

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

September 23, 2015

Mr. Ernest J. Harkness Site Vice President FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company Perry Nuclear Power Plant PO Box 97, A290 Perry, OH 44081

SUBJECT: PERRY NUCLEAR POWER PLANT UNIT 1 – STAFF REVIEW OF INTERIM EVALUATION ASSOCIATED WITH REEVALUATED SEISMIC HAZARD IMPLEMENTATING NEAR-TERM TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION 2.1 (TAC NO. MF5261)

Dear Mr. Harkness:

By letter dated March 12, 2012 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML12053A340), the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued a request for information pursuant to Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Part 50, Section 50.54(f) (hereafter referred to as the 50.54(f) letter). The request was issued as part of implementing lessons-learned from the accident at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant. Enclosure 1 to the 50.54(f) letter requested that licensees reevaluate seismic hazards at their sites using present-day methodologies and guidance. Enclosure 1, Item 6, of the 50.54(f) letter requested that licensees identify "interim evaluation and actions taken or planned to address the higher seismic hazard relative to the design basis as appropriate, prior to completion of the [seismic] risk evaluation." In addition to the interim evaluation provided in the March 2014 Seismic Screening and Hazard report, the licensees for the Central and Eastern United States committed to providing the Expedited Seismic Evaluation Process (ESEP) report, an interim evaluation, by December 31, 2014.

By letter dated December 19, 2014¹, FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company. (FENOC, the licensee), provided its ESEP report in a response to Enclosure 1, Item (6) of the 50.54(f) letter, for Perry Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1 (Perry). The NRC staff assessed the licensee's implementation of the ESEP guidance through the completion of a reviewer checklist². In support of NRC staff questions, FENOC provided a response dated July 22, 2015³, clarifying submittal information. Based on the NRC staff review of the ESEP report and responses to the staff's questions, the NRC staff concludes that the licensee's implementation of the interim evaluation meets the intent of the guidance.

³ The FENOC response to NRC staff questions can be found ADAMS Accession No. ML15212A955.

¹ The December 19, 2014, letter can be found under ADAMS Accession No. ML14353A058.

² The Perry ESEP NRC review checklist can be found under ADAMS Accession No. ML15240A212.

E. Harkness

- 2 -

The NRC 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 alternating current power and loss of access to the ultimate heat sink to withstand a seismic event that exceeds the re-evaluated seismic hazard for Perry. The licensee's ESEP assessment provides 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, ltem (6) of the 50.54(f) letter. Application of this review is limited to the interim evaluation as part of the Recommendation 2.1 Seismic review.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1115 or via e-mail at Nicholas.DiFrancesco@nrc.gov.

Sincerely

Nicholas DiFrancesco, Senior Project Manager Hazards Management Branch Japan Lessons-Learned Division Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-440

cc: Distribution via Listserv

E. Harkness

The NRC 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 alternating current power and loss of access to the ultimate heat sink to withstand a seismic event that exceeds the re-evaluated seismic hazard for Perry. The licensee's ESEP assessment provides 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. Application of this review is limited to the interim evaluation as part of the Recommendation 2.1 Seismic review.

2

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-1115 or via e-mail at Nicholas.DiFrancesco@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Nicholas DiFrancesco, Senior Project Manager Hazards Management Branch Japan Lessons-Learned Division Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

* via concurrence e-mail

Docket No. 50-440

cc: Distribution via Listserv

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC JLD R/F RidsOeMailCenter RidsNrrDorllpl3-1 RidsRgn3MailCenter DJackson, NRO NDiFrancesco, NRR

RidsNrrPMPerry RidsNrrLASLent RidsNrrOd MShams, NRR

ADAMS Accession Number: ML15240A032

OFFICE	NRR/JLD/JHMB/PM	NRR/JLD/LA	NRO/DSEA/RGS2
NAME	SWyman	SLent	DJackson*
DATE	8/ 28 /2015	8/31/2015	8/ 25 /2015
OFFICE	NRR/JLD/JHMB/BC	NRR/JLD/JHMB/PM	
NAME	MShams	NDiFrancesco	
DATE	9/3/2015	9/15/2015	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY