

September 27, 2013

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

FROM: Lisa M. Regner, Senior Project Manager **/RA/**  
Projects Management Branch  
Japan Lessons-Learned Project Directorate  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF AUGUST 29, 2013, CATEGORY 2 PUBLIC  
WEBINAR TO DISCUSS TOPICS ASSOCIATED WITH JAPAN  
LESSONS-LEARNED PROJECT DIRECTORATE REQUEST FOR  
INFORMATION CONCERNING SEISMIC HAZARD  
REEVALUATIONS

On August 29, 2013, a public meeting was held between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) and representatives of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI), the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), and other industry members. Topics discussed were associated with licensees' efforts to perform plant-specific seismic hazard reevaluations, as requested by the NRC's March 12, 2012, request for information per Title 10 to the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 50.54(f) (50.54(f) letter). Enclosure 1 to the 50.54(f) letter includes Recommendation 2.1: Seismic (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML12056A047).

The meeting participants are included in the enclosure to this document. The following documents were referenced during the meeting:

EPRI Ground Motion Model Acceptance Letter: ML13233A102  
Seismic Hazard and Screening Report example: ML13231A149  
NRC slides on the use of Method 2 for site response: ML13240A327  
EPRI High Frequency Testing Program update: ML13241A029

The first topic staff discussed was the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) screening as provided in the Screening Prioritization and Implementation Details (SPID) guidance,<sup>1</sup> Section 3.3 *IPEEE Screening Task*, and how to address relay chatter. Staff requested NEI staff to submit a proposal by letter for the NRC staff to consider. NEI staff agreed.

---

<sup>1</sup> The SPID guidance is found in ADAMS at Accession No. ML12333A170.

The next topic was a High Frequency Testing Program update from EPRI staff. Please refer to ADAMS Accession No. provided in this document above. The NRC staff then discussed the Seismic Hazard and Screening Report example.

The NRC staff discussed potential issues associated with the use of Method 2 for site response. It stressed that this methodology may be used if adapted to provide complete seismic hazard curves as well as the GMRS. The NRC staff stressed that whether Method 2 or 3 is used, the site response analysis should capture the uncertainty in the subsurface properties as outlined in the SPID guidance and 50.54(f) letter. Industry representatives requested an opportunity to further discuss the use of Method 2 at a future meeting.

The staff then presented proposed topics for the next planned meeting. The topics included:

- Discussion of modifications to the staff's Seismic Hazard and Screening Report example resulting from the discussion at this public meeting
- Prioritization approach
- An industry proposal for the use of Method 2 for site response
- Development of an Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process template

Enclosure:  
Participant list

The next topic was a High Frequency Testing Program update from EPRI staff. Please refer to ADAMS Accession No. provided in this document above. The NRC staff then discussed the Seismic Hazard and Screening Report example.

The NRC staff discussed potential issues associated with the use of Method 2 for site response. It stressed that this methodology may be used if adapted to provide complete seismic hazard curves as well as the GMRS. The NRC staff stressed that whether Method 2 or 3 is used, the site response analysis should capture the uncertainty in the subsurface properties as outlined in the SPID guidance and 50.54(f) letter. Industry representatives requested an opportunity to further discuss the use of Method 2 at a future meeting.

The staff then presented proposed topics for the next planned meeting. The topics included:

- Discussion of modifications to the staff’s Seismic Hazard and Screening Report example resulting from the discussion at this public meeting
- Prioritization approach
- An industry proposal for the use of Method 2 for site response
- Development of an Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process template

Enclosure:  
Participant list

**DISTRIBUTION:**

PUBLIC	RidsOgcMailCenter Resource
JLD R/F	RidsOpaMail Resource
RidsNrrDorl Resource	RidsNrrLASLent Resource
EMiller	RidsAcrcAcnw_MailCTR Resource
TWertz	
LRegner	SKennedy, EDO RI, RII, RIII, & RIV
BWittick	

**ADAMS Accession No.:** ML13261A187

\*Concurrence via e-mail

<b>OFFICE</b>	NRR/JLD/PMB/PM	NRR/JLD/LA	NRR/JLD/PMB/BC	NRR/JLD/PMB/PM
<b>NAME</b>	LRegner	SLent*	MMitchell	LRegner
<b>DATE</b>	9/25/2013	9/ 18 /2013	9/27/2013	9/27/2013

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

Public Webinar to Discuss Topics Associated with Seismic Hazard Reevaluations

August 29, 2013

Participant List

<b>Name:</b>	<b>Organization:</b>
Nilesh Chokshi	U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC)
Kamal Manoly	NRC
Yong Li	NRC
Stephanie Devlin	NRC
Thomas Weaver	NRC
Jon Ake	NRC
Vladimir Graizer	NRC
Clifford Munson	NRC
Michelle Flanagan	NRC
Scott Stovall	NRC
Taekmo Shim	NRC
Siva Lingam	NRC
Gerry Stirewalt	NRC
Thomas Herrity	NRC
Diane Jackson	NRC
George Wilson	NRC
Annie Kammerer	NRC
Lawrence Salomone	Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) – Consultant
Kimberly Keithline	Nuclear Energy Institute
Bob Whorton	Southern California Electric and Gas
John Richards	EPRI
Tim Solberg	Wolf Creek Nuclear Operating Corporation
Jana Bergman	Sciencetech
Michael Hall	DTE Energy
Jeff Kimball	Rizzo Association Incorporated
Greg Hardy	Simpson Gumpertz and Associates
Donald P. Moore	Southern Nuclear Operating
Richard Starck	MPR Associates
Sanj Malushte	Bechtel Power Corporation
Brian Lockett	Zachry Nuclear Engineering, Inc.
Robert Reible	Comanche Peak
Edward Dykes	Constellation Energy Nuclear Group, LLC

Enclosure