



UNITED STATES  
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

March 20, 2013

Ms. Kimberly A. Keithline  
Senior Project Manager  
Nuclear Energy Institute  
1776 I Street NW, Suite 400  
Washington, DC 20006-3708

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF DRAFT ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE REPORT, "SEISMIC EVALUATION GUIDANCE: AUGMENTED APPROACH FOR THE RESOLUTION OF FUKUSHIMA NEAR-TERM TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION 2.1: SEISMIC"

Dear Ms. Keithline:

On behalf of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the staff), I am responding to the Nuclear Energy Institute's (NEI's) January 31, 2013, letter<sup>1</sup> transmitting the Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI) draft document, "Draft – EPRI (2004, 2006) Ground-Motion Model (GMM) Review Project" (GMM update project). The purpose of this letter was to transmit information on a preliminary, updated, EPRI GMM for the central and eastern United States (CEUS) to "facilitate discussion and decision making." A CEUS GMM will be used by licensees in responding to Enclosure 1, "Recommendation 2.1: Seismic," of the March 12, 2012, information request<sup>2</sup> that was issued pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), Section 50.54(f) (50.54(f) letter). The 50.54(f) letter was issued as part of the lessons learned from the accident at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear facility. The 50.54(f) letter requested, in part, nuclear power plant licensees to perform a seismic hazard reevaluation and indicated that licensees in the CEUS are to use the EPRI (2004, 2006) GMM currently endorsed by the NRC.

The GMM update project was undertaken by the EPRI staff to provide a more current GMM for use by the CEUS licensees in responding to the 50.54(f) letter. By letter<sup>3</sup> dated August 24, 2012, the EPRI staff notified the NRC of its intent to proceed with Phase 2 of the GMM update project.

Staff conducted three public meetings to discuss EPRI's GMM update project on October 18, 2012, January 23, 2013, and February 28, 2013. At the January 23, 2013, public meeting, industry stated it expected to receive formal staff approval to use the updated GMM by February 27, 2013. Staff stressed that industry should use the existing EPRI 2004, 2006 staff-approved model if staff was not able to approve the EPRI update.

At this time the NRC staff is unable to accept the EPRI updated GMM for CEUS licensees due to two major concerns with the updated model:

<sup>1</sup> The letter is available in the Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS) under Accession No. ML13059A090.

<sup>2</sup> The letter is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML12053A340.

<sup>3</sup> The letter is available in ADAMS under Accession No. ML12240A034.

- **Treatment of Uncertainty** – Only three new ground motion models were included in the proposed update while several previously used ground motion prediction equations were eliminated from the new model; two of the new models receive a disproportionate amount of weight relative to the other models.
- **Documentation** – The documentation provided is inadequate; therefore staff cannot make its determination of acceptability; portions of the report that were expected to be completed by January were insufficient. Specifically, staff needs to understand why application of the draft updated EPRI GMM results in significant changes in hazard results for seven test sites in the CEUS.

The NRC staff notified industry and stakeholders of these concerns at a public meeting on February 28, 2013. After stating its concerns, the staff provided suggestions for potential improvements to the GMM update project to better capture uncertainties. Staff is willing to continue to work with industry to ensure the NRC staff's concerns are addressed and to arrive at a mutually agreeable GMM update for the CEUS. The next public meeting<sup>4</sup> to discuss the GMM update project is March 26, 2013. However, by this letter we are notifying you that the staff has ceased its formal review of NEI's January 31, 2013, submittal. After NRC and industry staff resolve the concerns noted above, the NRC will open a new formal review if industry chooses to submit a revised GMM and supporting technical basis document.

If you or your staff have additional questions, please contact Lisa Regner at 301-415-1906, or by email at [Lisa.Regner@nrc.gov](mailto:Lisa.Regner@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,



Matthew A. Mitchell, Chief  
Projects Management Branch  
Japan Lessons-Learned Project Directorate  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See enclosed list  
Additional distribution via Listserv

---

<sup>4</sup> The meeting notice is available in ADAMS at Accession No. ML13065A056.

- **Treatment of Uncertainty** – Only three new ground motion models were included in the proposed update while several previously used ground motion prediction equations were eliminated from the new model; two of the new models receive a disproportionate amount of weight relative to the other models.
- **Documentation** – The documentation provided is inadequate; therefore staff cannot make its determination of acceptability; portions of the report that were expected to be completed by January were insufficient. Specifically, staff needs to understand why application of the draft updated EPRI GMM results in significant changes in hazard results for seven test sites in the CEUS.

The NRC staff notified industry and stakeholders of these concerns at a public meeting on February 28, 2013. After stating its concerns, the staff provided suggestions for potential improvements to the GMM update project to better capture uncertainties. Staff is willing to continue to work with industry to ensure the NRC staff's concerns are addressed and to arrive at a mutually agreeable GMM update for the CEUS. The next public meeting<sup>5</sup> to discuss the GMM update project is March 26, 2013. However, by this letter we are notifying you that the staff has ceased its formal review of NEI's January 31, 2013, submittal. After NRC and industry staff resolve the concerns noted above, the NRC will open a new formal review if industry chooses to submit a revised GMM and supporting technical basis document.

