



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

July 22, 1994

Docket No. 52-003

Mr. Nicholas J. Liparulo  
Nuclear Safety and Regulatory Activities  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Dear Mr. Liparulo:

SUBJECT: DRAFT SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT (DSER) FOR THE AP600 DESIGN

In its memorandum dated July 14, 1994, the staff provided the Commission with the expedited review schedule for the AP600 design certification application proposed by Westinghouse. In that memorandum, the staff indicated that it was scheduled to prepare technical input for the DSER by August 1994, with the DSER being issued to the Commission and the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards in November 1994. The staff indicated that this was "an optimistic schedule with no margin that can be met only if the staff receives high quality responses that address its concerns and review needs sufficiently in time to support the schedule."

The assumptions used to develop the schedule for the DSER input included an assumption that Westinghouse would be providing responses to all but about 110 recently asked requests for additional information (RAIs) (primarily on the PRA and testing program) by June 30, 1994. Westinghouse did not meet this commitment, as 381 responses had not been provided by July 1, 1994. As of July 20, 1994, a total of 325 RAIs remained unanswered. In addition, Westinghouse has not completed its submittal of information that it committed to provide this spring concerning human factors, the reliability assurance program, and the probabilistic risk assessment.

In addition, Revision 2 to the standard safety analyses report (SSAR) of the AP600 is not expected for a few more months. We understand that Westinghouse chose to delay submittal so that it could complete the RAI responses by June. Although the staff has documentation regarding the recent major modifications to the design, they have not been integrated into the SSAR so that the staff can clearly understand the safety implications to the design. In addition, we understand that much of the SSAR may need to be changed as a result of the responses to the RAIs.

The staff has previously indicated to Westinghouse that information not submitted in support of the review of the design by June 30, 1994, might not be considered in the DSER, and therefore, would be designated as open issues for later resolution. There is a potential to have over 300 open items in the

260030

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

9407270167 940722  
PDR ADOCK 05200003  
A PDR

DFB 10

DSER because the staff has not had the benefit of timely submittals. This lack of information will prevent the staff from progressing beyond the early stages of its review in a number of important review areas. This number of open items does not include open issues that will result from the review of information already in-house.

Based on the information currently available for NRC review, a DSER issued in accordance with the expedited schedule will have many open items resulting from unanswered questions and the large quantity of changes to the SSAR that have not been consolidated into one integrated package for review by the staff. Such a DSER may not clearly define all of the staff's concerns on the design, and may not provide an accurate assessment of the design. A DSER with too many open or incompletely reviewed items may be counterproductive to a timely and efficient licensing process. Continued delays in responding to RAIs or providing final design information will jeopardize the review schedule because there are no contingencies for such delays in the recently developed schedules.

We request that you identify when the outstanding design material will be submitted, the RAI responses will be provided, and when related SSAR changes will be sent to the staff. After we receive that information, we will assess the impact on the recently proposed schedule.

Sincerely,

*Original Signed By:*

Dennis M. Crutchfield, Associate Director  
for Advanced Reactors and License Renewal  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File	PDST R/F	WRussell/FMiraglia	ATHadani, 012G18
PDR	DCrutchfield	WTravers	TKenyon
RBorchardt	RArchitzel	KShembarger	FHasselberg
JMoore, 15B18	WDean, EDO	ACRS (11)	

\*See previous concurrence

OFC	LA:PDST:ADAR	PM:PDST:ADAR	SC:PDST:ADAR	D:PDST:ADAR	ADAR:NRR 65
NAME	PShea	TKenyon:sg*	RArchitzel	RBorchardt*	DCrutchfield
DATE	07/ /94	07/21/94	07/22/94	07/21/94	07/22/94

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY:  
DOCUMENT NAME: CONCERNS.LTR

Mr. Nicholas J. Liparulo  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation

Docket No. 52-003  
AP600

cc: Mr. B. A. McIntyre  
Advanced Plant Safety & Licensing  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
Energy Systems Business Unit  
P.O. Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Mr. Raymond N. Ng, Manager  
Technical Division  
Nuclear Management and  
Resources Council  
1776 Eye Street, N.W.  
Suite 300  
Washington, D.C. 20006-3706

Mr. John C. Butler  
Advanced Plant Safety & Licensing  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
Energy Systems Business Unit  
Box 355  
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15230

Ms. Lynn Connor  
Suite 610  
3 Metro Center  
Bethesda, Maryland 20814

Mr. M. D. Beaumont  
Nuclear and Advanced Technology Division  
Westinghouse Electric Corporation  
One Montrose Metro  
11921 Rockville Pike  
Suite 350  
Rockville, Maryland 20852

Mr. Sterling Franks  
U.S. Department of Energy  
NE-42  
Washington, D.C. 20585

Mr. S. M. Modro  
EG&G Idaho Inc.  
Post Office Box 1625  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83415

Mr. Steve Goldberg  
Budget Examiner  
725 17th Street, N.W.  
Room 8002  
Washington, D.C. 20503

Mr. Frank A. Ross  
U.S. Department of Energy, NE-42  
Office of LWR Safety and Technology  
19901 Germantown Road  
Germantown, Maryland 20874

Mr. Victor G. Snell, Director  
Safety and Licensing  
AECL Technologies  
9210 Corporate Boulevard  
Suite 410  
Rockville, Maryland 20850