

June 18, 2015

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 */RA/*
Policy and Support Branch
Japan Lessons-Learned Division
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF JUNE 15, 2015, PUBLIC JOINT STEERING
COMMITTEE MEETING TO DISCUSS ACTIVITIES RELATED TO
LESSONS LEARNED FROM THE FUKUSHIMA DAI-ICHI
NUCLEAR POWER PLANT EVENT

On June 15, 2015 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML15166A167), 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 Dai-ichi. The meeting was held in O13-B4, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland. The NRC slides used in the meeting are available at ADAMS Accession No. ML15166A105. In addition, a detailed description of the NRC's proposed approach for completing Recommendation 2.1—Flooding is available at ADAMS Accession No. ML15163A205. The slides used by the industry are available at ADAMS Accession No. ML15166A123. A list of participants is provided as an enclosure to this document.

The meeting focused on the action plan that the staff is developing in response to Staff Requirements Memorandum (SRM) SRM-COMSECY-14-0037, "Integration of Mitigating Strategies for Beyond-Design-Basis External Events and the Reevaluation of Flooding Hazards." The staff presented its proposed approach as described in the slides. The purpose of these discussions was to clarify the exact deliverables and their due dates and to understand any interdependencies and challenges.

The staff's proposed plan would ensure that licensees address the reevaluated flood hazard levels with the mitigating strategies. For the Near-Term Task Force Recommendation 2.1—Flooding reviews, it would enhance the Phase 1 guidance and develop the Phase 2 guidance. The guidance would establish and support a graded evaluation and decision-making approach with increased focus on the plants with the most potential safety benefit.

Highlights of the discussion included:

- The NRC staff and the industry discussed the proposed schedule for issuing interim letters documenting the staff's acceptance of the reevaluated flood hazards to support the mitigating strategies assessment (MSA). Although a draft schedule has been shared

with the licensees, the industry requested the NRC staff to issue a formal schedule letter.

- The NRC staff and industry are aware that some plants may modify their flood hazard reevaluation reports. It is not yet clear whether those plants would want to modify the hazard reports for use in the MSA or the additional evaluations as part of Phase 1 or Phase 2. The exact number of plants interested in doing so is also not known at this time.
- The NRC staff and industry discussed what was expected to be finished by the end of 2016 for the MSA. The NRC staff would like the assessment and the upgrades to be complete by then. Industry noted that the assessment could be complete by then, but the staff's review of the assessment is not likely to be. Actual changes at the plant may take more time. The NRC and industry agreed that the goal is to be as far along as possible in the assessment and implementation of changes by the end of 2016. Industry suggested having staggered dates for implementation, since the level of effort and complexity would vary by site. The industry will propose the schedule to the NRC for review.
- The staff noted that some portions of the plan are still under development, such as the mechanism for reviewing the MSAs.
- For the additional assessments, the industry and the NRC staff are aligned on the screening criteria, but the industry would like an additional 6 months (to June of 2017) to perform the screening and focused evaluations, provided that MSAs will be ongoing in parallel. Likewise, the industry requested the due date for integrated assessments to be the end of 2018. The staff agreed to consider the proposed schedule, to allow sufficient time for the necessary interactions between the staff and the industry to develop the guidance and assess the screening results.
- The guidance supporting the implementation of the plan was discussed. The significant challenge for the guidance development is the timeframe. The guidance needs to have a public comment period and go to the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards. The industry is also concerned that working on the guidance development could pull resources away from the MSA if they are worked in parallel. The goal is to issue the guidance for the flooding MSA in fall 2015 and the seismic MSA by January 2016. Additionally, the staff will work with the industry to issue the guidance for the screening process in mid-2016.
- A similar process will be used for accounting for the reevaluated seismic hazard in the mitigating strategies. Industry proposed that those plants that are required to perform a seismic probabilistic risk assessment could use the results to assess and identify appropriate mitigating strategies. Since this would extend the timeline, the NRC staff requested the industry to propose an interim evaluation addressing any gaps to justify taking the additional time.

G. Bowman

- 3 -

The NRC staff also informed the industry that the National SAFER Response Centers would be inspected by direct inspection by the NRC's Vendor Inspection Program. The NRC staff also discussed plans for the Tier 2 and 3 recommendations and the status of rulemaking activities.

The next meeting will be held in approximately 6-8 weeks.

Members of the public were in attendance in the room and through the teleconference. Public meeting feedback forms were not received, although a comment was made. The member of the public requested that future meetings be webcast, as is usually done for these types of meetings.

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

Enclosure:
List of Participants

G. Bowman

- 3 -

The NRC staff also informed the industry that the National SAFER Response Centers would be inspected by direct inspection by the NRC's Vendor Inspection Program. The NRC staff also discussed plans for the Tier 2 and 3 recommendations and the status of rulemaking activities.

The next meeting will be held in approximately 6-8 weeks.

Members of the public were in attendance in the room and through the teleconference. Public Meeting Feedback forms were not received, although a comment was made. The member of the public requested that future meetings be webcast, as is usually done for these types of meetings.

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
CSantons, EDO

ADAMS Accession No: ML15168A275

*concurrence via e-mail

OFFICE	NRR/JLD/PSB/PM	NRR/JLD/LA	NRR/JLD/PSB/BC	NRR/JLD/PSB/PM
NAME	LKGibson	SLent	GBowman	LKGibson
DATE	06/18/15	06/17/15	06/18/15	06/18/15

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

LIST OF ATTENDEES

JUNE 15, 2015

JOINT STEERING COMMITTEE MEETING

The participants from the NRC included:

- Michael Johnson, Deputy Executive Director for Operations
- Jennifer Uhle, Deputy Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR)
- Jeremy Bowen, Associate Director, Japan Lessons-Learned Division (JLD), NRR
- Scott Flanders, Division Director, Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis , Office of New Reactors (NRO)
- John Monninger, Director, Division of Safety Systems and Risk Assessment, NRO
- Lauren Gibson, Project Manager, JLD, NRR

The participants from the industry included:

- Joseph Pollock, Vice President, Nuclear Operations, Nuclear Energy Institute (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, Chair of Fukushima Response Steering Committee
- Jim Riley, NEI

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

Enclosure