

## **NRR-PMDAPEm Resource**

---

**From:** Jackson, Diane  
**Sent:** Friday, July 10, 2015 11:14 AM  
**To:** Shams, Mohamed  
**Cc:** DiFrancesco, Nicholas; Wyman, Stephen; Spence, Jane; Devlin-Gill, Stephanie; Roche, Kevin; Yee, On; Wang, Weijun; Gallucci, Ray; Patel, Pravin; Graizer, Vladimir; Pettis, Robert; 50.54f\_Seismic Resource; RidsNroDsea Resource  
**Subject:** POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT - TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST RELATED TO INTERIM ESEP SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF NTTF R2.1, SEISMIC (TAC NO. MF5263 AND MF5264)  
**Attachments:** Point Beach R2.1 seismic ESEP NRC review.docx

July 10, 2015

MEMORANDUM TO: Mohamed K. Shams, Chief  
Hazards Management Branch (JHMB)  
Japan Lessons-Learned Division  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

FROM: Diane T. Jackson, Chief  
Geosciences and Geotechnical Engineering Branch 2 (RGS2)  
Division of Site Safety and Environmental Analysis  
Office of New Reactors

SUBJECT: POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 - TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST RELATED TO INTERIM EXPEDITED SEISMIC EVALUATION PROCESS SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF NTTF RECOMMENDATION 2.1, SEISMIC, RELATED TO THE FUKUSHIMA DAI-ICHI NUCLEAR POWER PLANT ACCIDENT (TAC NO. MF5263 AND MF5264)

The NRC technical staff working through the Geosciences and Geotechnical Engineering Branches 1 and 2 (RGS1 and RGS2) completed the Technical Review Checklist of the POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2 response to Enclosure 1, Item (6) of the March 12, 2012, request for information letter issued per Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, Subpart 50.54(f), to power reactor licensees and holders of construction permits requesting addressees to provide further information to support the NRC staff's evaluation of regulatory actions to be taken in response to Fukushima Near-Term Task Force (NTTF) Recommendation 2.1: Seismic which implements lessons learned from Japan's March 11, 2011, Great Tōhoku Earthquake and subsequent tsunami. This addresses the staff review of the interim Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process (ESEP) report in response to Requested Item (6) of Enclosure 1, "Recommendation 2.1: Seismic," of the 50.54(f) letter. Attached is a file containing the technical review checklist to prepare a response letter to the licensee.

The NRC staff reviewed the information provided and, as documented in the enclosed staff checklist, determined that sufficient information was provided to be responsive to this portion of the Enclosure 1 of the 50.54(f) letter. The application of this staff review is limited to the interim ESEP as part of NTTF R2.1: Seismic activities.

This electronic memo constitutes the DSEA concurrence provided that only editorial changes are made to the staff assessment that would not affect the technical conclusions or technical context of the assessment.

This concludes the NRC's efforts associated with TAC NO. MF5263 and MF5264 for the review of the interim ESEP report for the POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 and 2.

Docket No: 50-266 and 50-301

CONTACT: Stephanie Devlin-Gill  
Office of New Reactors  
301-415-5301

Copy: Nicholas DiFrancesco, Steve Wyman, Jane Spence, Stephanie Devlin-Gill, Kevin Roche, On Yee, Weijun Wang, Ray Gallucci, Pravin Patel, Bob Pettis, Vladimir Graizer, 50.54f\_Seismic Resource, RidsNroDsea Resource

**Hearing Identifier:** NRR\_PMDA  
**Email Number:** 2228

**Mail Envelope Properties** (79bb1aa8b41145a8a96be2e1f59dbae8)

**Subject:** POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT - TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST  
RELATED TO INTERIM ESEP SUPPORTING IMPLEMENTATION OF NTTF R2.1, SEISMIC (TAC NO.  
MF5263 AND MF5264)

**Sent Date:** 7/10/2015 11:14:06 AM

**Received Date:** 7/10/2015 11:14:07 AM

**From:** Jackson, Diane

**Created By:** Diane.Jackson@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"DiFrancesco, Nicholas" <Nicholas.DiFrancesco@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Wyman, Stephen" <Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Spence, Jane" <Jane.Spence@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Devlin-Gill, Stephanie" <Stephanie.Devlin-Gill@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Roche, Kevin" <Kevin.Roche@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Yee, On" <On.Yee@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Wang, Weijun" <Weijun.Wang@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Gallucci, Ray" <Ray.Gallucci@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Patel, Pravin" <Pravin.Patel@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Graizer, Vladimir" <Vladimir.Graizer@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Pettis, Robert" <Robert.Pettis@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"50.54f\_Seismic Resource" <50.54f\_Seismic.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"RidsNroDsea Resource" <RidsNroDsea.Resource@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

