

PMFermiCOLPEm Resource

From: LaGory, Kirk E. [lagory@anl.gov]
Sent: Monday, November 02, 2009 11:34 AM
To: Olson, Bruce
Cc: Hayse, John; Quinn, John; Carr, Adrienne E.; Kamboj, Sunita
Subject: Emailing: Conference call notes 10-30-09.doc
Attachments: Conference call notes 10-30-09.doc

Bruce:

Attached are our notes from the conference call on Friday.

Let me know if you have any questions or comments.

Kirk

~~~~~  
Kirk E. LaGory, Ph.D.  
Ecologist  
Environmental Science Division  
Argonne National Laboratory  
9700 S. Cass Ave.  
Argonne, IL 60439  
  
Office: 630-252-3169  
Cell: 630-564-3169  
Fax: 630-252-6090  
~~~~~

Hearing Identifier: Fermi_COL_Public
Email Number: 706

Mail Envelope Properties (A5D9DCF110A2794AAE55D1D4C0C3FF800217A3B024)

Subject: Emailing: Conference call notes 10-30-09.doc
Sent Date: 11/2/2009 11:34:07 AM
Received Date: 11/2/2009 11:34:10 AM
From: LaGory, Kirk E.

Created By: lagory@anl.gov

Recipients:

"Hayse, John" <hayse@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Quinn, John" <quinnj@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Carr, Adrienne E." <aecarr@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kamboj, Sunita" <skamboj@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Olson, Bruce" <Bruce.Olson@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: OZZY.anl.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	394	11/2/2009 11:34:10 AM
Conference call notes 10-30-09.doc		46146

Options

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

**Conference Call to Discuss Requests for Additional Information
for the Fermi 3 COL Environmental Review**

October 30, 2009

Purpose

To discuss Request for Additional Information (RAI) responses scheduled for delivery in November and December..

Participants

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC): Bruce Olson

Argonne National Laboratory (Argonne): Kirk LaGory, Sunita, Kamboj, John Quinn, Adrienne Carr

Detroit Edison: Randy Westmoreland, Chris Becker, Bob Peters

Black & Veatch (B&V): Dave O'Rourke, Lisa Fewins, Doug Timpe, Ed Meyer, Adam Liebergen, Jason Jouret, Craig Johnson, Glen Goodson

Summary of Discussions and Associated Action Items

The Summary of discussions during the conference call is presented below. Two action items were identified during the call (related to HH5.4.3-1 and HY4.2.1-2) and resolution identified in these notes.

1. Follow-up to RAI Responses Discussed on September 11 Conference Call

These discussions, as summarized below, were limited to RAIs in the attachment, "RAIs to be Discussed with Detroit Edison 10-30-09."

GE3.1-1

- Argonne believes that discussion of this RAI is not needed, because it is understood that a full accounting of impacts in all environmental resource areas will need to be provided.
- Detroit Edison provided assurance that they will provide a complete analysis based on the revised site layout.

HH5.4.2-2

- Detroit Edison indicated that additional information on dose calculations for the general population will be provided in the response and in revision to the ER. Table 5.4-2 of the ER will be revised to include parameters used in dose calculations for general population and Tables 5.4-1 and 5.4-3 will also be revised to be consistent with Table 5.4-2.

HH5.4.3-1

- B&V considered occupational dose to workers from Fermi 3 operations and included the dose from Fermi 2 operations. ESBWR DCD provides the occupational dose values from Fermi 3 operations. Using the shielding calculations for Fermi 2 releases, B&V determined that any incremental dose from Fermi 2 would be insignificant. B&V will revise the ER to describe their approach and findings.
- Detroit Edison questioned the need for calculating the dose from Fermi 1 because by the time Fermi 3 is operational, Fermi 1 will have been decommissioned, and therefore not a licensed source under NRC's purview. Such sources are not typically included in occupational dose calculations per NRC regulation.
- Argonne agrees that if Fermi 1 is decommissioned for unrestricted release at the time of Fermi 3 operations, any residual dose from Fermi 1 would be well below natural background and not contribute to occupational dose.

