

**From:** Mahesh Chawla  
**To:** Joe Birmingham  
**Date:** 2/28/01 2:57PM  
**Subject:** UFSAR review and update

I have completed the review of the UFSAR for both Byron and Braidwood. All the new pages have been inserted and the old pages have been removed. I have provided the list of discrepancies to the licensee and they will submit missing pages and update their copy of the UFSAR for the next update. Attached are the forms filled out for Byron and Braidwood stations. If you have any further questions, please contact me.

Mac Chawla  
(301) 415-8371  
MLC@NRC.GOV

**CC:** Anthony Mendiola, George Dick

**Data Sheets for FSAR Update Monitoring Program\***  
**(WITS Item 199900105, TAC# MA7353)**

**Project Manager: Mahesh Chawla**

**Licensee/Docket No.: \_STN50-456, STN-457**

**Date of Submittal: \_12/16/00**

**Date Completed: \_\_02/28/01**

**Did the licensee indicate that they followed the guidance of RG 1.181 or NEI 98-03? \_NO**

**References:**

- 1. 10 CFR 50.71(e)**
- 2. RG 1.181 and NEI 98-03**
- 3. Memorandum from R. Zimmerman to ADPR PMs and Project Directors, July 22, 1997**
- 4. Project Manager's Handbook, Section 4-5, <http://nrr10.nrc.gov/projects/irm25/ch4/4-5.htm>**

**(Return all completed FSAR reviews to Joe Birmingham, O-11-F-1, 415-2829)\*** The Monitoring Program is based on an audit of a representative sample of those items the Project Manager views as important to the FSAR update consistent with existing FSAR update review practices and requirements (see PM Handbook). This is not intended to be a 100% review of all changes made by the licensees.

**(For use in FSAR Update Monitoring Program WITS Item 19900105)**

Criteria	Reference	Yes	No	Not Known or Comment
1. Was the FSAR update submitted within 10 CFR 50.71(e) time requirements.	See 10 CFR 50.71(e)(4) or PM handbook. (Annually or 6 mos after each refueling outage, not to exceed 24 mos)	X		
2. Were changes to the facility, design bases, or limits of operation, (licensing actions, 50.59 actions, inspection reports, analyses) omitted from the FSAR update? If so, how was the omission resolved?	See PM handbook intro and process section fifth bullet. Also, NEI 98-03, Section 6.1		X	Based on the discussions with licensee and the sample review performed.
3. Were descriptions of modifications to the facility, design bases or limits of operation considered appropriate by the PM?	See NEI 98-03, Section 6.2	X		
4. Was significant information removed from the FSAR? If so, did the submittal indicate that the removal was in accordance with (IAW) RG-1.181 or NEI 98-03?	Needed for March 2001 report to Commission.		X	
5. Were concerns identified for information removed from the FSAR? If so, was the concern resolved? How?	See PM handbook intro and process section, fifth bullet. Also, see NEI 98-03, App A, A2 and A6	X		There were several discrepancies identified. Licensee is going to submit the missing pages and correct these errors for the next UFSAR update.
6. If known to the PM, were long-term temporary modifications expected to be in place through the next FSAR update cycle included in the FSAR update?	See NEI 98-03, Section 8, Treatment of Long-Term Temporary Modifications		X	

7. Were detailed drawings, P&IDs, etc. removed from the FSAR? If so, were simplified drawings or schematics substituted for them?	See NEI 98-03, AppA, A4.2.	X		The removed common drawings of Byron/Braidwood were replaced with individual drawings.
8. Were documents removed from the FSAR? If so, were the documents general reference documents i.e. they provided background material on a subject but not a necessary part of the FSAR?	See NEI 98-03, App A, A4.3 Examples are environmental studies, the ODCM, maintenance procedures, calculation manuals, etc.		X	
9. Was any information incorporated by reference? If so, was the information maintained as part of a controlled licensee document e.g. Emergency Plan, Fire Protection Plan, QA Plan? And had the information been submitted to NRC?	See NEI 98-03, App A, A4.3 This is to ensure that information incorporated by reference meets 50.71(e) update rqmts and the change controls of 50.59 or other applicable regulations.	X		The update includes information incorporated by reference to ITS and TRM which have been submitted to NRC. However, there is an ongoing investigation on removal of information from Table 8.3-5 regarding diesel generator loading.
10. Was risk information (PRAs) for safety significant SSCs removed from the FSAR?	This information needed to assess whether risk important information is being removed from FSARs.		X	

(When complete return to Joe Birmingham, O-11-F-1, 415-2829)

**Mail Envelope Properties** (3A9D580D.536 : 15 : 21352)

**Subject:** UFSAR review and update  
**Creation Date:** 2/28/01 2:57PM  
**From:** Mahesh Chawla  
  
**Created By:** MLC@nrc.gov

<b>Recipients</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
owf2_po.OWFN_DO	Delivered	02/28/01 02:57PM
AJM CC (Anthony Mendiola)	Opened	02/28/01 03:11PM
 owf4_po.OWFN_DO	 Delivered	 02/28/01 02:57PM
GFD CC (George Dick)	Opened	03/03/01 09:18AM
 twf3_po.TWFN_DO	 Delivered	 02/28/01 02:57PM
JLB4 (Joe Birmingham)	Opened	02/28/01 04:22PM

<b>Post Office</b>	<b>Delivered</b>	<b>Route</b>
owf2_po.OWFN_DO	02/28/01 02:57PM	
owf4_po.OWFN_DO	02/28/01 02:57PM	
twf3_po.TWFN_DO	02/28/01 02:57PM	

<b>Files</b>	<b>Size</b>	<b>Date &amp; Time</b>
Braid_FSAR Update_Response.wpd		24301 02/28/01 02:49PM
Byr_FSAR Update_Response.wpd		24830 02/28/01 02:49PM
MESSAGE	1154	02/28/01 02:57PM

**Options**  
**Auto Delete:** No  
**Expiration Date:** None  
**Notify Recipients:** Yes  
**Priority:** Standard

**Reply Requested:**  
**Return Notification:**

No  
None

**Concealed Subject:**  
**Security:**

No  
Standard

**To Be Delivered:**  
**Status Tracking:**

Immediate  
Delivered & Opened