"Shams, Mohamed" <Mohamed.Shams@nrc.gov>

Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQPWMSMRS04.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3201	7/10/2015 11:14:07 AM
Point Beach R2.1 seismic ESEP NRC review.docx		47649

**Options**

**Priority:** Standard

**Return Notification:** No

**Reply Requested:** No

**Sensitivity:** Normal  
**Expiration Date:**  
**Recipients Received:**

TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST  
BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION  
RELATED TO EXPEDITED SEISMIC EVALUATION PROCESS INTERIM EVALUATION  
IMPLEMENTING NTTF RECOMMENDATION 2.1 SEISMIC  
POINT BEACH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2  
DOCKET NOS. 50-266 AND 50-301

By letter dated March 12, 2012 (USNRC, 2012a), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued a request for information to all power reactor licensees and holders of construction permits in active or deferred status, pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.54(f) "Conditions of License" (hereafter referred to as the "50.54(f) letter"). Enclosure 1 of the 50.54(f) letter requests addressees to reevaluate the seismic hazard at their site using present-day methods and guidance for licensing new nuclear power plants, and identify actions to address or modify, as necessary, plant components affected with the reevaluated seismic hazards. Requested Information Item (6) in Enclosure 1 to the 50.54(f) letter requests addressees to provide an interim evaluation and actions taken or planned to address a higher seismic hazard relative to the design basis, as appropriate, prior to completion and submission of the seismic risk evaluation.

Additionally, by letter dated April 12, 2013<sup>1</sup>, the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) staff submitted EPRI TR 3002000704 "Seismic Evaluation Guidance: Augmented Approach for the Resolution of Fukushima Near-Term Task Force (NTTF) Recommendation 2.1: Seismic" (hereafter referred to as the guidance). The Augmented Approach proposed that licensees would use an Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process (ESEP) to address the interim actions as requested by Information Item (6) in the 50.54(f) letter. The ESEP is a simplified seismic capacity evaluation with a focused scope of certain key installed Mitigating Strategies equipment that is used for core cooling and containment functions to cope with scenarios that involve a loss of all AC power and loss of access to the ultimate heat sink to withstand the Review Level Ground Motion, which is up to two times the safe shutdown earthquake (SSE). Due to the expedited and interim nature of the ESEP, the assessment does not include many considerations that are part of a normal risk evaluation. These deferred items, include but are not limited to, structures, piping, non-seismic failures, and operator actions, as well scenarios such as addressing loss of coolant accidents. By letter dated May 7, 2013<sup>2</sup>, the NRC staff endorsed the guidance. Central and eastern United States licensees with a reevaluated seismic hazard exceeding the SSE submitted an ESEP interim evaluation in December 2014

Consistent with the interim nature of this activity, the staff performed the review of the licensee's submittal to assess whether the intent of the guidance was implemented. A multi-disciplined team checked whether the identified methods were consistent with the guidance. A senior expert panel reviewed the team's questions, if any, and checklist for consistency and scope. New or updated parameters (e.g., In-Structure Response Spectra, High Confidence of Low Probability of Failure calculations) presented by the licensees were assessed only based on licensee statements for acceptability for the Item (6) response. The application of this staff review is limited to the ESEP interim evaluation as part of NTTF R2.1: Seismic activities.

---

<sup>1</sup> ADAMS Accession No. ML13102A142

<sup>2</sup> ADAMS Accession No. ML13106A331

## NTTF Recommendation 2.1 Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process

### Technical Review Checklist for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

By letter dated December 22, 2014,<sup>3</sup>NextEra Energy Point Beach, LLC (the licensee), provided an Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process (ESEP) report in a response to Enclosure 1, Requested Information Item (6) of the 50.54(f) letter, for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant (Point Beach), Units 1 and 2.