HY2.3.1-1

- B&V will provide a map with a plan view of clay dikes on the Fermi site. They will also provide cross-sections from other Fermi drawings to show the vertical dimension.
- Argonne asked if those drawings would indicate the materials the dikes are made of and what material is underneath the clay dikes
- B&V indicated that they would provide us with whatever information they had.

HY2.3.1-2

- The discussion focused on the isopach maps because the requested construction drawings had been provided in an earlier response.
- B&V indicated that they would provide Argonne with an isopach map based on borings and other information that they used to estimate the thickness of gravel fill on the site.

HY4.2.1-2

- B&V indicated that the information requested in this RAI had already been provided in response to TE4.3.1-3 and found acceptable for that RAI. They indicated that their response would refer back to that earlier response rather than provide any additional information.
- Argonne agreed to review that response to determine its suitability for this hydrology RAI. Argonne reviewed the response and would like information on the invert elevation of the culverts that are shown on the map provided in the response to TE4.3.1-3. Argonne would like to compare the invert elevations to the low water elevation of Lake Erie to determine whether the response is acceptable.
- B&V indicated that all surface water on the site is hydraulically connected to Lake Erie and that dewatering of the site could result in a drop in Lake Erie's water level.
- Argonne noted that gravel fill may be in contact with the Bass Islands aquifer.

HY4.2.1-3

- B&V clarified that the model used to estimate dewatering effects was considered bedrock only because there will be no direct effect on any materials above bedrock (see previous RAI discussion). B&V also indicated that there were no direct calculations of dewatering of surficial materials. Their analysis was based on a USGS report (Water

Resources Investigation Report 03-4312) with the only modification of the USGS model being the modeling grid that they used. B&V has a report, "51.9014 Excavation Dewatering", but it is not known whether this report is available in the Reading Room or by any other means.

- Argonne indicated that they would like more detail than the very brief discussion provided in ER Sections 2.3.1.2.2.5.1 and 4.2.1.5.
- B&V indicated that they will provide a summary description of their approach and that their calculations will be provided in the reading room for Argonne's review.

HY4.2.1-4

- B&V stated that ER Section 2.3.1.2.2.5.1 briefly describes the changes they made to the USGS model. They indicated that they will clarify their approach and the methods they will use to hydraulically isolate excavation areas. They also indicated that they will describe how they used information in an existing pressure grouting report for Fermi 2.
- Argonne asked if the calculation package discussed the appropriateness of the grid size and barrier wall used in the model.
- B&V stated that the information will be provided in their response and the calculation package for Argonne's review.

HY4.2.1-6

- B&V stated that the MODFLOW drain package was used to maintain consistency with the USGS report and the model's original application. They used the drain package to determine the final head elevation. B&V stated that sumps would be used in excavation areas and that the drain package represented this application well. Regional values of hydraulic conductivity in the model were close to the average value that B&V determined in packer tests. The RAI response will provide justification for their approach.

HY4.2.1-11 and HY5.2-1

- B&V stated that several pages are devoted to monitoring in the ER (Section 2.3.1.2.4). In this section, monitoring is treated on a conceptual basis. Detroit Edison has indicated that they will comply with existing NRC guidance on monitoring and made that commitment in the ER. The level of detail provided is consistent with that provided in the North Anna ER. Taking a more detailed approach would be difficult because the exact location of monitoring wells cannot be fully determined at this time. There are existing Fermi 1 and 2 monitoring wells now. Fermi 2 and 3 monitoring will be consolidated into a single program. Detroit Edison's response will provide this rationale and planned approach. B&V will review NRC guidance and determine if more detail can be provided.
- NRC and Argonne agreed that the approach was acceptable.

2. Other Items

- Detroit Edison and NRC will discuss air conformity at a later time to be determined next week.
- The virtual reading room is being tested now and seems to be working. It should be ready for use sometime in November.