

A streamlined approach for the seismic hazard assessment of a new nuclear power plant in the UK

Guillermo Aldama-Bustos^a, Iain J. Tromans^a, Fleur Strasser^b, Graham Garrard^c, Guy Green^c, Liz Rivers^c, John Douglas^d, Roger M. W. Musson^e, Simon Hunt^c, Angeliki Lessi-Cheimariou^a, Manuela Daví^a, Colin Robertson^f

This article presents a streamlined approach to seismic hazard assessment aimed at providing regulatory assurance, whilst acknowledging commercial and program constraints associated with the development of safety-critical facilities. The approach was developed based on international best practice and followed the spirit of the Senior Seismic Hazard Analysis Committee (SSHAC) Level 2 requirements, while incorporating the key features of the SSHAC Level 3 process aimed at achieving regulatory assurance, but with a more flexible implementation. It has also benefited from experience gained by others regarding the implementation of the SSHAC process in projects in the USA, Switzerland and South Africa. The approach has been successfully applied as part of the Safety Case for the new-build nuclear power plant at Hinkley Point, UK. The proposed approach can be considered as a cost-effective solution for the seismic hazard evaluation of safety-significant facilities where a high level of regulatory assurance is required.

Keywords: PSHA, Safety-critical Facilities, SSHAC, Regulatory Assurance, UK

1. Introduction

The UK government energy policy currently considers the development of eight new nuclear power plants (NPPs). Hinkley Point C is expected to be the first of this new fleet of

Corresponding author:

Guillermo Aldama-Bustos; Guillermo.Aldama-Bustos@jacobs.com; +44 (0) 20 3479 8417

^a) Jacobs, Elms House, 43 Brook Green, London, W6 7EF, United Kingdom

^b) Independent consultant / Jacobs, Elms House, 43 Brook Green, London, W6 7EF, United Kingdom

^c) Jacobs, Burderop Park, Swindon, SN4 0QD, United Kingdom

^d) University of Strathclyde, James Weir Building, 75 Montrose Street, Glasgow, G1 1XJ, United Kingdom

^e) University of Edinburgh, School of Geosciences, James Hutton Road, Edinburgh EH3 3FE

^f) NNB GenCo, Bridgewater House, Counterslip, BS1 6BX, Bristol, U.K.

26 power plants to be built, and it will be the first nuclear plant to be built in the UK since 1995
 27 when Sizewell B became operational.

28 **Table 1** List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Meaning	Abbreviation	Meaning
CBR	Centre, body and range	PRT	Peer review team
CEUS	Central and eastern United States	SAP	Safety assessment principles
CH2M	CH2M Hill	SE	Subject Expert
EDF	Électricité de France	SSC	Seismic source characterization
GEM	Global Earthquake Model	SSM	Seismic source model
GMM	Ground-motion model	SHWP	Seismic Hazard Working Party
HID	Hazard input document	SRID	Site response input document
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency	SSHAC	Senior Seismic Hazard Analysis Committee
NNB GenCo	Nuclear New Build Generation Company (subsidiary of EDF Energy)	TAG	Technical assessment guides
NPP	Nuclear power plant	TDI	Technically defensible interpretations
ONR	Office for Nuclear Regulation	TDT	Technical Delivery Team
PSHA	Probabilistic seismic hazard analysis	TI	Technical Integrator
PMT	Project management team	USNRC	US Nuclear Regulatory Commission
PPRP	Participatory peer review panel		

29

30 As part of the UK regulatory requirements for new NPPs, utility operators are required to
 31 undertake a robust assessment of external hazards, including earthquake-related hazards, as a
 32 critical part of the NPP safety case. Such an assessment must be carried out following
 33 relevant good practice and to the satisfaction of the Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR).

34 The UK government operates a non-prescriptive, goal-setting approach to nuclear safety
 35 regulation. This means that the ONR sets out its regulatory expectations and requires duty-
 36 holders to determine how best to achieve them and justify their chosen approach. The ONR
 37 inspectors use Safety Assessment Principles (SAPs) (ONR 2014), together with Technical
 38 Assessment Guides (TAGs), to guide the regulatory decision-making process. However,
 39 owing to the ONR's non-prescriptive approach, these documents do not provide detailed
 40 guidance, although they have been developed to be consistent with the International Atomic
 41 Energy Agency's (IAEA) safety standards, to which they make reference.

42 In addition to the IAEA safety standards, the ONR guidance also recognizes the validity
43 of “relevant good practice” from other industries, as long as it is demonstrated to be
44 appropriate to the specific nuclear application. Furthermore, regulatory guidelines
45 acknowledge that *“reactors built in the UK should be at least as safe as modern reactors
46 anywhere else in the world”* whilst preventing *“gold-plating of reactor designs for use in the
47 UK”* (HSE 2009).

48 Given the hiatus between the last construction of NPPs in the UK (mid 1990s) and the
49 current new build, the reorganization of the regulator (from Nuclear Installations Inspectorate
50 to Office for Nuclear Regulation), and the ONR’s non-prescriptive approach to seismic safety
51 cases, there was uncertainty as to what standards in new PSHA studies would be considered
52 acceptable by ONR.

53 It was in this context that CH2M (now Jacobs) and collaborators developed an innovative
54 approach to PSHA aimed at providing regulatory assurance, whilst acknowledging the
55 commercial and program constraints faced by utility operators in the UK. This paper presents
56 the background to the development of the approach and discusses the main
57 differences/adaptations from the SSHAC process for Level 2 and Level 3 studies (Budnitz et
58 al. 1997; USNRC 2012). The approach to PSHA presented in this paper has successfully been
59 implemented for the seismic hazard evaluation underpinning the Safety Case for the Hinkley
60 Point C site, which is described in detail in Tromans et al. (2018).