#### I. Review Level Ground Motion

The licensee:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>described the determination of the review level ground motion (RLGM) using one of the means acceptable by the guidance</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identified location of the control point and is consistent with March submittal</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>compared the site ground motion response spectra used to select the ESEP RLGM to the SSE.</li> </ul>	Yes
Point Beach Units 1 and 2 used a scaled SSE at a ratio of <u>1.91</u>	
<b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b> 1. Typo/error in Table 4-2 (page 10 of report) but correct values were used in calculation.	
<b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No deviations or deficiencies were identified.</li> </ul>	
The NRC staff concludes:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the licensee's RLGM meets the intent of the guidance</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the RLGM is reasonable for use in the interim evaluation</li> </ul>	Yes

#### II. Selection of the Success Path

The licensee:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>described the success path</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>described normal and desired state of the equipment for the success path</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>ensured that the success path is consistent with the plant's overall mitigating strategies approach or provided a justification for an alternate path</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>stated that the selection process was in accordance with the guidance or meets the intent of the guidance</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>used installed FLEX Phase 1 equipment as part of the success path</li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>included FLEX Phase 2 and/or 3 <u>connections</u></li> </ul>	Yes
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>considered installed FLEX Phase 2 and/or 3 <u>equipment</u></li> </ul>	Yes

<sup>3</sup> ADAMS Accession No ML14356A426

## NTTF Recommendation 2.1 Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process

### Technical Review Checklist for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

<b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The licensee relies on a diesel driven fire pump in Phase 1 Core Cooling strategies to provide service water as a suction to the turbine drive auxiliary feedwater pump.</li> <li>2. The safety-related fuel oil storage tank is not included in the ESEL and not credited for Phase 1, however, the day tank for the diesel driven fire pump (DDFP) is included. Based on the capacity of the fuel oil day tank and the consumption rate of the pump, and availability of fuel oil in refueling trailers, there is greater than 20 hours of run time for the DDFP. For the interim evaluation, this is acceptable to the staff.</li> </ol>	
<b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No deviations or deficiencies were identified.</li> </ul>	
The NRC staff concludes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• the selected success path is reasonable for use in the interim evaluation</li> <li>• the licensee considered installed Phase 2 and 3 connections or equipment in the interim evaluation.</li> </ul>	Yes  Yes

  

III.      Selection of the Equipment List

The licensee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• developed and provided the ESEL by applying the ESEP</li> <li>• identified equipment considering the following functions:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Core cooling (with focus on Mode 1) function</li> <li>○ Available, sustainable water source</li> <li>○ Containment function and integrity</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes  Yes Yes Yes
--	------------------------------

<b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The staff verified that the licensee identified major components in direct flow path (use system notebooks).</li> <li>2. Typo in Table A, page 41 of 66: 1B<del>4</del>2-3212H should be 1B<del>3</del>2-3212H.</li> </ol>	
<b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• No deviations or deficiencies were identified.</li> </ul>	
<div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"><u>For PWR Plants Only</u></div> The licensee included indicators / instrumentation for the following functions: level, pressure, temperature, that would be indicative of (but not explicitly identified to specific instruments): water level of the steam generator(SG), pressure of SG, containment, and reactor coolant system (RCS); and temperature of the RCS.	Yes
<div style="text-align: center; margin-bottom: 10px;"><u>For BWR Plants Only</u></div> The licensee considered indicators for the following functions: level, pressure, temperature that would be indicative of (but not explicitly identified to specific instruments): Temperature of suppression pool, RCS, containment); Pressure of suppression pool, RCS, and drywell; water level of the suppression pool.	N/A

## NTTF Recommendation 2.1 Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process

### Technical Review Checklist for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

<b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b> None	
<b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b> No deviations or deficiencies were identified.	
Through a sampling of the ESEP key components, the NRC staff concludes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the licensee's process to develop the ESEL meets the intent of the guidance for the interim evaluation</li> <li>the desired equipment state for the success path were identified</li> <li>the licensee considered the support equipment for the ESEL</li> <li>both front-line and support systems appeared to be included in the ESEL as evidenced by inclusion of SSCs on the success path and of support systems (e.g., batteries, motor control center, inverters).</li> </ul>	Yes  Yes Yes Yes

