

October 11, 2012

MEMORANDUM TO: Mark Tonacci, Chief
Licensing Branch 4 (LB4)
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

FROM: Ngola Otto, Project Manager */RA/*
Licensing Branch 4 (LB4)
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF A PUBLIC CONFERENCE CALL WITH PROGRESS
ENERGY FLORIDA ON AUGUST 30, 2012, REGARDING LEVY
UNITS 1 AND 2 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) held a Category 1 public conference call on August 30, 2012, at 1:30 p.m. to discuss topics related to the Levy Nuclear Plant (LNP) Units 1 and 2 combined license application.

A summary of the topics and discussion appears below.

The meeting attendees list is enclosed. The meeting notice is in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML12226A338.

NRC staff (staff) and Progress Energy Florida (PEF) discussed RAI 109 (ADAMS Accession No. ML12228A611) dated August 15, 2012, related to NRC Bulletin 2012-01: Design Vulnerability of the Electric Power System (ADAMS Accession No. ML12074A115). Based on the discussion, PEF committed to providing a draft response for staff review by September 7, 2012, and a final response by September 14, 2012, if there were no changes needed to the draft response. Both NRC and PEF would then determine whether a discussion of the draft response was needed during the September 13, 2012 public meeting.

The staff and PEF also discussed the following questions below based on the staff's review of the response to NRC RAI 108 (ADAMS Accession No. ML122230155), Supplement 2, dated August 1, 2012 related to seismic hazard re-analysis.

- There is a discrepancy between NUREG-2115 Appendix H Equation H-1 and the original equation by Wells and Coppersmith (1994). The staff would like to discuss the applicant's implementation of NUREG-2115 Appendix H Equation H-1 for the Levy application.

CONTACT: Ngola Otto, NRO/DNRL
(301) 415-6695

- As described in final safety analysis report (FSAR) Section 2.5.2.7.2.6 “Results for the Savannah Site,” you modeled the Charleston regional and local sources using two different methods. First using “a series of closely spaced pseudo faults parallel to the northeast orientation of the zone and earthquake ruptures were modeled as occurring uniformly along these faults”. Second, an alternative approach was used “in which the source zone was filled with a grid of uniformly spaced points. At each location, magnitude-dependent ruptures were placed with the specified northeast orientation with a random location on the grid point. The “strict” boundary condition for the regional and local geometries was then imposed by forcing the ruptures to remain within the source boundary.” Please clarify which source model implementation was used for modeling the effects of the Charleston regional and local sources at the Levy site.
- In NUREG-2115, the Charleston RLME regional source is described being modeled as having two alternative fault rupture orientations (1) is parallel to the long axis of the source (northeast) with 0.80 weight, and (2) is oriented parallel to the short axis of the source (northwest) with 0.20 weight. Please verify that these are the orientations and weights used in your model computer files for the calculation of the Levy seismic hazard.
- NUREG-2115 lists the following moment magnitudes (M) as maximum magnitudes and (weights) for implementing the Charleston RLME source – M6.7 (0.1), M6.9 (0.25), M7.1 (0.3), M7.3 (0.25), and M7.5 (0.1). Please verify that these are the input parameters you coded into your model computer files for the calculation of seismic hazard at the Levy site.

Based on the discussion, PEF indicated that they may revise their response providing additional detail to address staff's questions.

Docket Nos.: 052-029 and 052-030

Enclosures:
Meeting Attendees List

cc w/encls: See next page

- As described in final safety analysis report (FSAR) Section 2.5.2.7.2.6 “Results for the Savannah Site,” you modeled the Charleston regional and local sources using two different methods. First using “a series of closely spaced pseudo faults parallel to the northeast orientation of the zone and earthquake ruptures were modeled as occurring uniformly along these faults”. Second, an alternative approach was used “in which the source zone was filled with a grid of uniformly spaced points. At each location, magnitude-dependent ruptures were placed with the specified northeast orientation with a random location on the grid point. The “strict” boundary condition for the regional and local geometries was then imposed by forcing the ruptures to remain within the source boundary.” Please clarify which source model implementation was used for modeling the effects of the Charleston regional and local sources at the Levy site.
- In NUREG-2115, the Charleston RLME regional source is described being modeled as having two alternative fault rupture orientations (1) is parallel to the long axis of the source (northeast) with 0.80 weight, and (2) is oriented parallel to the short axis of the source (northwest) with 0.20 weight. Please verify that these are the orientations and weights used in your model computer files for the calculation of the Levy seismic hazard.
- NUREG-2115 lists the following moment magnitudes (M) as maximum magnitudes and (weights) for implementing the Charleston RLME source – M6.7 (0.1), M6.9 (0.25), M7.1 (0.3), M7.3 (0.25), and M7.5 (0.1). Please verify that these are the input parameters you coded into your model computer files for the calculation of seismic hazard at the Levy site.

