

PMFermiCOLPEm Resource

From: Lemont, Stephen
Sent: Tuesday, August 11, 2009 1:08 PM
To: LaGory, Kirk E.
Cc: Hayse, John; FermiCOL Resource
Subject: S. Lemont Comments-Questions on July 31, 2009 Fermi 3 RAI Response Submittal

Kirk,

I have reviewed the subject RAI response submittal from Detroit Edison, and my comments/questions are presented below. I have not commented on the technical issues and leave that to the Argonne/ERI SME's; and as always, they should be discussing their comments with their NRC counterparts. Please incorporate my comments/questions as appropriate, along with the Argonne/ERI team comments, into an updated RAI status table for the July 31 RAI responses only. In updating the comments column in this table, for the sake of consistency please use a similar format and language to that used in the June 19 RAI response status table.

After we discuss our comments with the Applicant, please incorporate final modifications, send me the final July 31 status table for me to send to the Applicant as part of the conference call notes, and incorporate the July 31 status table into the master status table for all the RAIs. I need to have the draft of the July 31 RAI response status table in hand by August 24, 2009. If I receive any comments from NRC staff after August 14, I will incorporate them into this table.

S. Lemont Comments on July 31, 2009 Fermi 3 RAI Response Submittal

1. General Comments (to be discussed with Detroit Edison in the conference call):
 - a. Where references are cited in RAI responses, they need to be submitted to NRC for docketing unless we already have them or they are readily available to us in the public record. Our review of these references is part of our review of these RAI responses.
 - b. Where references are being withheld from docketing because they relate to admitted contentions, we will still need those docketed (all or in part, to be determined) because the issues in the admitted contentions must be fully addressed in the EIS.
 - c. We still need to work cooperatively with Detroit Edison determine what documents, portions of documents, or other information related to documents provided in reading rooms only must be cited as references in the EIS and therefore submitted for docketing.
 - d. We need reiterate that we need access to Detroit Edison proposed reading room web portal ASAP, and need to request that work on this be accelerated. (I have already sent Randy an email on this matter, but will bring it up again if necessary during the conference call.) We need this portal to facilitate our further review of the reading room only documents requested in RAIs and cited in some RAI responses, and determination of exactly what we must have submitted for docketing.
2. Attachment 1 - GE1.1-1: What Detroit Edison provided is not exactly what we were looking for (especially for the Purpose part; see first paragraph of Full RAI Text), and perhaps departs further from what we need than what we had in the first place. Please have Ron Kolpa write up a concise statement (drawing from language in the Full RAI Text) describing exactly what we need here in lieu of or in addition to what has been provided in the response.
3. Attachment 2 - GE2-1: Was more than one handout provided at the site audit general tour and with the RAI response.? Do we now have everything we need in response to this RAI?
4. Attachment 4 - AE2.4.2-1: Clearly, we will need this correspondence to cite as references in the EIS, yet they are providing them in the reading rooms only. (And do the reading rooms contain the actual correspondence or just a list of discussions as is implied in the RAI response?) I see no reason why these particular items cannot be submitted by Detroit Edison for docketing.

5. Attachment 6 - BC10.4.2-1: Did they adequately respond to our RAI to provide an updated and citable source of monetized benefits and costs. It doesn't look like it to me because they seem to be only pointing to items already in the ER.
6. Attachment 7 - CR4.1.3-1: Detroit Edison needs to modify its future submittal schedule to address the additional documents to be provided on or before August 7, 2009.
7. Attachment 10 - HH5.3.4-1: Again, I don't see why they can't submit this for docketing. We need to determine exactly what we need from this documentation, and request that be submitted for docketing.
8. Attachment 14 - HY2.3.1-5: We need the references listed on pp. 3-4 submitted to NRC for docketing, unless we already have them or they are readily available to us in the public record. Our review of these references is part of our review of this RAI response. Are these references even in the reading rooms right now?
9. Attachment 20 - HY4.6-1: It appears that response to this RAI is unacceptable because they have neither developed nor provided the requested SESC. Can we request something else that would suffice?
10. Attachment 21 - HY4.6-2: It appears that the response to this RAI is inadequate because they have neither developed nor provided the requested SWPPP. Can we request something else that would suffice?
11. Attachment 31 - SE4.4.2-9: Has an adequate response been provided?
12. Attachment 32 - TE2.4.1-3: Do we need all or part of the documentation described in the third paragraph of the response to be docketed?
13. Attachment 36 - TL4.1.2-1: Is this an adequate response?
14. Attachment 37 - TL4.1.2-2: Is this an adequate response?

In addition, please let me know if the future response schedule in Appendix B of the July 31 cover letter looks OK, or if there are any problems to discuss with Detroit Edison.

Please contact me if you have any questions or comments on the above.

Thanks,
Steve

Stephen Lemont, Ph.D.

Environmental Project Manager
United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Office of New Reactors
Mail Stop: T-7E30
Washington, DC 20555-0001
Telephone: 301-415-5163
Fax: 301-415-5397
Email: Stephen.Lemont@nrc.gov

Hearing Identifier: Fermi_COL_Public
Email Number: 454

Mail Envelope Properties (1FA53ADF29758448974A8AC1118E627EB5B8F4BC2D)

Subject: S. Lemont Comments-Questions on July 31, 2009 Fermi 3 RAI Response
Submittal
Sent Date: 8/11/2009 1:08:19 PM
Received Date: 8/11/2009 1:08:20 PM
From: Lemont, Stephen

Created By: Stephen.Lemont@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Hayse, John" <hayse@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"FermiCOL Resource" <FermiCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"LaGory, Kirk E." <lagory@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	5989	8/11/2009 1:08:20 PM

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