

## PMFermiCOLPEm Resource

---

**From:** Olson, Bruce  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2011 4:43 PM  
**To:** 'Randall D Westmoreland'; 'Chris Becker 'beckerc@dteenergy.com'; 'Craig D Tylenda'; 'Colette M. Luff (Colette.M.Luff@usace.army.mil)'; Hale, Jerry; Muniz, Adrian; 'LaGory, Kirk E.'; Whited, Ryan; Fringer, John; Karimi, Roohollah; Hayse, John; Carpentier, Marcia; Doub, Peyton; Natasha B. Snyder ; Muir, Jessie  
**Cc:** FermiCOL Resource  
**Subject:** Meeting Minutes--Conference Call for the Fermi 3 COL Environmental Review--Monday, May 23, 2011, 2:00 PM Eastern Time  
**Attachments:** Conference\_Call\_Notes-bao rev 5-23-11.docx

Here are notes from the May 23, 2011 teleconference.

Thanks.....

Bruce Olson  
Environmental Project Manager  
Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
NRO/DSER/RAP2  
301-415-3731

**Hearing Identifier:** Fermi\_COL\_Public  
**Email Number:** 840

**Mail Envelope Properties** (6566BAEC3DB1314381965386524904EC20F633D8FE)

**Subject:** Meeting Minutes--Conference Call for the Fermi 3 COL Environmental Review--Monday, May 23, 2011, 2:00 PM Eastern Time  
**Sent Date:** 5/25/2011 4:43:16 PM  
**Received Date:** 5/25/2011 4:43:18 PM  
**From:** Olson, Bruce

**Created By:** Bruce.Olson@nrc.gov

**Recipients:**

"FermiCOL Resource" <FermiCOL.Resource@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Randall D Westmoreland" <westmorelandr@dteenergy.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Chris Becker 'beckerc@dteenergy.com'" <beckerc@dteenergy.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Craig D Tylenda" <tylendac@dteenergy.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Colette M. Luff (Colette.M.Luff@usace.army.mil)" <Colette.M.Luff@usace.army.mil>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Hale, Jerry" <Jerry.Hale@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Muniz, Adrian" <Adrian.Muniz@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"LaGory, Kirk E." <lagory@anl.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Whited, Ryan" <Ryan.Whited@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Fringer, John" <John.Fringer@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Karimi, Roohollah" <Roohollah.Karimi@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Hayse, John" <hayse@anl.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Carpentier, Marcia" <Marcia.Carpentier@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Doub, Peyton" <Peyton.Doub@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Natasha B. Snyder " <NSnyder@ene.com>  
Tracking Status: None  
"Muir, Jessie" <Jessie.Muir@nrc.gov>  
Tracking Status: None

**Post Office:** HQCLSTR02.nrc.gov

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	208	5/25/2011 4:43:18 PM
Conference_Call_Notes-bao rev 5-23-11.docx		40372

**Options**

<b>Priority:</b>	Standard
<b>Return Notification:</b>	No
<b>Reply Requested:</b>	No
<b>Sensitivity:</b>	Normal
<b>Expiration Date:</b>	
<b>Recipients Received:</b>	

**Conference Call for the Fermi 3 COL Environmental Review  
Monday, May 23, 2011, 2:00 PM Eastern Time**

**Purpose**

To discuss the progress and status of the Fermi 3 COL Environmental Review

**Participants**

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC): Bruce Olson, Jessie Muir, Andy Kugler, John Fringer

Argonne National Laboratory (Argonne): Kirk LaGory

Detroit Edison: Randall Westmoreland, Jamie Steis

Ecology and Environment: Natasha Snyder

Public: Michael Keegan, Don't Waste Michigan

**Summary of Discussions and Associated Action Items**

The summary of discussions during the conference call is presented below. Action items are identified below as **[ACTION ITEM]**. Detroit Edison was not in attendance.

