

52-003



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 26, 1996

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

SUBJECT: REVIEW SCHEDULE AND PROCESS FOR THE AP600 DESIGN CERTIFICATION APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Liparulo:

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff has reviewed your July 26, 1996, letter which provided revised submittal dates for some of the necessary information for the review of the AP600 design certification application. However, this is not a complete schedule of the key items needed to complete the staff's review. We request that Westinghouse submit a current and comprehensive activity schedule. The schedule should identify all key activities, including submittals, design reviews, and issue resolution. This will enable the staff to develop a firm schedule for the completion of its review.

In response to your statement in the July 26, 1996, letter that certain SSAR information was removed because you believe the information to be "extraneous," the staff does not agree with Westinghouse that all of this information is extraneous. Part 52.47(a)(2) of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations requires the application to contain a level of design information sufficient to enable the Commission to reach a final conclusion on all safety questions associated with the design. In your letter you stated that Westinghouse would resubmit information to the SSAR required to reach a safety conclusion and correctly identified that one branch of the staff agreed to work with Westinghouse (after Revision 6) to return the necessary information. However, we did not expect this exercise to be a continual process of removal in Revisions 6 through 9 and later resubmission. This has increased the review time in several areas. Through subsequent discussions with Westinghouse, the staff has been told that you do not expect to change more information after the current revision (Revision 9) unless requested by the staff. However, if this should change, we request that you do not remove SSAR information without first discussing your intent to do so with the appropriate staff members. Prior communication with the staff will greatly improve review efficiency and will avoid a possible delay in the completion of the review.

One of the issues discussed at the July 17, 1996, Senior Management Meeting was the procedure for closure of open items. Westinghouse indicated the staff could be writing its final safety evaluation report sections for those chapters where final SSAR sections had been provided. However, considerable discussion occurred as to whether the SSAR sections Westinghouse characterized

1/0
DFB3

300109

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

9609300258 960926
PDR ADOCK 05200003
A PDR

September 26, 1996

as final were indeed final. It was agreed that the open items, not SSAR chapters, were important indicators of the progress toward closure. A measure of progress toward closure could be obtained from the open items tracking system (OITS). Westinghouse indicated that they would provide an update of OITS to the staff. The staff would then review OITS and update its status. Westinghouse provided a partial update on July 19, 1996, and provided a full update on August 29, 1996.

The staff has noticed that Westinghouse is now emphasizing the closure of open items, as evidenced by several facsimiles received that indicate the "done-ness" of SSAR chapters or sections and a statement of Westinghouse's closure of associated open items. These "doneness" statements are useful in that they provide a clear understanding what Westinghouse believes the status to be. However, in some cases Westinghouse's closure status appears based on the submittal of a document and does not reflect on-going discussions or reviews that will require further action by Westinghouse. We request that Westinghouse confirm its "doneness" claims by following these Westinghouse staff facsimiles with a formal transmittal to the staff.

Since the requests for additional information (RAIs) constitute a large portion of the remaining open items, and the information Westinghouse will provide in the responses to these open items will include necessary information to complete NRC's review, the staff requests that you include an RAI response schedule in your comprehensive activity schedule. Also, to be included, but not limited to, should be the final computer code benchmarking and validation reports, thermal hydraulic uncertainty results and documentation, shutdown evaluation report, Level 2/3 probabilistic risk assessment, human factors WCAPs, revisions to the SSAR (specifically the change to the design control document format and the incorporation of RAI information), and inspections, tests, analyses and acceptance criteria.

The submittal of a comprehensive activity schedule from Westinghouse would greatly assist the staff in developing a review schedule for the final safety evaluation report. While preparing this schedule, we are willing to hold project telephone conferences or meetings to discuss resource limitations or other items that have impacted the schedule or provide information that could assist your effort.

Sincerely,

original signed by:
Thomas T. Martin, Director
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 52-003

cc: See next page

DISTRIBUTION: See next page

DOCUMENT NAME: A:RSPJUL26.LET (8H AP600 DISK)

To receive a copy of this document, indicate in the box: "C" = Copy without attachment/enclosure "E" = Copy with attachment/enclosure "N" = No copy

OFFICE	PM:PDST:DRPM	D:PDST:DRPM	D:DRPM						
NAME	DTJackson:sg	TRQuay RO	TTMartin						
DATE	09/24/96	09/24/96	09/26/96						

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

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, PA 15230

Mr. Ronald Simard, Director
Advanced Reactor Programs
Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 Eye Street, N.W.
Suite 300
Washington, DC 20006-3706

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

Ms. Lynn Connor
Doc-Search Associates
Post Office Box 34
Cabin John, MD 20818

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

Mr. James E. Quinn, Projects Manager
LMR and SBWR Programs
GE Nuclear Energy
175 Curtner Avenue, M/C 165
San Jose, CA 95125

Mr. Sterling Franks
U.S. Department of Energy
NE-50
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874

Mr. Robert H. Buchholz
GE Nuclear Energy
175 Curtner Avenue, MC-781
San Jose, CA 95125

Barton Z. Cowan, Esq.
Eckert Seamans Cherin & Mellott
600 Grant Street 42nd Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219

Mr. S. M. Modro
Nuclear Systems Analysis Technologies
Lockheed Idaho Technologies Company
Post Office Box 1625
Idaho Falls, ID 83415

Mr. Ed Rodwell, Manager
PWR Design Certification
Electric Power Research Institute
3412 Hillview Avenue
Palo Alto, CA 94303

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

Mr. Charles Thompson, Nuclear Engineer
AP600 Certification
NE-50
19901 Germantown Road
Germantown, MD 20874

DISTRIBUTION:

Docket File

PUBLIC

PDST R/F

TMartin

BGrimes

TQuay

TKenyon

DJackson

BHuffman

JSebrosky

WDean, O-17 G21

JMoore, O-15 B18

EJordan, T-4 D18

ACRS (11)