

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket Files

(50-447)

NRC PDR

NSIC

NTIS

PRC

ACRS

SSPB Reading

E.L. Jordan, IE

J. M. Laylor, IE

D. Eisenhut

C. Thomas

D. Lynch

OCT 29 1982

MEMORANDUM FOR: Division Directors, NRR

FROM: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO GE's LETTER OF OCTOBER 1, 1982, REGARDING
AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE STAFF AND GE CONCERNING THE REVIEW
OF THE GESSAR II APPLICATION

GE submitted at our request, in a letter dated October 1, 1982, (enclosed) a list of six major agreements which they believe they have made with the staff regarding the conduct of our review of their GESSAR II application for an FDA. To aid us in responding to this letter, I request that you review this list and provide me with your comments no later than November 5, 1982.

There are a few matters we suggest you consider in reviewing the list of purported agreements. The first consideration is that the second item in this list is primarily oriented towards the foundation analysis methodology which was proposed by GE in its earlier application for a PDA for the 238 nuclear island, and which was approved by the staff in our SER in December 1975. This matter is presently being considered by DE. Additionally GE indicated in a meeting on October 12th that this agreement applies to some of the radwaste design criteria approved at the PDA stage in 1975. Since Item 2 in GE's list can significantly affect our flexibility in reaching licensing decisions for the FDA, I suggest that you give careful consideration to this particular item.

Secondly, there appears to be a fundamental conflict between Items 1 and 2 of GE's list since we have upgraded our requirements in some review areas for NTOL BWR 6/Mark III designs (i.e., Grand Gulf and Perry) over that which we required at the CP stage for these plants and for the GESSAR PDA. If Item 2 were to take precedence over Item 1, we would be faced with the situation that the GESSAR II FDA scheduled to be issued in 1983 and which would be referencable until 1988, would be potentially licensed to less stringent requirements than Grand Gulf or Perry. In addition, please indicate any agreements between GE and the staff regarding the GESSAR review, which may have been omitted from the enclosed list.

Original Signed by:

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

8211050083 821029
PDR ADOCK 05000447
A PDR

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc: H. Denton

*SEE PREVIOUS CONCURRENCE

OFFICE	*DL:LB#2	*DL:SSPB	*DL:AD/SA	DND		
SURNAME	DLynch:mj	C.Thomas	F.Miraglia	DGEisenhut		
DATE	10/ 8/82	10/2/82	10/8/82	10/2/82		

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket Files
NRC PDR
NSIC
NTIS
PRC
ACRS
SSPB Reading
E. L. Jordan, IE
J. M. Taylor, IE
D. Eisenhut
C. Thomas
D. Lynch

MEMORANDUM FOR: Division Directors, NRR
FROM: Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing
SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO GE's LETTER OF OCTOBER 1, 1982, REGARDING
AGREEMENTS BETWEEN THE STAFF AND GE CONCERNING THE REVIEW
OF THE GESSAR II APPLICATION

GE submitted at our request, in a letter dated October 1, 1982, (enclosed) a list of six major agreements which they believe they have made with the staff regarding the conduct of our review of their GESSAR II application for an FDA. To aid us in responding to this letter, I request that you promptly review this list and provide me with your comments no later than October 29th.

There are a few matters you should consider in reviewing the list of purported agreements. The first consideration is that the second item in this list is primarily oriented towards the foundation analysis methodology which was proposed by GE in its earlier application for a PDA for the 238 nuclear island, and which was approved by the staff in our SER in December 1975. This matter is presently being considered by DE. Additionally GE indicated in a meeting on October 12th that this agreement applies to some of the radwaste design criteria approved at the PDA stage in 1975. Since Item 2 in GE's list can significantly affect our flexibility in reaching licensing decisions for the FDA, I suggest that you give careful consideration to this particular item. Secondly, there appears to be a fundamental conflict between Items 1 and 2 of GE's list since we have upgraded our requirements in some review areas for NTOL BMR6/Mark III designs (i.e., Grand Gulf and Perry) over that which we required at the CP stage for these plants and for the GESSAR PDA. If Item 2 were to take precedence over Item 1, we would be faced with the situation that the GESSAR II FDA scheduled to be issued in 1983 and which would be referencable until 1988, would be potentially licensed to less stringent requirements than Grand Gulf or Perry. In addition, please indicate any agreements between GE and the staff regarding the GESSAR review, which may have been omitted from the enclosed list.

Darrell G. Eisenhut, Director
Division of Licensing

Enclosure:
As Stated

cc: H. Denton
M. Diecks

OFFICE	DL:LB#2	DL:SSPB	DL:PB/SA	DL:D		
SURNAME	DLynch:cc	CThomas	FPrigolia	DEisenhut		
DATE	10/8/82	10/8/82	10/ /82	10/ /82		