



Near-term Task Force Recommendation 2.1 (R2.1) Seismic Hazard Evaluation

**Energy Northwest
Columbia Generating Station
Public Meeting
June 4, 2015**

References and Logistics

- Public Meeting Agenda – ML15142A452
- NRC Presentation Slides – ML15155A748
- Licensee Presentation Slides – ML15154B396
- Licensee Hazard Report – ML15078A243
- Screening and prioritization results – ML15113B344
- Meeting Feedback Form (request from njd2@nrc.gov)
- Meeting Summary to be issued within 30-day

Meeting Purposes

- Gather additional information based on early identification of areas where additional technical information will support the staff's review
- Gain a better understanding of how the licensee conducted their evaluation

Outline

- Overview of Recommendation 2.1 – Response to NRC 50.54(f) letter
- Screening and Prioritization results
- NRC approach to seismic hazard characterization reviews for Western US (WUS) sites
- Review schedules and timeline

Seismic R2.1 Process Ensures Clarity, Consistency, and Risk-Informed Regulatory Decisions

PHASE 1

INFORMATION GATHERING

STAGE 1

Interact with Industry on Hazard and Risk Evaluation Guidance



CEUS Licensees submit Site Response (9/2013 & 3/2014)



Licensees submit Hazard Reevaluations and Interim Evaluations, as needed (CEUS:3/2014,WUS:3/2015)

STAGE 2

Screen and prioritize plants for Risk Evaluation.
Review Interim Evaluations, as needed
(CEUS:5/2014; WUS:5/2015)



Screened-in plants complete Expedited Interim Evaluation
(CEUS:12/31/2014;WUS:1/2016)
and Risk Evaluation
(Group 1: 6/2017)



NRC reviews Risk Evaluation

PHASE 2

DECISION-MAKING

NRC makes Regulatory Decisions as Needed

- * Safety Enhancements
- * Backfit Analysis
- * Modify Plant License

Seismic Screening and Prioritization results

- NRC Letter issued for WUS sites on May 13, 2015 (ML15113B344)
- Columbia has screened-in for seismic risk evaluation and limited scope evaluations
 - Review Group 1 plant
- No immediate safety issues identified
- Information supports safety assurance allowing additional time to complete the seismic risk evaluation

NRC Review of SSHAC Studies for WUS Sites

- Did SSHAC process follow NRC guidance?
- How effective was the peer review panel?
- Have all applicable data been considered?
- Were data uncertainties identified and considered?
- Was an appropriate range of applicable models considered?
- How were models selected and weighted in the analysis?
- How were models assembled into the PSHA?

NRC Review of Source Models for WUS Sites

- How were seismic sources identified?
 - Geologic mapping
 - Geophysical observations
 - Earthquake catalog
- How were seismic sources characterized?
 - Geometry (location, length, dip)
 - Range of magnitudes
 - Faulting style (normal, reverse, strike-slip)
 - Slip rate and recurrence models
 - Complex rupture scenarios

NRC Review of Ground Motion Models and Site Response for WUS Sites

- Do final ground motion models capture a reasonable range of alternative models?
- How were sources of uncertainty captured in model development?
- How were ground motion models adjusted for local site geology?
- Does site response analysis cover a reasonable range of alternative soil/rock properties?
- How was uncertainty in site response analysis incorporated into final probabilistic hazard curves?

WUS Hazard Staff Review Timeline

- ✓ March 2015: WUS Hazard Submittals
- ✓ May: Screening and prioritization letter
- ✓ June/July: Public meetings
- Late summer/early fall: Staff questions
- December: GMRS suitability Letter
- January 2016: ESEP Interim Evaluation
- April 2016: ESEP review response
- Summer 2016: Document Hazard review
- June 2017: Risk Evaluation submittal (Grp 1)

Break for NRC Staff Alignment

- 15 – 20 minute planned break for NRC staff alignment to support meeting wrap-up
- Meeting to resume at 3:00pm (Eastern) or 12:00pm (Western)

Opportunity for Public Questions or Comments

- Additional Questions?

Please ask us at:

JLD_PublicResource@nrc.gov

List of Acronyms

- CEUS – Central and Eastern United States
- ESEP – Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process (for Interim Evaluation)
- GMRS – Ground Motion Response Spectrum
- NRC – U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
- NPP – Nuclear Power Plant
- NTTF – Near-Term Task Force
- PSHA – Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Analysis
- SFP – Spent Fuel Pool
- SMA – Seismic Margins Analysis
- SPID - Screening, Prioritization, and Implementation Details SPID
- SPRA – Seismic Probabilistic Risk Assessment
- SSC – Structures, Systems and Components
- SSHAC – Senior Seismic Hazard Analysis Committee
- SSE – Safe Shutdown Earthquake
- SPID – Screening, Prioritization, and Implementation Details
- WUS – Western United States



Backup Slides

Additional WUS Seismic Hazard Reports

Public SSHAC Report


- Hanford Sitewide (PSHA including Columbia Generating Station)

<http://www.hanford.gov/page.cfm/OfficialDocuments/HSPSHA>

Guidance Documents

- Two main guidance documents proposed by industry and endorsed by the NRC
- Screening, Prioritization, and Implementation Details (SPID)
 - Submitted by EPRI on November 2012
 - Endorsed by NRC on February 15, 2013
 - [EPRI-1025287 \(ML12333A170\)](#)
- Seismic Evaluation Guidance: Augmented Approach (aka Expedited Approach)
 - Submitted by EPRI on April 9, 2013
 - Endorsed by NRC on May 7, 2013
 - [EPRI-3002000704 \(ML13102A142\)](#)

Schedule for Seismic Hazard and Risk Evaluations



 **Hazard Analyses**

 **Expedited Interim Evaluations**

 **Risk Evaluations**

✓ **Staff acknowledgement to use GMRS for risk evaluation**

● **Staff Assessment or response**