

**From:** [Bamford, Peter](#)  
**To:** [Grzeck, Lee](#)  
**Cc:** [Todd, Laura Frances](#)  
**Subject:** Oconee SPRA Questions  
**Date:** Thursday, May 02, 2019 8:35:00 AM  
**Attachments:** [Revised Question 3.pdf](#)

---

Lee, thanks for coordinating the call yesterday from the Duke side. Per the phone call action items, please find a revised question 3 (changes made to both 3a and 3b) that hopefully clarifies the information we are looking for. You should use this version of Question 3 in place of the one I originally sent to you on April 22, 2019 (ADAMS Accession No. ML19113A168).

Thanks.

Peter Bamford  
Senior Project Manager  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRR/DLP/PBMB)  
(301)415-2833

**Question 3 – Topic 14: Peer Review of the Seismic PRA, Accounting for NEI 12-13 (SPID Section 6.7)**

The dispositions to F&O 25-14 and 26-2, related to SRs C-SPR-B1 and C-SPR-A1, respectively, regarding applicability of the accident sequences, system logic, and initiating events in the internal events PRA model to the SPRA, state that the majority of the items did not require updating the SPRA model. However, for the remaining items, the disposition states that they were considered for inclusion. It is unclear to the NRC staff how the systematic review was performed to identify the items for inclusion in the SPRA. The rationale for exclusion of any of the identified items from the SPRA used for this submittal is also unclear. In light of these observations:

- a. Describe the systematic review performed to identify the internal events modeling assumptions applicable to the SPRA and disposition the cited F&Os.
- b. As described in the introductory paragraph to this question, it is unclear if items were excluded from the SPRA. For any items that were excluded, provide justification, such as a sensitivity study, that the exclusion of these items does not impact the decisions for this submittal (i.e., identifying potential substantial safety enhancements using importance measures from the SPRA).