections 11.2, 11.3, and 11.5. Failure of radwaste tank with offsite impact addressed in SAR Section 15.7.6 per SRP Section 11.2, BTP 11-6. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 16(i) CFR 52.79(a), 50.34a(d) | Yes | Yes | N/A | Inventories of radioactive materials generated and released during operations are addressed in SAR Section 12.2.<br><br>Applicant identified following departure in SAR Section 11.4: Tier 2 : STD DEP T2 11.4-1. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.4 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.4 Date: 11/01/07

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 16(ii) CFR 52.79(a), 50 App. I | Yes | No | Yes | SAR does not include an analysis of population doses associated with the treatment of solid & wet wastes. The SAR misconstrues the purpose and application of Draft NEI Template 07-11. The NEI template presents a bounding envelope which, if met, demonstrates compliance with ALARA cost-benefit requirements under Part 50, App. I, Section II.D. Process and effluent monitoring and controls are addressed in SAR Section 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 37 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406 | Yes | Yes | N/A | See related review comments for SAR Section 12. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.4 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.4 Date: 11/01/07

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 2(viii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | In the context of sampling and sample analyses, see review comments associated with SAR Sections 9.3.2 and 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xvii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxvii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | See related review comments for SAR Section 11.5. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxviii) CFR 50.34(f) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| Total Review this Section | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No | Re-evaluation of original estimate resulted in reduction in estimated total hours, with no change in schedule. | Out of Scope | N/A | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.5 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewe Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.5 Date: 11/01/07

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 2 CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 2 (i) CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 3 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(i) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 4(ii) CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.5 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: [redacted]

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.5 Date: 11/01/07

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 4(iii) CFR 52.79(a) | N/A | N/A | N/A | | N/A | N/A | | | N/A | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 5 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 16(i) CFR 52.79(a), 50.34a(d) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 16(ii) CFR 52.79(a), 50 App. I | Yes | No | Yes | Applicant incorporated Section 11.5 of the ABWR DCD by reference with the following departures:<br><br>Tier 1 STD DEP T1 3.4-1<br>Tier 2 STD DEP T2 7.1-1<br>Tier 2 STD DEP T2 7.2-1<br>Tier 2 STD DEP T2 11.5-1<br><br>In T2 STD DEP 11.5-1, the departure deletes monitoring and sampling components and replaces them with | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.5 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.5 Date: 11/01/07

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. |
| | | | | performance-based criteria, but the criteria are not sufficiently specific to support the technical review.<br><br>In the context of sampling, see review comments associated with SAR Sect 9.3.2. | | | | | | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 37 CFR 52.79(a) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206, C.IV.1 item 45 CFR 52.79(a), 20.1406 | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 item 2(viii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | See related review comments in SAR Section 9.3.2. | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xvii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |

**Table 1: Safety Analysis Report Acceptance Review Results for NRG Energy South Texas Project 3/4 Combined License**

SAR Section: 11.5 Technical Branch: CHPB/Primary Technical Reviewer: Out of Scope

Branch Chief: Timothy Frye SRP Section: 11.5 Date: 11/01/0

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 2(xxvii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| RG 1.206 C.IV.1 Item 2(xxviii) CFR 50.34(f) | Yes | Yes | N/A | | No | Yes | | | Yes | |
| Total Review this Section | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | N/A | No | Re-evaluation of original estimate resulted in reduction in estimated total hours, with no change in schedule. | Out of Scope | N/A | |

## Table 2: NRO/DCIP/CHPB Resource Plan Revisions for South Texas Project ABWR Combined License Application

| Task Changes | | | | | | Resource Changes | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SER Section No. | SER Section Title | Task * | Concurrent Dependent Review Activity ** | Revised Start Date | Revised Finish Date | Name of Resource | Change Type *** | Revised Hours |
| 2.4.13 | Accid Rel of Rad Liq Effluents | Phase 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 7.5 | Information Systems Important to Safety (e.g., PASS) | Phase 1 | N/A | 01/07/08 | 05/06/08 | | New | |
| 7.6 | Other Instrumentation Systems Required for Safety | Phase 1 | N/A | 01/07/08 | 05/06/08 | | New | |
| 11.1 | Source Terms | Phase 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.2 | Liquid Waste Mgmt | Phase 1 | NEI Topical Report 07-11 | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.3 | Gaseous Waste Mgmt | Phase 1 | NEI Topical Report 07-11 | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.4 | Solid Waste Mgmt | Phase 1 | NEI Topical Report 07-11 | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.5 | Rad Monit Inst & Sampling | Phase 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 12.2 | Radiation Sources | Phase 1 | N/A | 01/07/08 | 05/06/08 | | New | |
| 13.4S | Operational Program Implementation | Phase 1 | N/A | 01/07/08 | 05/06/08 | | New | |
| 15.7 | Radioactive Release | Phase 1 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 16.5 | Administrative Controls / Staffing | Phase 1 | N/A | 01/07/08 | 05/06/08 | | New | |

Out of Scope

This template is to be used to facilitate management of revised planning data resulting from application acceptance reviews. Cha planning data resulting from acceptance reviews may include identifying dependencies to concurrent activities in other projects, 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.

**Table 2: NRO/DCIP/CHPB Resource Plan Revisions for South Texas Project ABWR Combined License Application**

| Task Changes | | | | | | Resource Changes | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| SER Section No. | SER Section Title | Task * | Concurrent Dependent Review Activity ** | Revised Start Date | Revised Finish Date | Name of Resource | Change Type *** | Revised Hours |
| 1.8 | SRP Conformance, Codes & Standards | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | Out of Scope | New | Out of Scope |
| 1.9 | SRP Conformance, Regulations | Phase 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | New | |
| 2.4S.13 | Accidental Releases (Liquid) | Phase 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 7.5 | Information Systems Important to Safety (e.g., PASS) | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | | New | |
| 7.6 | Other Instrumentation Systems Required for Safety | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | | New | |
| 9.2 | Water Systems [non-radioactive] | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | | New | |
| 9.3 | Process Auxiliaries | Phase 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | New | |
| 9.4 | HVAC | Phase 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | New | |
| 10.4 | Other Features of Steam and Power Conversion | Phase 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.1 | Source Terms | Phase 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.2 | Liquid Waste Mgmt | Phase 2 | NEI Topical Report 07-11 | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.3 | Gaseous Waste Mgmt | Phase 2 | NEI Topical Report 07-11 | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.4 | Solid Waste Mgmt | Phase 2 | NEI Topical Report 07-11 | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 11.5 | Rad Monit Inst & Sampling | Phase 2 | N/A | N/A | N/A | | Revised | |
| 12.2 | Radiation Sources | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | | New | |
| 13.4S | Operational Program Implementation | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | | New | |
| 14.0 | Initial Test Program | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | | New | |
| 15.7 | RP ITAAC | Phase 2 | N/A | 06/20/08 | 08/15/08 | | New | |