61 It should be noted that TAG-13 on external hazards is currently being updated (ONR
62 2017a), including its Annex 1 on seismic hazards (ONR 2017b), to provide more detail on
63 regulatory expectations for its evaluation (ONR Expert Panel on Natural Hazards 2017). A
64 draft version of the updated TAG-13 was circulated by the ONR for comments from industry
65 in late 2017 and the final version is expected to be published in autumn 2018. The approach
66 presented in this study is expected to be in agreement with the updated TAG-13 guidelines.

67 **2. PSHA approach development background**

68 The UK has a strong tradition of using PSHA for the evaluation of the seismic hazard for
69 NPPs, dating back to the 1980s when the Seismic Hazard Working Party (SHWP) carried out
70 seismic hazard assessments for a number of UK NPP sites (Musson 2014). The SHWP was a
71 group of specialist consultants led by David Mallard of the Central Electricity Generating
72 Board, including staff from Principia Mechanica Ltd. and Soil Mechanics Ltd. The SHWP
73 developed a set of working practices for the evaluation of the seismic hazard, which were

74 published as a two-volume methodology report: Volume 3M (SHWP 1988) and its
75 supplement (SHWP 1991). Although the SHWP methodology, which included treatment of
76 uncertainties through a logic-tree framework and consideration of multiple expert judgement,
77 was state-of-the-art at the time, it no longer represents best practice when compared against
78 modern standards and was therefore assessed as unlikely to be acceptable by the ONR to
79 support the Safety Case of a new-build NPP. Nevertheless, it sets a ‘regulatory precedent’,
80 which has to be considered alongside methodological developments in the intervening years.

81 A few years after the work by the SHWP was completed, in the mid-1990s the Senior
82 Seismic Hazard Analysis Committee (SSHAC) published in the USA what is commonly
83 known as the SSHAC guidelines (Budnitz et al. 1997). These guidelines, which have been
84 endorsed by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission (USNRC) as the
85 recommended approach for the development of new models to be used in PSHA (e.g.,
86 Regulatory Guide 1.208, USNRC 2007), focused on methodological aspects of the PSHA,
87 aiming in particular to provide a structured framework for multiple-expert hazard
88 assessments. The underlying motivation was to reconcile the findings of two multi-expert
89 PSHA studies for NPP sites in the Central and Eastern United States (Bernreuter et al. 1989;
90 EPRI 1989), discrepancies between which were found to stem primarily from procedural
91 differences. The SSHAC guidelines define four levels of PSHA study, reflecting increasing
92 levels of technical complexity and resources allocated to the study, as described in Table 4.2
93 of NUREG-2117 (USNRC 2012). A notable feature of this classification scheme is the large
94 increment in both complexity and regulatory assurance between the lower (1 and 2) and
95 higher (3 and 4) levels of study. The higher levels of study are generally associated with a
96 greater level of regulatory assurance owing to the greater level of effort expended to capture
97 the centre, body and range (CBR) of technically defensible interpretations (TDI), which is the
98 common goal of all four levels. For this reason, the USNRC requires Level 3 or 4 studies for
99 nuclear facilities.

100 Since its publication, the SSHAC process has been used for numerous natural hazard
101 studies not only in the USA but also worldwide, in particular those developed for safety-
102 critical facilities such as NPPs. Examples of this are the PEGASOS project (Abrahamson et
103 al. 2002) and PEGASOS Refinement Project (Renault 2013) in Switzerland, and the
104 Thyspunt project in South Africa (Bommer et al. 2015). As a result, the original SSHAC
105 guidelines have recently been supplemented by NUREG-2117 (USNRC 2012) in order to

106 incorporate practical insights gained during recent PSHA projects implementing the higher
107 levels of the SSHAC process.

108 Efforts have also been made to suggest solutions to improve the cost-effectiveness of
109 SSHAC studies. In particular, Coppersmith and Bommer (2012) proposed that for multiple
110 sites, a regional SSHAC Level 3 or 4 study followed by site-specific Level 2 refinement
111 studies represented the most efficient solution in terms of cost and duration. This approach
112 has been implemented in the development of regional seismic source (CEUS-SSC project;
113 Salomone 2015) and ground-motion models for the Central and Eastern United States (EPRI
114 2013). Bommer (2010) recommended a similar approach be adopted for the UK. However, to
115 date, SSHAC guidelines have not been applied in the UK.

116 At present, guidance for the organization of SSHAC studies is well-developed for Levels
117 3 and 4 but is limited for Levels 1 and 2. This will be addressed in a forthcoming update to
118 NUREG-2117 (Juckett et al. 2016, USNRC 2018), which for obvious reasons was not
119 available for the development of the PSHA approach described in the present paper. A wide
120 variety of approaches can technically be considered “Level 2”, even when the engagement of
121 outside experts is minimal. When utility operators are on a tight schedule, as is the case for
122 UK new build NPP, the long duration of level 3 and 4 studies, which would normally be
123 more than two-and-a-half years for a SSHAC Level 3 study (Coppersmith et al. 2013;
124 Bommer and Coppersmith 2013), is a source of difficulty.

125 Fortunately, the UK sites currently under consideration for new-build NPPs are all
126 located in the immediate vicinity of operational or decommissioned NPPs, and as a result
127 there is an extensive body of pre-existing site-specific information available for modern
128 PSHA studies. However, given the safety-critical nature of NPP sites, the level of regulatory
129 assurance required remains high. Therefore, there was a need for a more compact study,
130 closer to a SSHAC Level 2 study in terms of duration and cost, but with a similar level of
131 regulatory assurance to a SSHAC Level 3 study. A Level 2/3 approach is not sanctioned by
132 the SSHAC guidelines (Bommer and Coppersmith 2013); anything that falls between the
133 specification for Level 2 and Level 3 is de facto Level 2. However, as long as the hybrid
134 approach, which could be classified as an “enhanced Level 2”, meets the approval of both the
135 operator (for cost and timescale) and the regulator (for regulatory assurance), it is a practical
136 solution. It is worth noting that the forthcoming update to NUREG-2117 is expected to
137 specifically sanction Level 2 studies with augmented options. In this sense, the procedure

138 developed and applied for the Hinkley PSHA could be considered as an illustrative example
139 and practical application of the general concept of an enhanced Level 2 study.

140 Our approach to PSHA, discussed in this paper, is in line with international best practice
141 and follows the principles of the SSHAC Level 2 requirements, but incorporates key features
142 of the SSHAC Level 3 process, particularly those aimed at achieving regulatory assurance.
143 The structure of the project and roles of the various participants is more flexible than in the
144 SSHAC approach, allowing for adjustments to the approach as the project develops based on
145 knowledge acquired during the execution of the project and making more efficient use of the
146 already limited pool of available experts in the field.

147 **3. Project structure and implementation**

148 As previously discussed, the proposed methodology does not formally follow the
149 framework of a SSHAC Level 3 study. It was developed so as to satisfy all the requirements
150 of a SSHAC Level 2 study, but with a particular emphasis on incorporating those elements of
151 a SSHAC Level 3 process that contribute to regulatory assurance. Regulatory assurance is
152 defined in NUREG-2117 (USNRC 2012) as “*confidence that views of the larger technical*
153 *community have been properly considered and that the center, body, and range of technically*
154 *defensible interpretations has been represented and documented*”. Elements that have been
155 identified as particularly important to achieve regulatory assurance include:


- 156 • Number of participants, with a larger project team, of similar size as normally required
157 for a SSHAC Level 3 study, and several international (UK, US and continental Europe)
158 Subject Experts (eleven in total);
- 159 • Participatory nature of peer-review, allowing for participation at all stages, not only at
160 workshops, the incorporation of feedback and correction of issues as soon as they arise,
161 rather than at a late stage in the process;
- 162 • Transparency of interactions, with thorough documentation of the decision process (see
163 Section 4.4), and the participation of client’s and nuclear regulator’s representatives at the
164 various workshops run throughout the project in an observer role;
- 165 • Clear recognition of cognitive biases, in particular the distinction between resource and
166 proponent views; and

167 • The iterative nature of the collective process of reducing epistemic uncertainties within
168 the seismic hazard community, with each new project benefiting from the insights gained
169 and lessons learnt in previously completed projects.

170 Consistent with this perspective, the proposed approach aimed to develop further the
171 methodology implemented to date, by others, in other similar projects and to incorporate
172 insights gained from personal involvement of individual project team members in recently
173 completed SSHAC Level 3 and 4 projects. These are predominantly based on experiences of
174 the SSHAC Level 3 PSHA for the Thyspunt new-build NPP site in South Africa (Bommer et
175 al. 2015), and the refinement phase of the PEGASOS project for the revision of the design
176 bases at four NPP sites in Switzerland (Renault 2015). Methodological aspects of other
177 recently completed SSHAC Level 3 studies were also considered.

178 **4. Project delivery team structure**

179 The project delivery team structure is shown in Figure 1. As illustrated, the project
180 delivery structure is similar to that of a SSHAC Level 3 study, with the main difference being
181 the amalgamation of Resource Experts and Proponent Experts, as per SSHAC terminology,
182 into the single role of Subject Experts and the consideration of two independent Hazard
183 Calculation teams, which significantly contributed towards the QA process and increased
184 regulatory assurance. Other aspects of the SSHAC Level 3 structure, including an
185 independent Peer Review Team overseeing the project from inception (fundamental for the
186 objective of achieving regulatory assurance), and a larger Technical Delivery Team
187 (Technical Integrator Team as per SSHAC terminology) were kept.



188

189

Fig. 1 Hinkley PSHA project delivery team and team structure

190

Solid lines in Figure 1 represent direct formal interactions between the various groups of the project. Dashed lines represent a close interaction between the PRT and the TDT, while the PMT remain as the “formal” channel of communication, and the possibility for the PRT to co-opt SEs to their team to assist with their PRT role when considered necessary (see also discussion in Section 4.3).

195

Note that since the approach deviates from the guidelines for a SSHAC Level 3 study, the terminology adopted deliberately avoids the use of SSHAC terminology, to prevent confusion between original and adapted concepts.

198

The Technical Delivery Team (TDT) was an amalgamation of CH2M’s internal specialists, combined with key experts in the form of retained consultants and sub-consultants from the University of Edinburgh (formerly at the British Geological Survey) and the University of Strathclyde (formerly at the Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières). The Peer Review Team (PRT) was composed of experts external to CH2M, which was considered essential to maintain their independence. PRT members were selected based not only on their experience and technical knowledge of the PSHA process, but also their

204

205 knowledge of the SSHAC process through participation in previous SSHAC Level 3 and
206 Level 4 studies.


207 **4.1. Project plan**

208 Overall, the Project Plan followed the structure of a SSHAC Level 3 as described in
209 NUREG-2117 with a phased approach punctuated by working meetings and workshops
210 representing the key milestones in the development of the project. Figure 2 presents the
211 project plan for the Hinkley PSHA, which consists of three phases:

212 Phase 1 – *Study Definition Stage* concentrated on defining the scope of works necessary
213 for a detailed and robust PSHA. It also included a high-level review of existing data and
214 studies, identification of hazard sensitive issues, identification of further data requirements
215 and the setup of a databank for relevant information.

216 Phase 2 – *Implementation Stage* constituted the main part of the project, including Subject
217 Expert and PRT interactions, development of the models, and calculations.

218 Phase 3 – *Support Stage* consisted of any ad hoc support to the client, NNB GenCo, on
219 the Safety Case submission, as required.



