

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

September 10, 2015

Mr. Robert Braun President and Chief Nuclear Officer PSEG Nuclear LLC-N09 P. O. Box 236 Hancocks Bridge, NJ 08038

SUBJECT: HOPE CREEK GENERATING STATION – INTERIM STAFF RESPONSE TO REEVALUATED FLOOD HAZARDS SUBMITTED IN RESPONSE TO 10 CFR 50.54(f) INFORMATION REQUEST – FLOOD-CAUSING MECHANISM REEVALUATION (TAC NO. MF3789)

Dear Mr. Braun:

The purpose of this letter is to provide a summary of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff's assessment of the re-evaluated flood-causing mechanisms described in the March 12, 2014 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML14071A511) flood hazard reevaluation report (FHRR) submitted by PSEG Nuclear LLC (PSEG, the licensee) for Hope Creek Generating Station (Hope Creek), as well as supplemental information resulting from requests for additional information and audits.

By letter dated March 12, 2012, the NRC issued a request for information pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations*, Section 50.54(f) (hereafter referred to as the 50.54(f) letter) (ADAMS Accession No. ML12053A340). The request was issued as part of implementing lessons-learned from the accident at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant. Enclosure 2 to the 50.54(f) letter requested licensees to re-evaluate flood-causing mechanisms using present-day methodologies and guidance. Concurrently, with the reevaluation of flooding hazards, licensees were required to develop and implement mitigating strategies in accordance with NRC Order EA-12-049, "Requirements for Mitigation Strategies for Beyond-Design-Basis External Events" (ADAMS Accession No. ML12054A735). On March 30, 2015, the Commission provided Staff Requirements Memoranda (SRM) (ADAMS Accession No. ML15089A236) to COMSECY-14-0037, "Integration of Mitigating Strategies for Beyond-Design-Basis External Events and the Reevaluation of Flooding Hazards," dated November 21, 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14309A256), affirming that licensees need to address the reevaluated flooding hazards within their mitigating strategies for beyond-design-basis external events.

The NRC staff has reviewed the information submitted by the licensee and has summarized the results of the review in the tables provided as an Enclosure to this letter. Table 1 provides the current design-basis flood hazard mechanisms. Table 2 provides the reevaluated flood hazard mechanisms; however, the reevaluated flood hazard mechanisms bounded by the current design-basis (Table 1) are not included.

R. Braun

The NRC staff has concluded that the licensee's reevaluated flood hazards information, as summarized in the Enclosure, is suitable for the assessment of mitigating strategies developed in response to Order EA-12-049 (i.e., defines the mitigating strategies flood hazard information described in guidance documents currently being finalized by the industry and NRC staff) for Hope Creek. Further, the staff has concluded that the licensee's reevaluated flood hazard information is a suitable input for other assessments associated with Near-Term Task Force Recommendation 2.1 "Flooding". The NRC staff plans to issue a staff assessment documenting the basis for these conclusions at a later time.

In addition, NEI 12-06 "Diverse and Flexible Coping Strategies (FLEX) Implementation Guide" is currently being revised. This revision will include a methodology to perform a Mitigating Strategies Assessment (MSA) with respect to the reevaluated flood hazards. Once this methodology is endorsed by the NRC, flood event duration parameters and applicable flood associated effects should be considered as part of the Hope Creek MSA. The NRC staff will evaluate the flood event duration parameters (including warning time and period of inundation) and flood-related associated effects developed by the licensee during the NRC staff's review of the MSA.

As stated above, Table 2 of the enclosure to this letter describes the reevaluated flood hazards that exceed the current design-basis. In order to complete its response to the information requested by Enclosure 2 to the 50.54(f) letter, the licensee is expected to submit an integrated assessment or a focused evaluation, as appropriate, to address these reevaluated flood hazards, as described in the NRC letter, "Coordination of Request for Information Regarding Flooding Hazard Reevaluation and Mitigating Strategies for Beyond-Design-Basis External Events" (ADAMS Accession No. ML15174A257). This letter describes the changes in the NRC's approach to the flood hazard reevaluations that were approved by the Commission in its SRM to COMSECY-15-0019, "Closure Plan for the Reevaluation of Flooding Hazards for Operating Nuclear Power Plants" (ADAMS Accession No. ML15209A682).

