## July 2, 2014

MEMORANDAM TO:	Gregory T. Bowman, Chief Policy and Support Branch Japan Lessons-Learned Division Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
FROM:	Lauren K. Gibson, Project Manager <i>/<b>RA</b>/</i> Policy and Support Branch Japan Lessons-Learned Division Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
SUBJECT:	SUMMARY OF JUNE 19, 2014, PUBLIC JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING TO DISCUSS ACTIVITES RELATED TO LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE FUKUSHIMA DAI-ICHI NUCLEAR POWER PLANT EVENT

On June 19, 2014, a Category 2 public meeting was held between the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Steering Committee and the Industry Steering Committee for applying the lessons-learned from the events at Fukushima Daiichi. The meeting was held in the Commission Hearing Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The NRC slides used in the meeting are available at Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML14170B202. A list of participants is provided as an Enclosure to this document. The meeting was webcast and can be found at the following link for video archives: <u>http://video.nrc.gov/</u>.

The NRC presentation began with an overview of the significant progress that has been made in implementing the lessons-learned. Implementing the recommendations is a multiyear, multistep process. Generally, the steps are to: identify, gather information, and assess; deliberate and decide; regulatory action; licensee actions; and, in some cases, NRC inspection. The staff presented tables of the recommendations with indications of which of those steps have been completed, are in progress, or are scheduled or being actively planned. A few of the recommendations have been completed, but most of the higher priority items are in progress. The industry found the tables to be helpful. The industry noted that public health and safety were being improved throughout the entire process, not just when a recommendation is completed, and recommended that the staff consider incorporating such a perspective in the tables. Each of the steps has already added margin to public safety.

The NRC then discussed the ongoing reorganization of the Japan Lessons-Learned Division. The Japan Lessons Learned Project Directorate and the Mitigation Strategies Directorate merged into one division under the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. While the new division is already officially in place, it will be fully manned as of July 1<sup>st</sup>. When David Skeen assumes his new duties in the Office of International Programs, Jack Davis, the former head of the Mitigation Strategies Directorate, will lead the new division. One of the purposes of the merger was to effectively and efficiently use agency resources to implement the lessons-learned.

Next, the NRC discussed the status of the Mitigation Strategies and the Spent Fuel Pool Instrumentation orders. The onsite audits are continuing. There will be a public meeting on July 2, 2014, to discuss the draft temporary instruction that will cover mitigation strategies, spent fuel pool instrumentation, and emergency preparedness staffing and communications. The NRC staff is planning to approach the long-term regulatory treatment of mitigation strategies in a manner similar to the fire protection program. The industry was generally supportive of this approach, but had concerns about the proposed tiered change control mechanism. Industry noted that this is all beyond-design-basis, so the licensees ideally would have significant control with respect to making changes to their programs, and that any change process should be consistent with NEI 12-06 "Diverse and Flexible Coping Strategies (FLEX) Implementation Guide," Revision B, May 4, 2012 (ADAMS Accession No. ML12144A419). The NRC's intent is to be consistent with NEI 12-06. The NRC noted that this issue is being worked through at a staff level using specific examples. The industry suggested that some of those examples be discussed at the next Joint Steering Committee, and the NRC agreed.

The issues being considered for the long term oversight for mitigation strategies were then covered. Long-term oversight includes the oversight mechanism and the dispositioning of issues for both reactor sites and regional response centers. The NRC will be focusing on the reactor sites as it considers the issues. The intention is to use a direct oversight mechanism (part of baseline inspections) for the reactor sites. The method of dispositioning issues has not yet been decided. The industry noted, with respect to dispositioning issues at the regional response centers, that the industry is dedicated to resolving issues should any arise.

The next topic was severe accident capable hardened vents. The industry is proposing a path forward regarding Phase 2 of this topic which focuses on water injection/management, and deliverables regarding this approach were discussed at a recent working level public meeting. The NRC noted that this approach does appear to be appropriately focused on safety. However, the NRC is concerned that it would be challenging to meet the latest compliance date of 2019 using the industry's suggested approach. The industry acknowledged that it may be a challenge to get the procedures approved through the Boiling Water Reactor Owners Group (BWROG) in time to support the schedule since it would be a modification to the Severe Accident Management Guidelines. The NRC requested that the process of BWROG approval be expedited as much as possible and suggested additional meetings to help with that.

The NRC review of the seismic and flooding walkdown reports is complete. The remaining staff assessments are expected to be issued shortly. Generally, the NRC found that the licensees fulfilled the guidance.

