

Beverly Sweeney

From: Nilesh Chokshi
Sent: Tuesday, January 13, 2009 2:52 PM
To: Beverly Sweeney
Subject: FW: Industry Comments on Proposed Seismic Interim Staff Guidance
Attachments: 09-12-07_NRC_Industry Comments on Proposed Seismic Interim Staff Guidance.pdf;
09-12-07_NRC_Industry Comments on Proposed Seismic Interim Staff
Guidance_Enclosure.pdf

From: HEYMER, Adrian [mailto:aph@nei.org]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2007 12:38 PM
To: Nilesh Chokshi, NRC
Subject: Industry Comments on Proposed Seismic Interim Staff Guidance

September 12, 2007

Mr. Nilesh C. Chokshi
Deputy Director
Division of Site and Environmental Review
Office of New Reactors
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, DC 20555-0001

Subject: Industry Comments on Proposed Seismic Interim Staff Guidance

Project Number: 689

Dear Mr. Chokshi:

The industry appreciates the opportunity to comment on the staff's proposed interim staff guidance (ISG) in support of seismic evaluations. This document represents years of work from the industry and NRC staff to update the seismic methodologies and prepare for new plant licensing.

We commend the work of the staff in supporting these evaluations and appreciate the comprehensive and thorough nature of the document. The industry has brought in top experts on seismology to study this issue. As the staff has noted, these individuals tend to follow a more academic timeline than any of us would like, but their work is world renowned. We appreciate the staff's patience in working with them to review technical reports focusing solely on seismic considerations for nuclear power plant sites that were prepared in support of our efforts.

Our comments provided in this letter are largely requests for clarification to ensure consistent interpretation of the guidance over time. This will be critical to our mutual success in closing out these issues since we believe the purpose of this ISG is to provide a single regulatory position on each issue that can be referenced by reviewers and industry alike without question.

There are is one area from enclosure 4 where we feel additional dialogue is warranted:

- In enclosure 4, item 3.1 regarding SSI and Structural Models the guidance states justification should be provided that the SSI and structural models adequately transmit the high frequency ground motion to obtain IRS needed to evaluate high frequency components. Practical analytical modeling limitations will dictate

what is achievable. Specifically the text states, "SSI and structural models are of adequate refinement". The industry proposes further interaction with NRC to arrive at a consensus as to what defines "adequate refinement".

We would appreciate the opportunity to discuss this item and any questions you may have regarding our comments on the ISG document at your earliest convenience.

Again, we thank you for the efforts to provide this ISG and your willingness to work with us on this complex technical issue. We look forward to a continued dialogue on these topics. If you have any questions on this letter or its enclosure, please contact me or Leslie Kass at (202) 739-8115; lck@nei.org.

Adrian P. Heymer
Senior Director, New Plant Deployment

Nuclear Energy Institute
1776 I Street NW, Suite 400
Washington, DC 20006
www.nei.org

P: 202-739-8094
F: 202-533-0147
E: aph@nei.org

nuclear. clean air energy.

This electronic message transmission contains information from the Nuclear Energy Institute, Inc. The information is intended solely for the use of the addressee and its use by any other person is not authorized. If you are not the intended recipient, you have received this communication in error, and any review, use, disclosure, copying or distribution of the contents of this communication is strictly prohibited. If you have received this electronic transmission in error, please notify the sender immediately by telephone or by electronic mail and permanently delete the original message. IRS Circular 230 disclosure: To ensure compliance with requirements imposed by the IRS and other taxing authorities, we inform you that any tax advice contained in this communication (including any attachments) is not intended or written to be used, and cannot be used, for the purpose of (i) avoiding penalties that may be imposed on any taxpayer or (ii) promoting, marketing or recommending to another party any transaction or matter addressed herein.

INDUSTRY COMMENTS ON PROPOSED SEISMIC INTERIM STAFF GUIDANCE

Enclosure 1

No comments

Enclosure 2

The definitions provided by the staff are helpful. To improve the clarity of the footnote on page 5 of enclosure 2, we propose the following amended language to ensure inclusion of the entire soil column:

When the GMRS are determined as free-field outcrop motions on the uppermost in-situ competent material, the site response analysis should be based on the full height of the soil column that includes the soil layers above the uppermost in-situ competent material.

Enclosure 3

The industry recommends the addition of a sentence to the end of the second paragraph as follows:

The above OBE definition meets the intent of the requirement associated with OBE in Appendix S to 10 CFR Part 50 that no explicit response or design analyses are required for OBE.

Enclosure 4

Item 2 Coherency Functions - Second Paragraph

"Since the incorporation of the incoherency effects increases the rotational motions (rocking and torsional), the foundation transfer functions for these motions will be provided when incoherency is included in the soil-structure interaction (SSI) analyses."

This sentence should be deleted for the following reasons:

- (i) It is unclear whether this refers to the Incoherency Transfer Function (the response of the rigid massless foundation, which is only meaningful from the CLASSI analyses) or the response of the foundation after kinematic and inertial interaction. For SASSI, the models will include foundation flexibility and the "foundation transfer functions" will need to be defined as a result of the response at many foundation node points.
- (ii) Items 3.3 and 3.4.1 cover the concept that the model should capture the effects of the additional rotations induced by incoherency. So the statement in Item 2 is covered from a performance basis of the model.

We appreciate the common understanding that has been reached regarding use of the rock coherency function for all sites since it is the most conservative case. We look forward to continuing to work with the staff to explore the use of the other coherency functions in the future.

Item 3.1 SSI and Structural Models

The guidance states justification should be provided that the SSI and structural models adequately transmit the high frequency ground motion to obtain IRS needed to evaluate high frequency components. For high frequency sensitive components (e.g. contacts, relays, etc.), it is our understanding that the analysis of structural models to obtain "accurate" ISRS is not necessary because the industry intends to use a screening procedure for consideration of sensitive components and equipment as defined in the white paper recently sent to the NRC. It is also our understanding that the industry agreed to evaluate the effects of high frequency ground motions on structures, piping, and large major components on a one-time sampling basis using existing models. Practical analytical modeling limitations will dictate what is achievable. "SSI and structural models are of adequate refinement" will require further interaction with NRC to arrive at a consensus as to what defines "adequate refinement".

Item 4 High Frequency Component Screening –

EPRI white papers, *Considerations for NPP Equipment and Structures Subjected to Response Levels Caused by High Frequency Ground Motions* and *Seismic Screening of Components Sensitive to High Frequency Vibratory Motions* have been sent to the NRC and discussed in NRC conference calls and meetings (most notably at the May 31, 2007 meeting). Based on these interactions, the industry understood that these white papers provide an acceptable path forward for high frequency component screening of sensitive components (e.g. contacts, relays, etc.). The industry understood that per the Westinghouse approach, the staff's comments were focused on high frequency effects for structures and large components which are considered separately in Section 3.1 of the ISG. Therefore, it is our understanding from the interactions this year that the EPRI papers provide an acceptable alternative method for component screening compared with that outlined in the ISG enclosure 4, item 4.

Item 5.2 ITAAC –

The industry believes the ITAAC provided in approved design certifications are sufficient to demonstrate that the plant will perform in accordance with seismic design considerations including high frequency ground motion. One exception has been identified related to the potential need for a site-specific COL ITAAC on backfill under Category 1 structures. This has been discussed in recent public meetings with the NRC staff.

While Regulatory Guide 1.206 does not specifically call for such an ITAAC, the industry has determined that for specific soil conditions backfill under Category 1 structures meets the criteria for ITAAC because proper backfill is integral to the ability of Category 1 structures to withstand seismic design-basis loads. The industry also determined that a backfill ITAAC was amenable to generic development.

The backfill ITAAC would be included only in COL applications for sites where the native soil conditions call for backfill under Category 1 structures. The backfill ITAAC would also be included in LWA applications where the requested activities involve backfill under Category 1 structures. The industry has provided a generic backfill ITAAC for NRC consideration in an NEI letter dated August 8, 2007 and is awaiting NRC feedback on the proposal.

Enclosure 5

No comments