#### IV. Walkdown Approach

The licensee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>described the walkdown screening approach, including walkbys and walkdowns performed exclusively for the ESEP, in accordance with the guidance</li> <li>credited previous walkdown results, including a description of current action(s) to verify the present equipment condition and/or configuration (e.g., walk-bys), in accordance with the guidance</li> <li>stated that the walkdown was performed by seismically trained personnel</li> </ul>	Yes  Yes  Yes
<b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b> None	
<b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No deviations or deficiencies were identified.</li> </ul>	
The licensee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>described, if needed, adverse material condition of the equipment (e.g. material degradation)</li> <li>credited previous walkdown results, included a description of current action(s) to verify the present equipment condition (e.g., walk-bys), meeting the intent of the guidance</li> </ul>	Yes  Yes
The licensee: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>described the conditions of structural items considered for the interim evaluation, including:             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>spatial interactions (i.e. interaction between block walls and other items/components)</li> <li>anchorage</li> <li>piping connected to tanks (i.e. differential movement between pipes and tanks at connections)</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Yes  Yes Yes
<b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Although a statement was not explicit in the submittal, the day tank for the DDFP was included and evaluated as part of the ESEL, in accordance with the guidance, connections were also included in the evaluation.</li> </ol>	
<b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No deviations or deficiencies were identified.</li> </ul>	



## Technical Review Checklist for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

The licensee reported deviations for Point Beach, Units 1 and 2.	No
If deviations were identified, there is a discussion of how the deficiencies were or will be addressed in the ESEP submittal report.	N/A
The NRC staff concludes that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>the licensee described the performed walkdown approach, including any credited previous efforts (e.g., Individual Plant Examination of External Events(IPEEE)) consistent with the guidance</li> <li>the licensee addressed identified deviations consistent with the guidance, if any</li> </ul>	Yes    Yes

## V. Capacity Screening Approach and HCLPF Calculation Results

<p>The licensee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>described the capacity screening process for the ESEL items, consistent with the guidance (e.g., use of EPRI NP-6041 screening table).</li> <li>presented the results of the screened-out ESEL items in the ESEP report</li> <li>described the development of in-structure response spectra(ISRS) based on scaling</li> <li>described the development of ISRS based on new analysis consistent with the guidance</li> <li>described the method for estimating HCLPF capacity of screened-in ESEL items, including both structural and functional failure modes consistent with the guidance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>use of Conservative Deterministic Failure Margin (CDFM)</li> <li>use of fragility analysis (FA)</li> <li>use of experience data or generic information</li> </ul> </li> <li>credited IPEEE spectral shape for HCLPF capacity estimates is similar to or envelopes the RLGM, and anchored at the same control point</li> <li>presented the results of HCLPF capacities including associated failure modes for screened-in ESEL items</li> <li>reviewed the ESEL items with the lowest HCLPF values to ensure that their capacities are equal or greater than the RLGM</li> </ul>	Yes
	Yes
	Yes N/A
	Yes
	Yes N/A Yes
	N/A
	Yes
	Yes

## NTTF Recommendation 2.1 Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process

### Technical Review Checklist for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

**Notes from the Reviewer:**

1. Licensee identified 4 items where the HCLPF is below the RLGM; plant modifications will be made in accordance with EPRI 3002000704 to enhance the seismic capacity of the plant (Section 8.2). Two masonry walls, one block wall, and anchorage for condensate storage tank (CST) T-24A and T-24B. CST modifications (EC279034) to be completed prior to U2 Outage Fall 2015, however the CST mod is not listed as an item in Section 8.4, "Summary of Regulatory Commitments." The masonry and block walls are listed in Section 8.4 under Items 4, 5, and 6.
2. Although the CST modification is not included in the Summary of Commitments, CST modifications are related to Work Control Center block wall modification and listed in Attachment B. Level transmitters LT-4038 and LT-4041 are also affected by the WCC modification. HCLPF value for CSTs and LTs is 0.158 prior to completion of WCC block wall modifications.

**Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:**

- No deviations or deficiencies were identified.

The NRC staff concludes that:	
• the licensee described the implementation of the capacity screening process consistent with the intent of the guidance	Yes
• the licensee presented capacity screening and calculation results, as appropriate, in the ESEP report	Yes
• the method used to develop the ISRS is consistent with guidance for use in the ESEP	Yes
• for HCLPF calculations, the licensee used HCLPF calculation methods as endorsed in the guidance	Yes
• no anomalies were noted in the reported HCLPF	Yes

