



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

September 12, 2012

MEMORANDUM TO: Matthew A. Mitchell, Chief
Projects Management Branch
Japan Lessons-Learned Project Directorate
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: G. Edward Miller, Project Manager *Richard Lerner for*
Projects Management Branch
Japan Lessons-Learned Project Directorate
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF AUGUST 21, 2012, PUBLIC MEETING ON
IMPLEMENTATION OF NEAR-TERM TASK FORCE
RECOMMENDATION 2.1, FLOODING HAZARD REANALYSIS,
RELATED TO THE FUKUSHIMA DAI-ICHI NUCLEAR POWER
PLANT ACCIDENT

On August 21, 2012, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff held a public meeting¹ with the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) and industry representatives to discuss addressing the recommendations in the *Near-Term Task Force (NTTF) Recommendations for Enhancing Reactor Safety in the 21st Century* report, issued July 12, 2011.² The meeting was focused specifically on the NTTF Recommendation 2.1, flooding hazard reanalysis, which is one of the Tier 1 recommendations under consideration for implementation without unnecessary delay. By letter dated March 12, 2012, the NRC issued an information request³ pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* 50.54(f) to implement this recommendation.

The first discussion was on the burden associated with including flooding-induced loss of the ultimate heat sink (UHS) within the scope of the hazard reevaluations. Previously, NEI had submitted a letter⁴ indicating that inclusion flooding-induced loss of the UHS should be a Tier 2 activity and would adversely impact the schedule for completing the reevaluations. In a previous public meeting, the NRC staff requested additional details of the impact such as additional man-hours of effort and anticipated schedule delays. NEI provided a discussion of the impact and supporting assumptions. Additionally, they agreed to provide this information in writing⁵ after the meeting.

The next topic discussed was NEI's proposed position on hazard screening.⁶ The NRC staff provided feedback that it was amenable to the concept of providing a concise engineering justification to determine that a potential hazard mechanism isn't feasible for a particular site,

¹ The original meeting notice is available via the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) under Accession No. ML12220A016.

² The NTTF report is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML111861807.

³ The 50.54(f) letter is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12053A340.

⁴ The NEI letter is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12236A228.

⁵ The details of including flooding-induced loss of the UHS are available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12236A217.

⁶ The NEI position paper is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12219A300.

but would evaluate each such justification on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, the NRC staff indicated that there was disagreement with a number of the examples included.

The next topic discussed was the NEI write-ups on how to determine available physical margin (APM).⁷ In support of the discussion, the NEI staff provided a draft position paper.⁸ This continued a discussion on whether APM should be determined solely as a difference in height or if other factors (e.g., the ability of submerged seals to handle increased hydrostatic pressure) needed to be considered. NEI agreed that the suggested position could work going forward, but identified that some plants that have already completed the walkdowns may not be in alignment with the position. After some discussion, NEI agreed to provide a revised write-up that addresses this issue for discussion at the next public meeting.

The final topic was a presentation by NEI⁹ regarding the interim staff guidance being developed on performing an integrated assessment. The discussion following the presentation identified the need, at the next public meeting, to begin review and editing of the actual document.

The meeting concluded with no additional questions or comments. A reminder was given that the next public meeting was on August 30, 2012. Subsequent to the meeting, however, the meeting date was moved to August 28, 2012, to accommodate the schedules of critical participants.

Enclosure:
Lists of Attendees

⁷ The write-ups on determining APM are available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12219A257.

⁸ The draft position paper is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12236A213.

⁹ The NEI presentation is available in ADAMS under accession No. ML12236A168.

Sign In Sheet

Discussion of 2.1 Flooding

DATE: August 21, 2012

Name	Organization
Ed MILLER	NRR/JLD
Janise Thompson	NRO/DSEA
JEFF MITMAN	NRR/DRA/APOB
Rich LAURA	NRR/JLD
MALCOLM PATTERSON	NRO/DSRA
Joseph Kanney	RES/DRA
Joseph P. [unclear]	RES/DRA
Peter Chaput	NRO/DSEA
Michelle Benci	NRC
Michael Chelbi	NRG
Christopher Cook	NRC
VIA PHONE	
JIM CHAPMAN	SCIENTECH
JIM RILEY	NEI

but would evaluate each such justification on a case-by-case basis. Additionally, the NRC staff indicated that there was disagreement with a number of the examples included.

The next topic discussed was the NEI write-ups on how to determine available physical margin (APM).⁷ In support of the discussion, the NEI staff provided a draft position paper.⁸ This continued a discussion on whether APM should be determined solely as a difference in height or if other factors (e.g., the ability of submerged seals to handle increased hydrostatic pressure) needed to be considered. NEI agreed that the suggested position could work going forward, but identified that some plants that have already completed the walkdowns may not be in alignment with the position. After some discussion, NEI agreed to provide a revised write-up that addresses this issue for discussion at the next public meeting.

The final topic was a presentation by NEI⁹ regarding the interim staff guidance being developed on performing an integrated assessment. The discussion following the presentation identified the need, at the next public meeting, to begin review and editing of the actual document.

The meeting concluded with no additional questions or comments. A reminder was given that the next public meeting was on August 30, 2012. Subsequent to the meeting, however, the meeting date was moved to August 28, 2012, to accommodate the schedules of critical participants.

Enclosure:
Lists of Attendees

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RidsOgcMailCenter Resource	JThompson
JLD R/F	RidsOpaMail Resource	JMitman
TWertz	RidsNrrDorl Resource	RLaura
PHiland	RidsAcrcsAcnw_MailCTR Resource	MPatterson
RRaione	RidsRgn1MailCenter Resource	JKanney
ARussell	RidsRgn2MailCenter Resource	JPhilip
GWilson	RidsRgn3MailCenter Resource	PChaput
CCook	RidsRgn4MailCenter Resource	MBensi
NChokshi	SKennedy, EDO RI, RII, RIII, and RIV	GMiller
JCaverly	RidsNrrLABTully Resource	KManoly
CMunson		

ADAMS Accession Nos.: ML12220A014 (Pkg.), ML12240A020 (Sum.)

OFFICE	PM: NRR/JLD/PMB	LA: NRR/DORL	BC: NRR/JLD/PMB	PM: NRR/JLD/PMB
NAME	EMiller (RLaura for)	BTully	MMitchell	EMiller (RLaura for)
DATE	09/10/2012	09/11/2012	09/12/2012	09/12/2012

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

⁷ The write-ups on determining APM are available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12219A257.

⁸ The draft position paper is available under ADAMS Accession No. ML12236A213.

⁹ The NEI presentation is available in ADAMS under accession No. ML12236A168.