



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

June 7, 2016

Mr. Mark E. Reddemann  
Chief Executive Officer  
Energy Northwest  
MD 1023  
76 North Power Plant Loop  
P.O. Box 968  
Richland, WA 99352

SUBJECT: COLUMBIA GENERATING STATION – STAFF REVIEW OF INTERIM  
EVALUATION ASSOCIATED WITH REEVALUATED SEISMIC HAZARD  
IMPLEMENTATING NEAR-TERM TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATION 2.1  
(CAC NO. MF7289)

Dear Mr. Reddemann:

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 January 20, 2016<sup>1</sup>, Energy Northwest (EN, the licensee), provided its ESEP report in a response to Enclosure 1, Item (6) of the 50.54(f) letter, for Columbia Generating Station (Columbia). The NRC staff assessed the licensee’s implementation of the ESEP guidance through the completion of a reviewer checklist<sup>2</sup>. In support of NRC staff questions, EN provided a response dated May 17, 2016<sup>3</sup>, 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.

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

<sup>1</sup> The January 20, 2016, letter can be found under ADAMS Accession No. ML16028A316.

<sup>2</sup> The Columbia ESEP NRC review checklist can be found under ADAMS Accession No. ML16152A534.

<sup>3</sup> The EN response to NRC staff questions can be found under ADAMS Accession No. ML16139A074.

M. Redderman

- 2 -

involve the loss of all alternating current power and the loss of access to the ultimate heat sink to withstand a seismic event up to two times the licensing basis seismic hazard for Columbia. The licensee's ESEP assessment provides additional assurance of the existence of seismic margin, 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.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-3041 or via e-mail at [Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov](mailto:Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stephen Wyman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Stephen Wyman, Project Manager  
Hazards Management Branch  
Japan Lessons-Learned Division  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-397

cc: Distribution via Listserv

involve the loss of all alternating current power and the loss of access to the ultimate heat sink to withstand a seismic event up to two times the licensing basis seismic hazard for Columbia. The licensee's ESEP assessment provides additional assurance of the existence of seismic margin, 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.

If you have any questions, please contact me at (301) 415-3041 or via e-mail at Stephen.Wyman@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

Stephen Wyman, Project Manager  
Hazards Management Branch  
Japan Lessons-Learned Division  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-397

cc: Distribution via Listserv

**DISTRIBUTION:**

PUBLIC

LPL4-1 R/F

JLD R/F

RidsOeMaiiCenter

RidsNrrDorllpl3-1

RidsRgn3MaiiCenter

DJackson, NRO

RidsNrrPMColumbia

RidsNrrLASLent

RidsNrrOd

MShams, NRR

**ADAMS Accession Number: ML16154A016**

**\* via e-mail**

<b>OFFICE</b>	NRR/JLD/JHMB/PM	NRR/JLD/LA	DSEA/RGS2	NRR/JLD/JHMB/BC
<b>NAME</b>	SWyman	SLent	DSeber*	MShams
<b>DATE</b>	06/02/2016	06/02/2016	05/31/2016	06/07/2016

**OFFICIAL RECORD COPY**