**Alternatives Analysis**

- Subsequent to a thorough review of the alternatives site selection process used for the Fermi 3 COLA and Draft EIS, NRC needs some clarification information about the approach used to help ensure consistency with the Environmental Standard Review Plan (ESRP) Section 9.3 methodology, including Revision 1, July 2007. Questions and requests for information were discussed on the call and are summarized below. As requested by Detroit Edison, NRC has specified particular elements of the site selection studies of 2006 and 2008 that are of particular importance and are needed in the reference material.
  1. Provide the following portions of the 2006 site selection study and the 2008 update on the docket. For the 2006 study, provide Section 2.4, the nuclear site considerations, and Section 4.2.4, the explanation of the differences between Site "F" and Site "M". For the 2008 update, provide Table 4-2, which is referenced in the text of the document but doesn't appear in the document. The text indicates that this table includes comments on the noteworthy factors differentiating the candidate sites.
  2. DE's contractor used criteria such as proximity to transmission lines and numbers of residences or sensitive receptors in the process of identifying potential sites. Provide the objective measures (e.g., numeric criteria) used in this process. This information will assist the NRC in its determination whether DE "used a logical process that would reasonably be expected to produce a list of the best potential sites" in the region considered (see ESRP 9.3).
  3. DE's contractor considered existing DE power stations in its search for potential sites. Were all existing power stations included as potential sites? Or were some existing stations (e.g., small peaking stations) eliminated from consideration?

4. DE's contractor narrowed the list of potential sites down to eight candidate sites. Provide the objective measures (e.g., numeric criteria) used in this process. This information will assist the NRC in its determination whether DE used a "well documented process for screening potential sites," whether "all potential sites were screened in a consistent manner," and whether the process "provides reasonable assurance that potentially licensable candidate sites have not been omitted" (see ESRP 9.3).
  5. For those potential sites that were eliminated from further study, Environmental Report (ER) Table 9.3-2 includes a brief description of the reasons for the elimination of each site. This table is taken from the 2008 update to the siting study. In at least some cases (e.g., Site B-North Britton, Site H-Dexter) the reasons listed for elimination differ from those provided in the 2006 siting study. The reasons for the differences are unclear, and the bases for new issues that have been introduced are also unclear. Explain how the screening process used in the 2008 update differs from that used in the 2006 study. Provide any objective criteria used in the 2008 update that may have been different from those used in 2006. (For example, for Site B, the 2006 study states as an advantage "Rail (115 lbs.) and transmission line relatively close." But the ER and the 2008 update state "Long distance to some utilities.")
  6. The criterion "Public Receptivity" in ER Table 9.3-3 is given a very high weighting factor of 10 percent of the total for all criteria. Only two other criteria (Geologic/Seismic Activity with a weight of 6 percent and Security Considerations with a weight of 5 percent) have weights over 4 percent. Considering the inherently uncertain nature of public receptivity, did DE perform a sensitivity analysis to determine any changes in the rankings if this criterion were given a much lower weight, or eliminated? Provide the results of any such analysis previously performed, or perform the analysis and provide the results.
- Detroit Edison will review these questions and provide a written response **[ACTION ITEM]**.

#### Aquatic Resources

- Questions have arisen during the review of the preliminary draft EIS. Included are:
  - Does Detroit Edison allow fishing in the canals? Several recreationally and commercially important fish species have been documented in the canal system on the Fermi site. Detroit Edison responded that fishing is not allowed in the canals. This question is related to RAI AE2.4.2-2.
  - Have there been any documented instances of heat or cold shock related to operation of Fermi 2?
  - What are the procedures used by Detroit Edison to mitigate the potential for heat and cold shock and any interaction between Fermi 2 and 3?
- Detroit Edison will review these questions and provide a written response **[ACTION**

**ITEM].**

**Cultural Resources**

- The Michigan State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would like to send a letter out to solicit feedback from interested parties on Fermi 1 demolition effects. Detroit Edison will provide NRC with a list of interested parties **[ACTION ITEM]**.
- NRC must describe the mitigation that would be used for Fermi 1 demolition. NRC plans to use the Big Rock MOA as a template for that mitigation. The MOA has to show how effects would be mitigated. Included should be a description of recordation procedures that would be used (following the National Park Service's Historic American Engineering Record [HAER] guidelines) and some sort of public outreach.
- Detroit Edison will review the HAER requirements and evaluate options to follow those guidelines **[ACTION ITEM]**.
- Detroit Edison will check with Lynn Goodman to determine if any public displays or exhibits are available that could support public outreach activities **[ACTION ITEM]**.

**Fermi COL EIS**

- The preliminary writing session draft of the Fermi 3 COL EIS was submitted to NRC for internal staff review on April 29, 2011.
- The writing session is currently scheduled for the week of July 11, 2011.
- A Draft EIS is scheduled for publishing by October 2011 **[ACTION ITEM]**.

**Future Calls Planned**

- The next call will be held on Monday, June 6, 2011. Topics will include follow-up to items from the May 23, 2011, call as well as an update on the overall project. This call will be open to the public.