PMFermiCOLNPEm Resource

From: Lemont, Stephen
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2009 10:58 AM
To: tylendac@dteenergy.com
Cc: Randall Westmoreland; Mussatti, Daniel; 'Guerin, Jone'; Kirk LaGory; John Hayse; FermiCOL Resource
Subject: Fermi 3 LOS Traffic Study Call Notes 6-18-09.doc
Attachments: Fermi 3 LOS Traffic Study Call Notes 6-18-09.doc

Craig,

I have attached the notes summarizing our 6-18-09 conference call regarding the LOS Traffic Study. If you have any questions or comments on these notes, please let me know. Otherwise, please forward these notes to Mannik and Smith for action and to others as necessary.

There are two items highlighted in yellow in the notes that are action items, one for DTE Energy (DTE) and one for NRC/E&E. These are repeated below. Please let me know on DTE's action item as soon as possible, in terms of the ability to provide advance information and when it could be provided.

Action Items from 6-18-09 LOS Traffic Study Conference Call

- **DTE Action Item:** [Regarding NRC reviewing an advance copy of study, annotated outline, advance sections, assumptions that will be used in the analysis in terms of workforce, time periods, residency, and road usage or scope of work for review to ensure the study is on target.] Will check with management, but generally agree that this would be a good approach, at least in the reading room in Buffalo (DTE Tonawanda).

- **NRC/E&E Action Item:** [Regarding information in emergency evacuation report, COLA Part 5—Emergency Plan, Appendix 5.] E&E and NRC will evaluate for sufficiency and consistency with assumptions used in LOS analysis. Additional discussion may be needed after review.

Thanks,
Steve Lemont

Hearing Identifier: Fermi_COL_NonPublic
Email Number: 128

Mail Envelope Properties (1FA53ADF29758448974A8AC1118E627EB58846EAB4)

Subject: Fermi 3 LOS Traffic Study Call Notes 6-18-09.doc
Sent Date: 6/22/2009 10:58:19 AM
Received Date: 6/22/2009 10:58:20 AM
From: Lemont, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Lemont@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Randall Westmoreland" <westmorelandr@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Mussatti, Daniel" <Daniel.Mussatti@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"'Guerin, Jone'" <JGuerin@ene.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Kirk LaGory" <lagory@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"John Hayse" <hayse@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"FermiCOL Resource" <FermiCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"tylendac@dteenergy.com" <tylendac@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	1428	6/22/2009 10:58:20 AM
Fermi 3 LOS Traffic Study Call Notes 6-18-09.doc	51194	

Options
Priority: Standard
Return Notification: No
Reply Requested: No
Sensitivity: Normal
Expiration Date:
Recipients Received:

Conference Call to Discuss the Level of Service (LOS) Traffic Study for the Fermi 3 Project

Thursday, June 18, 2009

Purpose

To discuss Request for Additional Information (RAI) Number SE4.4.2-10 pertaining to the LOS analysis/traffic study for the Fermi 3 Environmental Report (ER).

Call Participants

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC): Stephen Lemont, Daniel Mussatti

DTE Energy (DTE): Craig Tylenda

Mannik and Smith (M&S) Group: Barry Buschmann, Jean Hartline

Argonne National Laboratory: Kirk LaGory, John Hayse

Ecology & Environment (E&E): Jone Guerin

Summary of Discussions

1. RAI Item 1: Carrying capacity and condition of roads and highways during construction, operation, and outage periods
    - M&S: What is needed for the study?
    - NRC: Looking for information about the physical conditions of roads (potholes, turning lanes, maintenance, etc.) and for information about traffic levels to evaluate what impacts would be if no mitigation was done during all phases of the project, including a "worst case" scenario of an outage for Fermi 2 occurring during the same time frame as peak construction for Fermi 3.. If the analysis indicates that a decrease would occur in the LOS, M&S should recommend what kinds of mitigation are needed to bring the roads back up to acceptable LOS. Also, looking for more quantification regarding level of traffic anticipated (number of employees, construction workers, etc.). Need better quantification of numbers of workers, roadways used to access site, and periods of construction, operation, and outages to evaluate potential impacts.
    - M&S: Have been collecting the traffic data needed to address information needs. Traffic counters in place; roadway network is currently under capacity right now, but looking to see if there are any aspects that would be limiting with regard to traffic needs. Will look at traffic now, projections for Fermi 3 (when it comes on line). Future level of need. M&S has experience with Fermi 2 construction traffic.
    - NRC: Need to know more than just the average capacity of roads and levels. Need to have a characterization of expected traffic levels (and resulting LOS levels) during peak periods in order to evaluate road quality impacts.

- E&E: As identified in the ER, the traffic study is needed to meet Michigan Department of Transportation (DOT) requirements.
- M&S: Have worked with Michigan DOT and are familiar with their requirements for analysis in a traffic study.
- DTE: Plans to transmit the LOS study to NRC by November 25, 2009.
- NRC: There was discussion during the site audit that the duration of the traffic study may need to cover 1 year. Will it do that?
- DTE: Not familiar with that requirement. Current plan is to develop the report based on some new data (not full year) and historical data collected over the last 30 years. M&S does not plan on conducting a one-year study.
- NRC: Prefer to have one year of data collected specifically for the project, but if not, then DTE can use professional judgment to discuss seasonal patterns.
- M&S: There is about 30 years of historical information about the roads in the area. Sterling State Park has some seasonal traffic peaks associated with it, but other than that the levels are fairly steady across the year.
- NRC: Would it be possible to get an advance copy of study, annotated outline, advance sections, assumptions that will be used in the analysis in terms of workforce, time periods, residency, and road usage or scope of work for review to ensure the study is on target? Perhaps place advance materials in reading rooms for review?
- DTE: Will check with management, but generally agree that this would be a good approach, at least in the reading room in Buffalo (DTE Tonawanda).

2. RAI Item #2: Information about emergency evacuation reports
   - DTE: COLA Part 5—Emergency Plan, Appendix 5 already has this information.
   - NRC: Will evaluate for sufficiency and consistency with assumptions used in LOS analysis. Additional discussion may be needed after review.
3. RAI Item #3: Public transportation
   - DTE: Not much public transportation in the area now. That might be a potential mitigation if any impacts are identified. Applicant could consider providing group or public transportation to address those impacts. There is some public transportation provided regionally by Monroe County.
   - NRC: County was not opposed to adding a permanent route if it is needed. This can be covered in the LOS report.
4. Region of analysis
   - DTE: How far out should analysis be conducted?
   - NRC: M&S can use professional judgment regarding the distance at which effects would no longer be discernable.