220

221


Fig. 2 Hinkley PSHA project plan

222 Within the context of the project plan, the term “workshop” was taken in the conceptual
223 sense, and denoted any form of interaction (physical or virtual) within the TDT (‘internal’
224 Definition Workshops), or between the TDT and the PRT (Presentation Workshops), to
225 which the client’s representatives, and the ONR’s representatives and retained experts were
226 invited in the role of Observer to satisfy themselves that these interactions were in line with
227 the project objectives. The study methodology also provided the PRT with the discretion to
228 invite a number of Subject Experts to attend the Presentation Workshops, as co-opted
229 members of the PRT.

230 The Definition Workshops had the objective of discussing within the TDT and agreeing
231 on the interim seismic source model (SSM) and ground-motion model (GMM) components
232 of the PSHA based on the review and interpretation of the available data, the expert
233 engagement process, and the findings from the preliminary hazard calculations. Following
234 the Definition Workshops, the TDT presented the technical justification for the interim
235 models to the PRT, in two formal Presentation Workshops, covering the SSM and GMM
236 components of the study. A Final Presentation Workshop was also run to help finalize
237 outstanding issues before the final hazard calculations. This process gave the TDT the
238 opportunity to obtain feedback from experts outside the TDT before finalization of the
239 relevant models.

240 Although the large majority of the TDT members were based in two fairly nearby offices
241 in the UK (London and Swindon), due to the logistical constraints imposed by the
242 compressed project duration, video- and tele-conference facilities were used during working
243 meetings and workshops when required. Such facilities were also used for interactions
244 between the TDT and SEs, mainly for those based in the US or continental Europe, and with
245 the PRT, which were based in Switzerland and Norway. Such “virtual” workshops can also
246 be used in projects with a more generous schedule as a cost-effective tool. Presentation
247 Workshops were scheduled to allow for attendance in-person of all members of the PRT,
248 including PRT co-opted Subject Experts, and key relevant members of the TDT.

249 An important element of the Project Plan was the definition of formal communication and
250 reporting protocols that would allow the efficient and controlled exchange of information
251 between the various parties, with particular attention to how elicitation of expert judgement
252 would be undertaken and recorded, and how the independence of the PRT would be
253 demonstrated; both of these elements being crucial for the goal of achieving regulatory
254 assurance. The protocols adopted for the Hinkley PSHA are summarized in Figure 3.



255

256 **Fig. 3** Hinkley PSHA communications chart

257 **4.2. Subject Expert roles**

258 In practice, it is often inevitable that multiple expert roles within the same project are
 259 taken on by the same individual (e.g. an evaluator expert may also be the proponent of a
 260 model, or a resource expert on specific data). The SSHAC guidelines allow for such
 261 situations, provided the change in expert role is explicitly acknowledged and made clear to all
 262 other evaluators, and that, when returning to their role as an evaluator, the expert carries out
 263 their assessment in an impartial and objective way. The process of challenges from other
 264 evaluators within the team and the general oversight by the participatory peer review panel
 265 (PPRP, as per SSHAC terminology) ensure that the guidelines are met. Also, practical
 266 implementation has revealed the difficulty in finding a consistent terminology for individuals
 267 assisting the delivery process without being part of the (core) Technical Integrator (TI, as per
 268 SSHAC terminology) team in terms of ownership of the models. Such individuals have been
 269 variously described as “database developers” or “technical support staff”, while performing
 270 tasks that were often similar in nature to the contributions of resource experts.

271 For the approach presented herein, the concept of “Subject Expert” (SE) was therefore
 272 developed. This was defined as any individual who contributes on one or more technical
 273 aspect(s) (data, model, interpretation) of the technical delivery process, without, however,
 274 having an ownership stake in the model developed. Although a number of members of the
 275 TDT are expected to fulfil the role of SEs for some technical aspects of the PSHA, for
 276 simplicity of the approach and terminology, the term of SE was applied only to specialists co-
 277 opted from outside the TDT.

278 Although the combined expertise of the TDT was broad, it has to be acknowledged that in
279 a small-to-medium sized team, it is unlikely that interactions within the TDT alone are
280 sufficient to capture the full breadth of technically defensible interpretations. Therefore, the
281 TDT had to identify and enter into discussions with SEs within the wider technical
282 community to ensure that the project captured, documented, and understood the significance
283 and relevance of the available data, and any valid alternative interpretations. Identification of
284 the subject areas requiring expert engagement, and the subsequent selection of suitable
285 Subject Experts, was an iterative process considering technical factors such as specialisms
286 and level of expertise, but also heeding logistical project constraints, such as availability
287 within the project timeframe. This selection process was carried out in conjunction with the
288 PRT.

289 Engagement of SEs was based on face-to-face meetings, or teleconferences, between each
290 individual expert and relevant members of the TDT. Depending on whether resolution of the
291 topics discussed during the meeting was achieved or not, additional meetings were scheduled.
292 In advance of each meeting, SEs were provided with relevant project-specific information on
293 the topic to be discussed, which may include data, preliminary interpretations of the data or
294 models, or preliminary results of a particular analysis, *inter alia*. Following each of the
295 interviews, agreed summaries of the discussions were formally captured and documented as
296 part of the project records, and approved by the SE. The summaries of the SE interviews were
297 made available to the PRT for their consideration and feedback.

298 One of the main differences with the expert interaction approach required for a SSHAC
299 Level 3 study was that no formal direct interaction between individual SEs took place, as it
300 would in the second workshop of a SSHAC Level 3 study. In most cases, more than one
301 expert was interviewed on a particular topic, interviews with different SEs occurred relatively
302 closely in time to each other, and more than one interview with the same SE was often
303 required (particularly on the most controversial issues). Therefore, SEs were often made
304 aware of other SEs' view on the same topic. This could be argued to represent an informal
305 type of interaction between SEs. Additionally, for methodological uncertainties that are not
306 region- or site-specific, the "slipstream effect" generated by the publication of detailed
307 documentation of expert elicitation and interaction on specific topics in other recent projects
308 should be acknowledged, since the availability of such documentation greatly facilitates the
309 capture of the CBR of the TDI.