R. Braun

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-6197 or e-mail at tekia.govan@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

Skial Da

Tekia V. Govan, Project Manager Hazards Management Branch Japan Lessons-Learned Division Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-354

Enclosure: Summary of Results of Flooding Hazard Re-Evaluation Report

cc w/encl: Distribution via Listserv

ENCLOSURE:

SUMMARY TABLES OF REEVALUATED FLOOD HAZARD LEVELS

| Table 1. (| Current [| Design | Basis | Flood | Hazards | for | Use i | in the MSA |
|------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|---------|-----|-------|------------|
|------------|-----------|--------|-------|-------|---------|-----|-------|------------|

| Mechanism | Stillwater Elevation | Waves/ Runup | Design Basis Hazard Elevation | Reference |
|--|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Local Intense Precipitation | | | | |
| | 12.1 ft NAVD88 | Minimal | 12.1 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Table 3-1 |
| Streams and Rivers | | | | |
| Powerblock/Service Water Intake Structure | 7.5 ft NAVD88 | 12.5 ft | 20.0 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Section 1.2.2 |
| Failure of Dams and Onsite Water Control/Storage Structures | | | | |
| Multiple Failures of Connonsville, Pepacton and Tocks Island Dams | 12.7 ft NAVD88 | 12.8 ft | 25.5 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Section 1.2.3 |
| Storm Surge | | | | |
| Powerblock A | 24.0 ft NAVD88 | 6.2 ft | 30.2 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Table 3-1 |
| Powerblock B | 24.0 ft NAVD88 | 10.6 ft | 34.6 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Section 1.2.4 |
| Service Water Intake Structure | 24.0 ft NAVD88 | 20.6 ft | 44.6 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Section 1.2.4 |
| Seiche | | | | |
| | No Impact on the Site Identified | No Impact on the Site Identified | No Impact on the Site Identified | FHRR Section 1.2.5 |
| Tsunami | | | | |
| | 5.2 ft NAVD88 | 12.1 ft | 17.3 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Section 1.2.6 |
| Ice-Induced Flooding | | | | |
| | No Impact on the Site Identified | No Impact on the Site Identified | No Impact on the Site Identified | FHRR Section 1.2.7 |

| Mechanism | Stillwater Elevation | Waves/ Runup | Design Basis Hazard Elevation | Reference |
|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--------------------|
| Channel Migrations/Diversions | | | | |
| | No Impact on the Site Identified | No Impact on the Site Identified | No Impact on the Site Identified | FHRR Section 1.2.8 |

Table 1. Current Design Basis Flood Hazards for Use in the MSA

Note 1: Reported values are rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a foot.

Note 2: Based on the NRC staff's independent (deterministic) hazard assessment using present-day regulatory guidance and methodologies of storm surge, the staff concludes that the site's current design basis remains bounded. For this reason, the staff concludes it is appropriate to utilize the current design basis storm surge elevation in conjunction with the mitigating strategies assessment.

| Mechanism | Stillwater Elevation | Waves/ Runup | Reevaluated Hazard Elevation | Reference |
|-----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------|------------------------------------|------------------|
| Local Intense Precipitation | 12.8 ft NAVD88 | Minimal | 12.8 ft NAVD88 | FHRR Section 3.1 |

Table 2. Reevaluated Flood Hazards for Flood-Causing Mechanisms for Use in the MSA

Note 1: The licensee is expected to develop flood event duration parameters and applicable flood associated effects to conduct the MSA. The staff will evaluate the flood event duration parameters (including warning time and period of inundation) and flood associated effects during its review of the MSA.

Note 2: Reevaluated hazard mechanisms bounded by the current design basis (see Table 1) are not included in this table.

Note 3: Reported values are rounded to the nearest one-tenth of a foot.

R. Braun

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-6197 or e-mail at tekia.govan@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Tekia V. Govan, Project Manager Hazards Management Branch Japan Lessons-Learned Division Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-354

Enclosure: Summary of Results of Flooding Hazard Re-Evaluation Report

cc w/encl: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION: PUBLIC TGovan, NRR RidsNrrDorlLpl1-2 Resource RidsRgn1MailCenter Resource RidsOpaMail Resource ARivera-Varona, NRO MWillingham, NRO MShams, NRR

JLD R/F LQuinn-Willingham, NRO RidsNrrDorl Resource RidsNrrLASLent RidsAcrsAcnw_MailCtr Resource KErwin, NRO RRivera-Lugo, NRO RidsNRRJLD Resource RidsNroDsea Resource RidsNrrPMHopeCreek Resource RidsOgcMailCenter Resource CCook, NRO ACampbell, NRO BHarvey, NRO

ADAMS Accession No.: PKG ML15238B660; LTR: ML15238B655; ENCL: ML15243A502 *via email

| OFFICE | NRR/JLD/JHMB/PM | NRR/JLD/LA | NRO/DSEA/RHM1/TR* | NRO/DSEA/RHM1/TL* |
|--------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-------------------|
| NAME | TGovan | SLent | MLee | KErwin |
| DATE | 09/02/15 | 09/01/15 | 09/09/15 | 09/09/15 |
| OFFICE | NRR/JLD/JHMB/BC | NRR/JLD/JHMB/PM | | |
| NAME | MShams | TGovan | | |
| DATE | 09/10/15 | 09/10/15 | | |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY