

PMFermiCOLPEm Resource

From: Olson, Bruce
Sent: Friday, December 18, 2009 4:12 PM
To: Randall D Westmoreland
Cc: Craig D Tylenda; LaGory, Kirk E.
Subject: Conference Call Notes--December 16, 2009

Conference Call Notes are attached for your information, review, and comment.



Conference call
notes-bao rev-...

Thanks.....

Bruce Olson, P.E.
Environmental Project Manager
NRC/NRO/DSER/RAP3
301-415-3731

Hearing Identifier: Fermi_COL_Public
Email Number: 746

Mail Envelope Properties (Bruce.Olson@nrc.gov20091218161100)

Subject: Conference Call Notes--December 16, 2009
Sent Date: 12/18/2009 4:11:58 PM
Received Date: 12/18/2009 4:11:00 PM
From: Olson, Bruce

Created By: Bruce.Olson@nrc.gov

Recipients:

"Craig D Tylenda" <tylendac@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None
"LaGory, Kirk E." <lagory@anl.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"Randall D Westmoreland" <westmorelandr@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	190	12/18/2009 4:11:00 PM
Conference call notes-bao rev-12-16-09.doc		37370

Options

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

Weekly Project Conference Call for the Fermi 3 COL Environmental Review

December 16, 2009

Purpose

To discuss several RAIs related to the Fermi 3 COL Environmental Review

Participants

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

Argonne National Laboratory (Argonne): Kirk LaGory, Sunita Kamboj, Bruce Biber

Detroit Edison: Randy Westmoreland, Ted Meyers, Chris Becker, Joe Leprad

Black & Veatch: Steve Thomas

Summary of Discussions and Associated Action Items

The summary of discussions during the conference call is presented below.

1. RAI HH5.4.3.1

- Argonne and NRC summarized concerns regarding the RAI response. Detroit Edison estimated the annual collective dose from the operation of Fermi Unit 3 at about 79 man-rem using values in the ESBWR DCD rev 5. This dose estimate appears to be appropriate. Detroit Edison tried to demonstrate that the contribution from other existing sources is negligible. The conclusion that the contribution from other sources is small may be correct but the approach used to demonstrate this is not acceptable.

To calculate occupational dose, Detroit Edison used the estimated maximum (unshielded) dose to construction workers of 72.3 mrem/yr, multiplied this value by the time workers would spend inside radiological controlled areas (43,931 person-hr according to DCD rev 5), and then proportionately reduced the value to account for shielding. The 43,931 person-hr is too low, as this would indicate that there would be only about 22 workers (assuming that one full time worker would be there for 2,000 hr/yr), and it only considers workers inside the radiological controlled areas rather than all monitored workers. This small number is not representative of the number of monitored worker at a typical reactor. Monitored workers include workers that do not spend all their time in radiological controlled areas.

- NRC noted that the ESRP references presentation of occupational dose in Table 5.4.3-2, but this reference actually should be to ESRP Table 5.4.3-3.
- NRC recommended that Detroit Edison revise their response by eliminating the calculations provided in 11/23/09 response, and instead present only the ESBWR DCD estimate of total occupational dose (79 man-rem/yr) from Fermi 3 together with a statement that dose from Fermi 1, Fermi 2, and the planned Fermi 2 ISFSI would be very small incremental additions to total dose, and governed by standards in 10 CFR Part 20. The proposed revisions to the COLA in the RAI response are considered acceptable.

- Detroit Edison indicated that a revised response could be provided together with responses to new RAIs scheduled for delivery in early 2010.

2. RAI TR7.4-1

- This RAI response was considered unacceptable by the Argonne reviewer (Biber) because it did not explicitly compare estimates of crud buildup in Fermi 3 with that of current reactors. In the conference call on December 7, 2009, Detroit Edison indicated that they would be unable to provide any more information than is already presented in the ER and the RAI response, and pointed to the recent write-up in the North Anna EIS (Section 6.2.1). Argonne reviewed the material in the North Anna EIS and has determined that Detroit Edison's response to the RAI is acceptable and requires no additional information.