

PMFermiCOLPEm Resource

From: Berrios, Ilka
Sent: Monday, November 30, 2009 3:01 PM
To: LaShawn G Green; Peter W Smith; peteronn@dteenergy.com
Cc: FermiCOL Resource; Kevern, Thomas
Subject: DRAFT RAIs Chapter 2
Attachments: RAI 4075.doc; RAI 4068.doc; RAI 4069.doc; RAI 4073.doc; RAI 4074.doc

All,

Attached files are DRAFT RAIs related to FSAR sections 2.4.2, 2.4.3, 2.4.5, 2.4.6 and 2.4.13. Please review them and let me know if a call is needed to clarify any of these questions. If we don't hear from you by Friday, we'll assume that a call is not needed and the RAI letter will be issued.

Any questions, please let me know.

Ilka E. Berrios
Project Manager
Office of New Reactors
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Phone: 301-415-3179
Mailstop: T-6D38M

Hearing Identifier: Fermi_COL_Public
Email Number: 716

Mail Envelope Properties (87B1F1BDFE5A554CA9DC5EAA75EB6D0D14FF351D16)

Subject: DRAFT RAIs Chapter 2
Sent Date: 11/30/2009 3:00:50 PM
Received Date: 11/30/2009 3:00:52 PM
From: Berrios, Ilka

Created By: Ilka.Berrios@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"FermiCOL Resource" <FermiCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Kevern, Thomas" <Thomas.Kevern@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"LaShawn G Green" <greenl@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"Peter W Smith" <smithpw@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"petersonn@dteenergy.com" <petersonn@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: HQCLSTR01.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	507	11/30/2009 3:00:52 PM
RAI 4075.doc	31226	
RAI 4068.doc	30202	
RAI 4069.doc	30714	
RAI 4073.doc	31738	
RAI 4074.doc	30202	

Options

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

Request for Additional Information No. 4075 Revision 0

Fermi Unit 3
Detroit Edison
Docket No. 52-033

SRP Section: 02.04.13 - Accidental Releases of Radioactive Liquid Effluents in Ground and Surface Waters

Application Section: 02.04.13

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.13-***

To meet the requirements of 10 CFR 100.20(c) and 10 CFR 52.79(a)(1)(iii), and to support the staff's review of the application, the staff requests additional information related to the RESRAD-OFFSITE simulations as follows:

1. The RESRAD-OFFSITE simulation as performed by the Applicant assumes that the contaminants are present initially (i.e. immediately after the release) in a volume of contaminated soil 56 m² by 2 m deep. The rates at which contaminants leach from the soil are not explicitly specified in the model input, so that the model uses the supplied K_d values to calculate leaching rates. For radionuclides with large K_d values (e.g. Co-60), this means that very little of the contamination would be leached from the soil and enter the groundwater. Please either provide a justification for the modeling approach that was used, or else perform and discuss RESRAD-OFFSITE simulations in which the contaminants enter the groundwater without delay, for example by specifying the rate of leaching from contaminated soil.
2. Please provide additional information regarding the well pumping rate used in the simulation. The value of about 5,000 m³/yr is based on an agricultural scenario, and appears to be unreasonably large for a residential well. Either provide an explanation for the choice of this rate, or else provide and discuss a simulation that uses a more reasonable pumping rate consistent with a residential well.
3. Please provide additional information, in "risk-informed" terms, regarding the uncertainty in the estimates of radionuclide concentrations at the receptor points. This might for example include sensitivity and/or uncertainty analyses.

Request for Additional Information No. 4068 Revision 0

Fermi Unit 3
Detroit Edison
Docket No. 52-033
SRP Section: 02.04.02 - Floods
Application Section: 02.04.02

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.02-***

To meet the requirements of 100.20(c) and 52.79(a)(1)(iii) and to support the staff's review of the application, the staff requests additional information concerning the erosion protection measures to be used for the slopes of the Fermi 3 elevated area. The staff requests the following:

- (1) calculations of the potential maximum velocity of runoff from the 8% slopes during the PMP at the site and
- (2) detailed information on specific erosion protection measures designed to resist erosion under the maximum predicted water velocities.

Request for Additional Information No. 4069 Revision 0

Fermi Unit 3
Detroit Edison
Docket No. 52-033

SRP Section: 02.04.03 - Probable Maximum Flood (PMF) on Streams and Rivers
Application Section: 02.04.03

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.03-***

In accordance with 100.20(c) and 52.79(a)(1)(iii) and to support the staff's review of the application, the NRC staff requests that the applicant provide rationale for choosing the 100-year surge as predicted by the USACE for flooding Alternative I rather than using the maximum recorded seiche at the site of 6.3 ft. The ANSI/ANS-2.8-1992 guidelines indicate that the Alternative I should include the "surge and seiche resulting from the worst regional hurricane or windstorm."

02.04.03-***

The staff has reviewed FSAR Section 2.4.3.6, Coincident Wind and Wave Activity. In accordance with 100.20(c) and 52.79(a)(1)(iii), the NRC staff requests that the applicant provide additional information on wind-wave activity coincident with a flood under Alternatives I and II. According to section 9.2.3.2 of ANSI/ANS-2.8-1992, all alternatives need to be evaluated with wind-wave activity. The applicant should provide the details on determination of critical wind direction and speed, calculation of possible wind-wave activities, and evaluation of potential impacts of wind wave run-up on the plant safety design.

Request for Additional Information No. 4073 Revision 0

Fermi Unit 3
Detroit Edison
Docket No. 52-033
SRP Section: 02.04.05 - Probable Maximum Surge and Seiche Flooding
Application Section: 02.04.05

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.05-***

To meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 52 and 10 CFR Part 100 and to support the staff's review of the application, the staff requests that applicant provide an evaluation to justify or an analysis to demonstrate that the surge calculated for moving squall line does not result in the most severe flood condition in this area.

02.04.05-***

To meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 52 and 10 CFR Part 100 and to support the staff's review of the application, the staff requests that the applicant provide the following:

1. descriptions of the limitations of the Bretschneider method used for calculating wind setup under the PMWS
2. rationale of choosing the Bretschneider method as a conservative approach to predict the probable maximum surge for Lake Erie compared to other commonly used methods
3. details on the derivation of the key parameters of fetch length and water depth used in the Bretschneider method
4. a table of results presented in applicant's calculation package.

02.04.05-***

To meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 52 and 10 CFR Part 100 and to support the staff's review of the application, the staff requests that the applicant provide a map showing the distribution of wave height overlain on the contours of the bathymetric map of Lake Erie. According to section 7.3.5 of ANSI/ANS-2.8-1992, "Results of the computation of the probable maximum surge hydrograph in graphical presentation" should be addressed.

02.04.05-***

To meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 52, and 10 CFR Part 100 and to support the staff's review of the application, the staff requests that the applicant provide the following:

- (1) Revise FSAR Table 2.4-224, Breaking Wave Heights, to show correct and consistent values of wave height in meter and feet, respectively, and

(2) Use graphs to illustrate the shore profile (from STWAVE point to the Fermi 3 safety structure), wave characteristics across the shore (maximum still water level, wave length, wave height, breaking wave, run-up, etc.), their relationship, and quantitative information that supports conclusion of no impact to Fermi 3 safety structures.

Request for Additional Information No. 4074 Revision 0

Fermi Unit 3
Detroit Edison
Docket No. 52-033
SRP Section: 02.04.06 - Probable Maximum Tsunami Flooding
Application Section: 02.04.06

QUESTIONS for Hydrologic Engineering Branch (RHEB)

02.04.06-***

To meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 52, and 10 CFR Part 100 and to support the staff's review of the application, the staff requests that the applicant conduct a thorough search for historical tsunamis in the area. Based on the search results, the applicant should provide an analysis to evaluate whether a tsunami may occur in the area and its potential impacts, if any. NRC Staff has conducted an initial search and found two historical events: one in the northern end of Lake Erie and the other near the Detroit River.