Based on the discussion, PEF indicated that they may revise their response providing additional detail to address staff's questions.

Docket Nos.: 052-029 and 052-030

Enclosures:
Meeting Attendees List

cc w/encls: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	DHabib	NOtto	JHale	RKaras
RidsOgcMailCenter	SDevlin	MTonacci	FAkstulewicz	JAndersen
NRO_DNRL_LB4	VGraizer	ZXi	GStirewalt	RMathew
JMartin	PKang			

ADAMS Accession No.: ML12265A085

NRC-001

OFFICE	LA: DNRL/LB4	PM: DNRL/LB4
NAME	RButler	NOtto
DATE	09/18/12	10/11/2012

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

List of Attendees
U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)/Progress Energy Florida (PEF)
Public Conference Call
August 30, 2012

Purpose: To address issues related to the Levy Units 1 and 2 combined license application.

Name	Organization
Ngola Otto	NRO/DNRL/LB4
Jerry Hale	NRO/DNRL/LB4
Stephanie Devlin	NRO/DSEA/RGS
Vladimir Graizer	NRO/DSEA/RGS
James Anderson	NRR/EEEB
Peter Kang	NRR/EEEB
Dave Waters	Duke Energy*
Bob Kitchen	Duke Energy*
Ken Pigg	Duke Energy*
A.K. Singh	Sargent & Lundy
Bob Youngs	AMEC
Jen Schaefer	CH2MHILL
Rich Delong	Westinghouse

* Under a recently completed merger, Duke Energy is the corporate parent of the applicant, PEF.

Enclosure

COL - Progress Energy - Levy County Mailing List

(Revised 09/10/2012)

cc:

Ms. Michele Boyd
Legislative Director
Energy Program
Public Citizens Critical Mass Energy
and Environmental Program
215 Pennsylvania Avenue, SE
Washington, DC 20003

Ms. Georgia Cranmore
Assistant Regional Administrator
NOAA Fisheries Southeast Regional Office
9721 Executive Center Drive North
Saint Petersburg, FL 33702

Mr. Christopher M. Fallon
VP, Nuclear Development
Progress Energy Florida, Inc.
P.O. Box 1006 - ECO9D
Charlotte, NC 28202

COL - Progress Energy - Levy County Mailing List

Email

APH@NEI.org (Adrian Heymer)
awc@nei.org (Anne W. Cottingham)
Bill.Jacobs@gdsassociates.com (Bill Jacobs)
billn@fcan.org (Bill Newton)
brian.mccabe@pgnmail.com (Brian McCabe)
BrinkmCB@westinghouse.com (Charles Brinkman)
christopher.fallon@duke-energy.com (Christopher M. Fallon)
CumminWE@Westinghouse.com (Edward W. Cummins)
cwaltman@roe.com (C. Waltman)
david.lewis@pillsburylaw.com (David Lewis)
david.waters@pgnmail.com (Dave Waters)
ed.burns@earthlink.net (Ed Burns)
gzinke@entergy.com (George Alan Zinke)
joe.w.donahue@pgnmail.com (Joe Donahue)
john.elnitsky@pgnmail.com (John Elnitsky)
Joseph_Hegner@dom.com (Joseph Hegner)
KSutton@morganlewis.com (Kathryn M. Sutton)
kwaugh@impact-net.org (Kenneth O. Waugh)
lchandler@morganlewis.com (Lawrence J. Chandler)
levynuke@ecologyparty.org (Cara Campbell)
maria.webb@pillsburylaw.com (Maria Webb)
mark.beaumont@wsms.com (Mark Beaumont)
maryo@nirs.org (Mary Olson)
matias.travieso-diaz@pillsburylaw.com (Matias Travieso-Diaz)
media@nei.org (Scott Peterson)
Mike.Halpin@dep.state.fl.us (Mike Halpin)
MSF@nei.org (Marvin Fertel)
nirsnet@nirs.org (Michael Mariotte)
Nuclaw@mindspring.com (Robert Temple)
patriciaL.campbell@ge.com (Patricia L. Campbell)
Paul@beyondnuclear.org (Paul Gunter)
pbessette@morganlewis.com (Paul Bessette)
RJB@NEI.org (Russell Bell)
robert.kitchen@pgnmail.com (Robert H. Kitchen)
ronald_m_bright@bellsouth.net (Ronald Bright)
sabinski@suddenlink.net (Steve A. Bennett)
sfrantz@morganlewis.com (Stephen P. Frantz)
stephan.moen@ge.com (Stephan Moen)
Tansel.Selekler@nuclear.energy.gov (Tansel Selekle)
twinkletoesdms@aol.com (Robert and Deborah Smith)
Vanessa.quinn@dhs.gov (Vanessa Quinn)