#### VI. Inaccessible Items

The licensee:	
• provided a list of inaccessible items	Yes
• provided a schedule of the planned walkdown and evaluation for all inaccessible items	Yes
• provided Regulatory Commitment to complete walkdowns.	Yes
Point Beach Units 1 and 2 will complete walkdowns and provide the results within 120 days following the restart from the Unit 2 Fall 2015 outage.	
<p><b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. No walkdown planned for some inaccessible items that are either located in high radiation area and not easily accessible, or inherently rugged and judged adequate by the licensee's SRT, in accordance with guidance. Other inaccessible items in Unit 2 are scheduled to be walked down during Unit 2 outage in Fall 2015.</li> </ol>	
<p><b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b></p> <p>No deviations or deficiencies were identified.</p>	
The NRC staff concludes that the licensee:	
• listed inaccessible items	Yes
• committed to provide the results (e.g. walkdowns, walkbys, etc) of the remaining inaccessible items consistent with the guidance	Yes
• substitutions, if needed, were appropriately justified	Yes

## NTTF Recommendation 2.1 Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process

### Technical Review Checklist for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2

#### VII. Modifications to Plant Equipment

<p>The licensee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identified modifications for ESEL items necessary to achieve HCLPF values that bound the RLGM (excluding mitigative strategies equipment (FLEX)), as specified in the guidance</li> <li>provided a schedule to implement such modifications (if any), consistent with the intent of the guidance</li> <li>provided Regulatory Commitment to complete modifications</li> <li>provided Regulatory Commitment to report completion of modifications.</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>
<p>Point Beach Units 1 and 2 will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>complete modifications by <u>Fall of 2017 or earlier.</u></li> <li>report completion of modifications by <u>60 days following completion of all modifications</u></li> </ul>	
<p><b>Notes from the Reviewer:</b> None</p> <p><b>Deviation(s) or Deficiency(ies), and Resolution:</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No deviations or deficiencies were identified.</li> </ul>	
<p>The NRC staff concludes that the licensee:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>identified plant modifications necessary to achieve the target seismic capacity</li> <li>provided a schedule to implement the modifications (if any) consistent with the guidance</li> </ul>	<p>Yes</p> <p>Yes</p>

#### VIII. Conclusions

Based on its review, the NRC staff concludes that the licensee's implementation of the interim evaluation meets the intent of the guidance. The staff concludes that, through the implementation of the ESEP guidance, the licensee identified and evaluated the seismic capacity of key components that are used for core cooling and containment functions to cope with scenarios that involve a loss of all AC power and loss of access to the ultimate heat sink to withstand a seismic event up to the Review Level Ground Motion (RLGM) and thus, provides additional assurance while the plant seismic risk evaluation is being conducted. The NRC staff concludes that the licensee responded appropriately to Enclosure 1, Item (6) of the 50.54(f) letter, dated March 12, 2012 for Point Beach Nuclear Plant Units 1 and 2.

The NRC staff assessed the licensee's implementation of the ESEP guidance. Due to the interim applicability of the ESEP evaluations, use of the information for another application would require a separate NRC review and approval. Based on its review, the NRC staff concludes that the licensee's implementation of the interim evaluation meets the intent of the guidance. The staff concludes that, through the implementation of the ESEP guidance, the licensee identified and evaluated the seismic capacity of certain key installed Mitigating Strategies equipment that is used for core cooling and containment functions to cope with scenarios that involve a loss of all AC power and loss of access to the ultimate heat sink to withstand a seismic event up to the Review Level Ground Motion (RLGM). In the case of Point Beach, in accordance with the guidance, the RLGM used a scaled SSE at the ratio of 1.91. The staff did not identify deviations or exceptions taken from the guidance. The application of this staff review is limited to the ESEP interim evaluation as part of NTTF R2.1: Seismic activities.

## **NTTF Recommendation 2.1 Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process**

---

### **Technical Review Checklist for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2**

The licensee identified safety enhancing modifications based on the evaluation and committed to complete modifications by Fall of 2017 or earlier and report completion of modifications by 60 days following completion of all modifications.

In summary, the licensee, by implementing the ESEP interim evaluation, has demonstrated additional assurance which supports continued plant safety while the longer-term seismic evaluation is completed to support regulatory decision making. The NRC staff concludes that the licensee responded appropriately to Enclosure 1, Item (6) of the 50.54(f) letter, dated March 12, 2012, for Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2.

Principle Contributors: Ray Gallucci, Kevin Roche, On Yee, Pravin Patel, Robert Pettis, Vladimir Graizer, Weijun Wang, Thomas Houston (NRC Consultant)