310 The approach adopted for the engagement of experts was not as comprehensive as that
311 required for a formal SSHAC Level 3 study. However, it allowed for greater flexibility, and
312 was considered proportionate for the project, providing appropriate representation of the
313 range of valid expert judgements within the technical community, and it was considered to be
314 consistent with the ONR's Safety Assessment Principles. Also, despite the differences in the
315 approach for a formal SSHAC Level 3 study, the objectives of the SE interactions were in
316 line with the "multiple-expert assessment" approach defined in NUREG-2117, rather than the
317 traditional "expert elicitation" approach.

318 Although the TDT were seeking the SEs' specialist judgements and comments, the
319 synthesis and incorporation of any technical interpretations into the Hinkley PSHA, as well as
320 the assessment of their defensibility, were fully the TDT's responsibility, using the same
321 "ownership" criterion as in NUREG-2117. Generally, the SEs provided similar judgements
322 and hence the use of their inputs by the TDT was relatively straightforward. When differing
323 judgements were encountered, the TDT carefully studied the various SE viewpoints and, if
324 required, asked them for clarification before developing their final models in an objective,
325 transparent and well-documented manner that sought to avoid "sponsor bias". The final
326 PSHA model includes some logic-tree branches that reflect alternative viewpoints provided
327 through discussions with the SEs.

328 **4.3. Participatory Peer-Review**

329 Participatory peer review is an integral, and critical, part of state-of-the-art PSHAs for
330 high-value infrastructure projects, and a key element of the SSHAC guidelines. It is strongly
331 recommended by the USNRC for SSHAC Level 3 and Level 4 studies, and a requirement in
332 the forthcoming update to NUREG-2117. Participatory peer review in this context means that
333 the review is continuous throughout the project to ensure that advice and comments can be
334 conveyed while there is still time to address them.

335 The participatory peer review process implemented in the Hinkley PSHA broadly
336 followed the requirements for a SSHAC Level 3 study, with a smaller number of members
337 than could be expected for a SSHAC Level 3 study but greater flexibility and more frequent
338 interactions with the TDT. As in the SSHAC guidelines, the role of the PRT for this project
339 was focused in two main areas: process and technical review. The process review ensures that
340 the PSHA approach conforms to the requirements of a high-level study, while the technical
341 review is concerned with assessing that the full range of data, models and methods have been

342 duly considered, and that all technical decisions have been adequately justified and
343 documented. Collectively, these two aspects of the peer-review process led to assurance that
344 the work was performed appropriately.

345 The main differentiators from the SSHAC methodology were: a closer interaction
346 between the TDT and the PRT than normally done in SSHAC Level 3 projects, and the
347 option for the PRT to co-opt SEs as part of the team when considered appropriate to cover
348 specific technical areas. When PRT co-opted SEs also acted as SEs for the TDT, they were
349 made aware of their change of role and asked to remain impartial on their assessment of the
350 data interpretation and/or models developed by the TDT. Other factors contributing towards
351 the objective assessment of the PRT co-opted SEs were: the participation of PRT co-opted
352 SEs being limited to their attendance of workshops, where entire models (e.g., SSM or
353 GMM) or hazard calculations results were presented and discussed rather than individual
354 technical topics on which the PRT co-opted SEs may have engaged with the TDT under their
355 role of SE. Also, PRT co-opted SEs' comments and feedback from the workshops were
356 provided directly to the PRT for the PRT's evaluation and integration into a single
357 consolidated PRT report.

358 For the Hinkley PSHA some of the SEs were allowed to play both roles as co-opted
359 members of the PRT and technical advisors to the TDT. This dual role was justified on the
360 basis of a limited pool of experts and a constrained schedule, and potential bias on their
361 assessments as co-opted members of the PRT was avoided by implementing the measures
362 discussed above. However, the authors acknowledge that, if the schedule, budget and
363 available pool of expertise allow it, it is preferable to have different SE in for these two roles.

364 The interactions between the TDT and PRT were not limited to the review of
365 deliverables, and face-to-face exchanges at the various Presentation Workshops held at
366 various stages of the project, but also included the use of ad hoc teleconferences to discuss
367 contentious issues as they arose. Where advised, the TDT produced "white papers" to help
368 explain to the PRT a particular method or model in order to obtain "approval in principle" in
369 advance of the development of the models and/or calculations, and submission of the
370 deliverables. The use of teleconferences and white papers were invaluable tools to make the
371 peer-review process as efficient as possible by reducing the likelihood of abortive work or
372 major modifications following the PRT's review of the final deliverables.

373 The PRT for the Hinkley PSHA comprised two members: Dr Hilmar Bungum and Dr
374 Martin Koller, both highly respected international seismic hazard experts, with extensive
375 experience of SSHAC Level 3 and Level 4 studies, and whose combined expertise covers a
376 broad range of areas including seismic source modelling, ground-motion prediction, site
377 characterization, and procedures to manage and incorporate expert judgement.

378 A total of three SEs were co-opted by the PRT to provide advice on the fields of ground-
379 motion modelling, geological and tectonic interpretation, and site characterization and site-
380 response analysis. PRT co-opted SEs were invited to attend the Presentation Workshop
381 corresponding to their area of expertise.

382 **4.4. Documentation**

383 One of the key differences between the lower (1 and 2) and higher (3 and 4) SSHAC
384 levels of study is the emphasis placed on documentation of the evaluation and integration
385 process; although in all cases a complete documentation of the PSHA is required. In a Level
386 2 study, this is effectively left at the discretion of the TI team, with the result that it is
387 difficult to assess the generic level of transparency and regulatory assurance that can be
388 expected from this level of study.