If you or your staff have additional questions, please contact Lisa Regner at 301-415-1906, or by email at [Lisa.Regner@nrc.gov](mailto:Lisa.Regner@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,  
/RA/

Matthew A. Mitchell, Chief  
Projects Management Branch  
Japan Lessons-Learned Project Directorate  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

cc: See enclosed list  
Additional distribution via Listserv

**DISTRIBUTION:**

See next page

**ADAMS Accession No.:** ML13078A029

\*Concurrence via e-mail

<b>OFFICE</b>	LA: NRR/DORL	PM: NRR/JLD/PMB	SLS: NRO/DSEA
<b>NAME</b>	SRohrer	LRegner	CMunson*
<b>DATE</b>	03/19/2013	03/19/2013	03/19/2013
<b>OFFICE</b>	SLS: NRR/DE	BC: NRR/JLD/PMB	PM: NRR/JLD/PMB
<b>NAME</b>	KManoly*	MMitchell*	LRegner
<b>DATE</b>	03/20/2013	03/19/2013	03/20/2013

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**

<sup>5</sup> The meeting notice is available in ADAMS at Accession No. ML13065A056.

Letter to Kimberly A. Keithline from Lisa M. Regner dated March xx, 2013

SUBJECT: RESPONSE TO NUCLEAR ENERGY INSTITUTE REQUEST FOR REVIEW OF DRAFT ELECTRIC POWER RESEARCH INSTITUTE REPORT, "SEISMIC EVALUATION GUIDANCE: AUGMENTED APPROACH FOR THE RESOLUTION OF FUKUSHIMA NEAR-TERM TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION 2.1: SEISMIC"

Distribution:

PUBLIC	RidsNrrLASFigueroa
LPL1-1 R/F	RidsNrrLAKGoldstein
LPL1-2 R/F	RidsNrrLASRohrer
LPLI2-1 R/F	RidsNrrLABTully
LPL2-2 R/F	RidsNrrPMANO
LPL3-1 R/F	RidsNrrPMBeaverValley
LPL3-2 R/F	RidsNrrPMBellefonte
LPL4 R/F	RidsNrrPMBraidwood
RidsNroOd	RidsNrrPMBrownsFerry
RidsNrrDorl	RidsNrrPMBrunswick
RidsNrrDorlLp1-1	RidsNrrPMByron
RidsNrrDorlLp1-2	RidsNrrPMCallaway
RidsNrrDorlLp2-1	RidsNrrPMCalvertCliffs
RidsNrrDorlLp2-2	RidsNrrPMCatawba
RidsNrrDorlLp3-1	RidsNrrPMClinton
RidsNrrDorlLp3-2	RidsNrrPMColumbia
RidsNrrDorlLp4	RidsNrrPMComanchePeak
RidsNrrOd	RidsNrrPMCooper
RidsNsirOd	RidsNrrPMCrystalRiver
RidsOeMailCenter	RidsNrrPMDCCook
RidsOgcMailCenter	RidsNrrPMDavisBesse
LRegner, NRR	RidsNrrPMDiabloCanyon
MMitchell, NRR	RidsNrrPMDresden
DSkeen, NRR	RidsNrrPMDuaneArnold
RTaylor, NRR	RidsNrrPMFarley
GWilson, NRR	RidsNrrPMFermi2
MKhanna, NRR	RidsNrrPMFitzPatrick
RPascarelli, NRR	RidsNrrPMFortCalhoun
JQuichocho, NRR	RidsNrrPMGrandGulf
RCarlson, NRR	RidsNrrPMHatch
MMarkley, NRR	RidsNrrPMHopeCreek
DBroaddus, NRR	RidsNrrPMIndianPoint
KManoly, NRR	RidsNrrPMKewaunee
NChoski, NRO	RidsNrrPMLaSalle
SFlanders, NRO	RidsNrrPMLimerick
CMunson, NRO	RidsNrrPMMcGuire
RidsNrrLAABaxter	RidsNrrPMMillstone
RidsNrrLAJBurkhardt	RidsNrrPMMonticello
RidsNrrLABClayton	RidsNrrPMNineMilePoint

RidsNrrPMNorthAnna  
RidsNrrPMOconee  
RidsNrrPMOysterCreek  
RidsNrrPMPalisades  
idsNrrPMPaloVerde  
idsNrrPM PeachBottom  
idsNrrPMPerry  
RidsNrrPMPilgrim  
RidsNrrPMPointBeach  
RidsNrrPMPrairieIsland  
RidsNrrPMQuadCities  
RidsNrrPMREGinna  
RidsNrrPMRiverBend  
RidsNrrPMRobinson  
RidsNrrPMSalem  
RidsNrrPMSanOnofre  
RidsNrrPMSeabrook  
RidsNrrPMSequoyah  
RidsNrrPMShearonHarris  
RidsNrrPMSouthTexas  
RidsNrrPMStLucie  
RidsNrrPMSummer  
RidsNrrPMSurry  
RidsNrrPMSusquehanna  
RidsNrrPMThreeMileIsland  
RidsNrrPMTurkeyPoint  
RidsNrrPMVermontYankee  
RidsNrrPMVogle  
RidsNrrPMWaterford  
RidsNrrPMWattsBar1  
RidsNrrPMWattsBar2  
RidsNrrPMWolfCreek  
RidsOgcRp Resource  
RidsRgn1MailCenter Resource  
RidsRgn2MailCenter Resource