Westinghouse **Electric Corporation**

Water Reactor Divisions

Nuclsar Technology Division

Box 355 Pittsburgh Pennsylvania 15230

(412) 373-4868

August 6, 1982

Mr. J. M. Rodriguez Office of the Controller Division of Accounting U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Maryland National Bank Building 7735 Old Georgetown Road Bethesda, Maryland

Dear Mr. Rodriguez:

RE: NRC fees for review of Revision 1, WCAP 9220/9221

RECEIVED BY LEMB Orbit. To x x x x x x x x x Action Compt.

Westinghouse Electric Corporation (Westinghouse) asserts that the \$10,725. billed on the attached invoice is inequitable and excessive for the reasons explained more fully below. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR §170.11(b)(1), Westinghouse hereby applies for exemption from the fee requirements of 10 CFR Part 170. By citing the exemption portion of Part 170, Westinghouse does not admit, directly or by implication, that Part 170 is applicable to this matter.

WCAP 9220 and 9221 were published by Westinghouse in 1978. Subsequently, the NRC reviewed and accepted their validity as an ECCS evaluation model. Westinghouse paid for this initial NRC review. Westinghouse saw no reason to revise them following their acceptance.

Subsequently, the Regulatory Staff published "revised staff requirements for cladding swell and rupture models" in NUREG 0630. Westinghouse attempted to demonstrate to the Regulatory Staff that the models used in WCAP 9220 and 9221 continued to be valid. (In fact, Westinghouse still asserts their continued validity.)

Westinghouse saw the futility of arguing this point further, revised its models to satisfy the $\frac{\text{Staff's}}{1981}$ revisions, and submitted them by $\frac{1}{1}$ Number NS-TMA-2448 on May 15, $\frac{1}{1981}$. Westinghouse asserts that fairness and equity demand that the NRC recognize its role in how this "revision" came about, and exempt the review from its otherwise applicable for roll

Westinghouse notes that 31 USC & 483a provides in part that "...the head of each Federal agency is authorized to prescribe...such fee, charge, or price, if any, as he shall determine...to be fair and equitable..." (Emphasis added)

August 6, 1982

NS-EPR-2641

Further, Westinghouse also notes that the revision was not submitted for review and approval as a topical report, as the invoice reads. Westinghouse did submit a letter and enclosure describing the changed Westinghouse model. Westinghouse published Revision 1 to WCAP 9220/9221 only after the NRC approval of the models and at the directive of J. R. Miller in a December 1, 1981 letter to E. P. Rahe. No provision exists in Part 170 for review of a letter, and the revision, or "topical report", came only after the review and approval of the models.

Further, most all of the material in the letter submittal nad been reviewed previously in WCAP 9220/9221, and Westinghouse paid for the review. Westinghouse brought this to the NRC's attention in the May 15, 1981, letter. It would be inequitable and unfair to be charged a second time for the staff review of the models and supporting data when most of the same information had already been reviewed in WCAP 9220/9221, and charged for then.

Further, the items submitted with the May 15, 1981 letter constitute perhaps five percent of the total ECCS evaluation model. A fee of over \$10,000 for such a relatively small change is excessive when compared to the regulatory limit of \$20,000.

For the foregoing reasons, Westinghouse submits that the NRC should exempt its review from the fee schedule set by the Commission.

Very truly yours,

male

E. P. Rahe, Manager Nuclear Safety Department

1mi

Attachment

cc: F. X. Davis

R. A. Wiesemann

B. A. McIntyre

LFMB Note 8/25/82: No fee pl. for WCAP-9220/9221. 120,000 pail for WCAP-9500-17×17(05) Le b. 1/6/ 8/24/81.