For the seismic hazard reevaluations, the NRC is currently holding public meetings with Category 1 and 2 licensees that have significant differences in the NRC- and licenseegenerated Ground Motion Response Spectra (GMRS) curves. The industry requested a definitive response on the issues that were discussed for those licensees whose meetings have already been held so that they can proceed with the next steps. The industry noted that the urgency is being driven by the due date for the Expedited Approach, which is December 2014. The NRC understands this concern. The NRC is also holding public meetings with plants who have conditionally screened in. The NRC goal is to confirm whether the plants are in or out for additional analysis by the end of July. The industry asked whether those who do not hear until the end of July would still be held to the original due date of December 2014 for the Expedited

Approach. While some plants have been working on the Expedited Approach as much as possible, others were not expecting to have to do that step. If they end up screening in, it would have to be completed rather quickly to meet the deadline. The NRC recognizes that this is a challenge. The NRC would like to hold to the original due date as much as possible, but is willing to entertain requests for extensions with good justification. The NRC also noted that the time crunch is a direct consequence of the insufficient submittals last September. Originally, these issues would have been worked out much earlier. The industry will be providing a draft Expedited Approach submittal that will be used as template.

The industry queried the staff on the differences in approaches for the seismic and flooding reevaluation reviews. For the seismic reevaluation reviews, the NRC performed independent analyses (generated GMRS curves) and compared the results with the submittals. For the flooding reevaluation reviews, the NRC is performing confirmatory analyses. The NRC noted that using an independent analysis tool upfront is helpful for screening, should we have the tool available. The industry would appreciate greater clarification on when the independent analysis approach versus the confirmatory analysis approach is generally used.

The NRC is actively continuing its review of the flooding hazard reevaluation reports and expects to issue the first staff assessment of the Category 1 reports in June. The staff is finalizing the decision on the Category 2 extension requests.

Three flooding focus areas were then discussed: appropriate modeling methods, integrated assessment examples, and phase 2 decision making criteria. Most of the discussion was centered around when licensees could deviate from the staff guidance in modeling methods. Specifically, certain licensees who are able to use values from the National Weather service for Probable Maximum Precipitation would like to perform a site-specific analysis instead of using those values. The NRC is not so much concerned about whether or not the site-specific method would be accurate, but rather about the impact on the overall schedule of licensees choosing a method that is significantly more labor intensive for both the industry and the NRC. The NRC does understand philosophically what the licensees are trying to do. The appropriate rigor for the review of manual actions given that the events are beyond-design-basis was also discussed. Routine working group meetings are being held approximately every 4 weeks. It is extremely important for both NRC and industry to have a clear understanding of the expectations for the Integrated Assessments.

For both seismic and flooding concerns, the NRC and the industry have an action to create a list of priorities. The lists will be compared with each other in a public forum in order to ensure alignment.

After the upcoming milestones were reviewed, the focus areas for the next meeting were discussed. The focus areas are: the long-term regulatory treatment of mitigation strategies and the need to work through the examples for the change control process; the deliverables for the Severe Accident Hardened Vents order; and creating a clearer understanding of priorities and aligning on schedules for the work related to seismic and flooding reevaluations.

The NRC and the industry discussed holding the next meeting in August. In the meantime, another public forum would be used to discuss aligning on the priorities.

Members of the public were in attendance in the room and through the teleconference. Public Meeting Feedback forms were not received.

Please direct any inquiries to me at 301-415-1056 or Lauren.Gibson@nrc.gov.

Enclosure: List of Participants

Members of the public were in attendance in the room and through the teleconference. Public Meeting Feedback forms were not received.

Please direct any inquiries to me at 301-415-1056 or Lauren.Gibson@nrc.gov.

Enclosure: List of Participants

DISTRIBUTION: PUBLIC JLD R/F RidsAcrsAcnw\_MailCTR Resource LGibson, NRR RidsNrrLASLent Resource TWertz, NRR MDudek, EDO

#### ADAMS Accession No: ML14174A833

\*concurrence via e-mail

OFFICE	NRR/JLD/PSB/PM	NRR/JLD/LA*	NRR/JLD/PSB/BC	NRR/JLD/PSB/PM
NAME	LKGibson	SLent	WReckley	LKGibson
DATE	06/20/14	06/23/14	06/25/14	07/02/14

# OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

# LIST OF ATTENDEES

## JUNE 14, 2014

## JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

The participants from the NRC included:

- Michael Johnson, Deputy Executive Director for Operations
- Eric Leeds, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR)
- Jennifer Uhle, Deputy Director, NRR
- David Skeen, Director, Japan Lessons Learned Division (JLD), NRR
- Scott Flanders, Division Director, Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis (DSEA), Office of New Reactors
- Lawrence Kokajko, Division Director, Division of Policy and Rulemaking, NRR
- Jack Davis, Deputy Director, JLD, NRR
- Jeremy Bowen, Branch Chief, Orders Management Branch, JLD/NRR
- Lauren Gibson, Project Manager, JLD, NRR

The participants from the industry included:

- Jim Scarola, Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)
- Joseph Pollock, Vice President, Nuclear Operations, NEI
- Anthony Pietrangelo, Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer, NEI
- Maria Korsnick, Chief Nuclear Officer, Constellation Energy Group and Senior Vice President for Exelon

Additional NRC staff members, industry representatives, and members of the public were in attendance in person or through the teleconference.