389 The approach implemented by the project delivery team for the Hinkley PSHA followed
390 the documentation principles for higher-level SSHAC studies by incorporating thorough and
391 detailed documentation of all “formal” interactions within the TDT, between the TDT and
392 Subject Experts, and between the TDT and the PRT. This also included a comprehensive
393 justification and reporting of all decisions taken in the development of the hazard model.

394 While some of the formalism of SSHAC, in particular regarding team and expert
395 interactions, was relaxed to meet the schedule of the project, as discussed above, the
396 documentation process was instead rendered more formal than described in the SSHAC
397 guidelines for a Level 3 study, with much the same aim. A hierarchical structure was adopted
398 for the reporting of the various technical elements of the PSHA (e.g., historical seismicity,
399 earthquake catalogue, ground-motion model), which is schematically represented in Figure 4.

400 In general, Level 4 reports cover the data collation, review and assessment, and
401 verification and validation of hazard calculations. Level 3 reports generally integrate the
402 outputs of Level 4 reports to define input models to the PSHA and site response. The Level 2
403 report is a summary of the whole PSHA process, while the Level 1 report is an executive
404 summary of the project. Level 1 and Level 2 reports should be self-contained and sufficient to

405 obtain an informed overview of the study, without the need to consult lower level reports. A
406 total of 19 technical reports were produced as part of the Hinkley PSHA, which together form
407 the Safety Case justification for vibratory ground-motion hazard submitted to the ONR.



408

409 **Fig. 4** Hinkley PSHA reporting structure

410 This hierarchical reporting structure facilitated a phased delivery and review of PSHA
411 inputs and results, which contributed towards a smooth and timely delivery of the project, and
412 helped to build peer-review and regulatory assurance progressively throughout the various
413 stages of the project.

414 In line with established practice for high-level PSHA studies, hazard input documents
415 (HIDs) and site response input documents (SRID) were produced. The objective of the HIDs
416 and SRIDs was to present in a clear and unambiguous manner to the seismic hazard and site
417 response analysts, all the necessary information / data needed to perform the calculations
418 undertaken at various stages of the project (e.g., preliminary hazard calculations, cross-
419 checking calculations and final hazard calculations).

420 The development of high-quality HIDs and SRIDs was found to be a crucial element of
421 the quality assurance system. Clear and unambiguous definition of the seismic hazard
422 calculation requirements resulted in a quick convergence of the cross-checking calculations.
423 These calculations were implemented by two independent teams using different software
424 [i.e., CH2M using CRISIS2015 (Ordaz et al. 2015) and GEM using the OpenQuake-engine
425 code (Pagani et al. 2014)], following a similar approach to that outlined in Bommer et al.
426 (2013). The achieved differences in the results between the two sets of analyses, which are
427 intrinsic to the use of different codes (e.g., Thomas et al. 2010), were smaller (typically below

428 1% on the calculated AFoEs, and in no case larger than 5%) than those observed in similar
 429 projects.

430 **5. Concluding remarks**

431 The implementation of the approach to PSHA described in this paper allowed the
 432 successful completion of the Hinkley PSHA, which achieved its two main objectives:

- 433 • To achieve regulatory approval within the non-prescriptive UK nuclear regulatory
 434 environment for a new-build NPP at the Hinkley Point site; and
- 435 • To complete the study within a relatively short period of time (21 months) and at
 436 considerably lower cost than a SSHAC Level 3 study.

437 Nevertheless, it has to be acknowledged that the availability of previous (at their time
 438 state-of-the-art) seismic hazard studies for the site as well as the collective knowledge of the
 439 seismicity of the UK, in addition to ground-investigations carried out in advance of the
 440 commencement of the PSHA study, were important contributors to the short duration of the
 441 project.

442 Although the approach to PSHA presented in this paper, which can be considered as an
 443 enhanced SSHAC Level 2, was developed to achieve regulatory approval within the UK
 444 nuclear regulatory context, it could be adapted to any other type of high-value and/or safety-
 445 significant infrastructure, and regulatory environment, as a cost-effective approach with a
 446 high reliability assurance.

447 A summary of the key features of the approach developed for this study, and its
 448 comparison against requirements for SSHAC Level 2 and Level 3 studies is presented in
 449 Table 2. The upcoming update to NUREG-2117 (USNRC 2018) will provide further
 450 guidance on the requirements for Level 2 studies, which has not been included in Table 2 as it
 451 is expected to represent the status of the SSHAC guidelines at the time the PSHA approach
 452 for this study was developed. USNRC (2018) will also provide guidance to Level 2 studies
 453 with augmented options, which resembles the approach described in this paper.

454 **Table 2** Attributes of the approach developed for this study in comparison with Level 2 and Level 3
 455 studies (after Table 4.2 of USNRC 2012)

SSHAC Level SSHAC Component	Level 2	This Study (Enhanced Level 2)	Level 3
Number of	• Project Manager	• Project Manager.	• Project Manager.

SSHAC Level Component	Level 2	This Study (Enhanced Level 2)	Level 3
participants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Small TI (Technical Integrator) team. • Peer reviewers. • Hazard calculation team. • Resource experts • Proponent experts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project TDT. • Larger TDT team. • Peer reviewers. • Resource experts and proponent experts (jointly referred to as Subject Experts). • Hazard calculation team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project TI. • Larger TI team. • Peer reviewers. • Resource experts. • Proponent experts. • Data team. • Hazard calculation team.
Interaction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent and resource experts contacted individually. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Subject Experts contacted individually. • Individual members of the TDT then take on the role of proponent/resource experts at workshops, with the TDT as a whole acting as evaluator/integrator. • All interactions with Subject Experts are thoroughly documented and subjected to the scrutiny of the PRT. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proponent and resource experts interact with TI Team in facilitated workshops.
Peer review	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Late stage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory. • PRT may include co-opted subject experts where appropriate to cover specific technical areas. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Participatory.
Ownership	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TI Team. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Technical Delivery Team (TDT). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TI Team.
Transparency	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dependent on documentation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Client and regulator can view interactions at workshops. • Participatory peer reviewers observe workshops and participate at all stages of the process where appropriate. • All interactions with Subject Experts as well as the evaluation and integration process are thoroughly documented. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interested parties can view interactions at workshops. • Participatory peer reviewers observe workshops, participate in Workshop #3. • Dependent on documentation.
Regulatory Assurance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual interaction with proponent and resource experts increases confidence over 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Individual interaction with subject experts is thoroughly documented and subjected to the scrutiny of the PRT, hence increased confidence over 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Interaction among proponent, resource, and evaluator experts in facilitated workshops greatly

SSHAC Level SSHAC Component	Level 2	This Study (Enhanced Level 2)	Level 3
	<p>Level 1.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Depends on TI team; degree to which data, models, and methods are readily available; and success in obtaining additional information and understanding from individual interactions. 	<p>Level 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Thorough documentation of all decisions and underlying rationale is a key component of the approach. Hierarchical reporting structure ensures phased delivery to regulator as well as client. 	<p>increases confidence over Level 2.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Documentation of evaluation and integration process by TI Team key to high levels of confidence.
Cost	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slightly greater than Level 1 because of time required for interaction with proponent and resource experts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater than Level 2 due to greater number of participants and inclusion of workshops, but smaller than Level 3 by holding separate meetings with Subject Experts and Subject Experts' judgements/views being integrated by the TDT at internal workshops. Physical dispersion of team is limited, systems to remotely access data and information already in place as part of CH2M's standard operations. Use of telephone and video conferencing for interactions with subject experts wherever feasible. TDT working meetings coincide with workshops, resulting in a reduced cost compared to Level 3 where workshops and working meetings are typically kept separate. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly greater than Level 2 because of greater number of participants and use of facilitated workshops. Greater likelihood that TI team members are physically dispersed, requiring costs for systems to remotely access data and information. Costs associated with TI Team working meetings.
Duration	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slightly greater than Level 1 because of time required for interaction with proponent and resource experts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Greater than Level 2 due to enhanced documentation and scrutiny of individual interactions with Subject Experts, and inclusion of workshops, hence need to 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly greater than Level 2 because of constraints in organizing workshops around proponent and

SSHAC Level SSHAC Component	Level 2	This Study (Enhanced Level 2)	Level 3
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Typically, 6-12 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> consider personal schedules. Shorter than Level 3 as constraints in organizing workshops are reduced by replacing direct intervention of external Subject Experts at workshops by a summary of individual interactions with these experts. Between 18 and 24 months. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> resource expert, TI team member, and PPRP member personal schedules. Typically, ≥ 30 months.
Management Challenge	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Slightly greater than Level 1 because of need to interact individually with proponent and resource experts whose schedules cannot be controlled. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Intermediate between Level 2 and Level 3. Subcontracts are typically required for subject experts. Longer engagement of subject experts. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significantly greater than Level 2 because of increased number of participants (a number of whom may require subcontracts) and the logistics of organizing workshops.

456

457 6. Acknowledgements

458 The authors would like to thank the PRT, Hilmar Bungum and Martin Koller, for their
459 valuable comments and discussions during the development of the project, which helped to
460 streamline the approach originally proposed at the beginning of the study. Their experience
461 on previous SSHAC Level 3 and Level 4 studies was invaluable.

462 The authors would like to thank EDF-NNB GenCo for agreeing to the publication of this
463 article. Finally, we thank three anonymous reviewers for their positive and constructive
464 comments on an earlier version of this article.

465 7. References

466 Abrahamson N, Birkhäuser P, Koller M, Mayer-Rosa D, Smit P, Sprecher C, Tinic S, Graf R
467 (2002) PEGASOS - A comprehensive probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for nuclear
468 power plants in Switzerland. 12th European Conference on Earthquake Engineering, 8 pgs.,
469 London

470 Bernreuter D, Savy J, Mensing R, Chen J (1989) Seismic hazard characterization of 69
471 nuclear plant sites east of the Rocky Mountains. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
472 Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory

473 Bommer J (2010) Seismic hazard assessment for nuclear power plant sites in the UK:
474 Challenges and possibilities. *Nuclear Future* 6(3):164-170

475 Bommer J J, Coppersmith K, Coppersmith R, Hanson K, Mangongolo A, Neverling J, Rathje
476 E M, Rodriguez-Marek A, Scherbaum F, Shelembe R, Stafford P J, Strasser, Strasser F O
477 (2015) A SSHAC Level 3 probabilistic seismic hazard analysis for a new-build nuclear site in
478 South Africa. *Earthq Spectra* 31(2):661-698

479 Bommer J, Coppersmith K (2013) Lessons learned from application of the NUREG-2117
480 guidelines for SSHAC Level 3 probabilistic seismic hazard studies for nuclear sites. 22nd
481 Conference on Structural Mechanics in Reactor Technology (SMiRT-22), 10 pgs., San
482 Francisco, California, USA: International Association for Structural Mechanics in Reactor
483 Technology (IASMiRT)

484 Bommer J, Strasser F, Monelli D, Pagani M (2013) Quality assurance for logic-tree
485 implementation in probabilistic seismic-hazard analysis for nuclear applications: A practical
486 example. *Seismol Res Lett* 84(6):938-945

487 Budnitz R J, Apostolakis G, Boore D M, Clu L S, Coppersmith K J, Cornell C A, Morris P A
488 (1997) Recommendations for probabilistic seismic hazard analysis: Guidance on uncertainty
489 and use of experts. US Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG/CR-6372

490 Coppersmith K, Bommer J (2012) Use of the SSHAC methodology within regulated
491 environments: Cost-effective application for seismic characterization at multiple sites.
492 *Nuclear Engineering and Design* 245:233-240.

493 Coppersmith K, Bommer J, Bryce R, McDuffie S, Lisle G (2013). An application of the
494 SSHAC Level 3 process to the probabilistic seismic hazard analysis for nuclear facilities at
495 the Hanford site, eastern Washington, USA. 22nd Conference on Structural Mechanics in
496 Reactor Technology (SMiRT-22), 10 pgs., San Francisco, California, USA: International
497 Association for Structural Mechanics in Reactor Technology (IASMiRT)

498 EPRI (1989) Probabilistic seismic hazard evaluations at nuclear power plant sites in the
499 central and eastern United States: Resolution of the Charleston earthquake issue. Electric
500 Power Research Institute, prepared by Risk Engineering Inc., Yankee Atomic Power
501 Company and Woodward Clyde Consultants, EPRI report NP-6395-D

502 EPRI (2013) EPRI 2004-2006 Ground-motion model (GMM). Review project 3002000717,
503 Final Report, Electric Power Research Institute, Palo Alto, California

504 HSE (2009) New nuclear power stations Generic Design Assessment: Safety assessment in
505 an international context. Health and Safety Executive, Version 3, 9 pgs

506 Juckett M, Stamatakos J, Coppersmith K, Ake J, Bommer J (2016) Updating the SSHAC
507 implementation guidance in NUREG-2117. DOE Natural Phenomena Hazards Technical
508 Meeting, Southwest Research Institute, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission

509 Musson R M (2014) UK seismic hazard assessments for strategic facilities: a short history.
510 *Bollettino di Geofisica Teorica ed Applicata* 55(1):165-173

511 ONR (2014) Safety assessment principles for nuclear facilities. Office for Nuclear
512 Regulation, Revision 0, 226 pgs

513 ONR. (2017a) External Hazards. Office for Nuclear Regulation, Nuclear Safety Technical
514 Assessment Guide, NS-TAST-GD-013 Revision 6-DRAFT, 68 pgs

515 ONR (2017b) Seismic Hazard. Office for Nuclear Regulation, Nuclear Safety Technical
516 Assessment Guide Annex, NS-TAST-GD-013 Annex 1 Revision 1-DRAFT, 30 pgs

517 ONR Expert Panel on Natural Hazards (2017) Analysis of Seismic Hazards for Nuclear Sites.
518 NS-TAST-GD-013 Annex 1 Reference Paper, Expert Panel report: GEN-SH-EP-2016-1
519 DRAFT, 40 pgs

520 Ordaz M, Martinelli F, Aguilar A, Arboleda J, Meletti C, D'Amico V (2015) Crisis2015 Ver.
521 1.0: Program for computing seismic hazard. Instituto de Ingenieria, UNAM.

522 Pagani M, Monelli D, Weatherill G, Danciu L, Crowley H, Silva V, Henshaw P, Butler L,
523 Nastasi M, Panzeri L, Simionato M, Vigano D (2014) OpenQuake Engine: An open hazard
524 (and risk) software for the Global Earthquake Model. *Seismol Res Lett* 85(3):692-702

525 Renault P (2013) Lessons learned from the seismic hazard assessment of NPPs in
526 Switzerland. SMiRT22 - NGA-East Special Session, Retrieved 5 February 2016 from
527 [http://peer.berkeley.edu/ngaeast/wp-](http://peer.berkeley.edu/ngaeast/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/02_Renault_PegasosRefinement_SMIRT22.pdf)
528 [content/uploads/2013/09/02_Renault_PegasosRefinement_SMIRT22.pdf](http://peer.berkeley.edu/ngaeast/wp-content/uploads/2013/09/02_Renault_PegasosRefinement_SMIRT22.pdf)

529 Renault P (2015) PEGASOS Refinement Project: A refined seismic hazard assessment for
530 Swiss nuclear power plants. 14 D-A-CH Conference - Earthquakes and existing buildings, 8
531 pgs, Zurich (In German).

532 Salomone L (2015) A probabilistic seismic hazard analysis update review for two DOE sites
533 and NGA-East project overview and status. Seismic Lessons-Learned Panel Meeting, 27
534 May, Link Technologies, Inc.

535 SHWP (1988) Report on seismic hazard assessment, Volume 3M, A review of seismic hazard
536 assessment methods and their adaptation for Britain. Seismic Hazard Working Party, Central
537 Electricity Generating Board.

538 SHWP (1991) Report on seismic hazard assessment, supplement to volume 3M - Seismic
539 ground motion. Seismic Hazard Working Party, Central Electricity Generating Board.

540 Thomas P, Wong I, Abrahamson N (2010) Verification of probabilistic seismic hazard
541 analysis computer programs. Pacific Earthquake Engineering Research Center, PEER Report
542 2010/106, 176 pgs

543 Tromans I J, Aldama-Bustos G, Douglas J, Lessi-Cheimariou A, Hunt S, Davi M, Musson R
544 M W, Garrard G, Strasser F, Robertson C (2018) Probabilistic seismic hazard assessment for
545 a new-build nuclear power plant site in the UK. *Bull Earthquake Eng*, submitted

546 USNRC (2007) A performance-based approach to define the site-specific earthquake ground
547 motion. Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research. U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
548 Regulatory Guide 1.208, 53 pgs

549 USNRC (2012) Practical implementation guidelines for SSHAC level 3 and 4 hazard studies.
550 U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, NUREG-2117, Rev. 1, 235 pgs

551 USNRC (2018) Updated implementation guidelines for SSHAC hazard studies. U.S. Nuclear
552 Regulatory Commission, NUREG-2213, in preparation