

Fermi2LRANPEm Resource

From: Lynne S Goodman [goodmanl@dteenergy.com]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 3:29 PM
To: James, Lois
Cc: Perkins, Leslie
Subject: Re: FW: Please send to Fermi.....: Clarification on SAMA Request

Lois, thank you very much for the quick turnaround on these clarifications. I think this answers our questions. I have forwarded them to our Subject Matter Experts and will let you know if any further clarification is needed.

Lynne

-----"James, Lois" <Lois.James@nrc.gov> wrote: -----

To: "goodmanl@dteenergy.com" <goodmanl@dteenergy.com>
From: "James, Lois" <Lois.James@nrc.gov>
Date: 09/05/2014 12:21PM
Cc: "Perkins, Leslie" <Leslie.Perkins@nrc.gov>
Subject: FW: Please send to Fermi.....: Clarification on SAMA Request

Lynne,

Below in ***bold, italic*** are our responses to your clarification. Let me know if you need more

Lois M. James, Senior Environmental Project Manager

Division of License Renewal

Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulations

lois.james@nrc.gov (preferred method of communication)

301-415-3306

From: Lynne S Goodman [<mailto:goodmanl@dteenergy.com>]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 6:47 PM
To: James, Lois
Cc: Perkins, Leslie
Subject: Clarification on SAMA Request

Lois, I'd appreciate if you would send the following request for clarification to the Fermi SAMA reviewers. I would be happy to discuss this in a telecom.

1. Regarding documentation request #4, please clarify what other reviews of Fermi 2 Level 1 ,2 and 3 PRAs you want documentation on. Is it all the different group reviews of the current PRA version? Is it reviews of all versions of the PRA? Is it the peer reviews of the versions we had peer reviews on?

The documentation requested is for reviews of the version of the Fermi 2 PRA used for the SAMA analysis (FermiV9). The response to question 1.g, might for example, refer to other quality reviews (other than the 2012 BWROG Peer review) of the SAMA PRA. Documentation of a comprehensive sample of these reviews is desired.

2. Regarding question 1.c.h, on discussing the relevance of the resolution of the peer review findings on internal flooding to the FermiV9 model when the Fermi V9 model flooding upgrades are significant, we would appreciate some clarification. Our group interpreted the question two different ways. Are you interested in the timing - e.g. that the peer review was on a draft that included extensive flooding re-evaluation? Are you interested in the significance of the peer review comments that addressed internal flooding because the model had included significant changes for internal flooding? or ??

As indicated in question 1.g, the 2012 BWROG peer review was apparently on a prior version of the Fermi PRA than that used for the SAMA. Since the internal flooding model used for the SAMA PRA was an "extensive re-evaluation" of the prior model, the applicability of the peer review findings and there resolution to the present application is not clear. If the peer review was on a draft of FermiV9, then this should be made clear and the information requested in question 1.g should be provided.

Lynne Goodman
Fermi 2 License Renewal Project Manager
734-586-1205

Hearing Identifier: Fermi2_LR_NonPublic
Email Number: 127

Mail Envelope Properties

(OF21A108FC.BD21112E-ON85257D4A.006AFE1D-85257D4A.006AFE1E)

Subject: Re: FW: Please send to Fermi.....: Clarification on SAMA Request
Sent Date: 9/5/2014 3:28:38 PM
Received Date: 9/5/2014 3:28:43 PM
From: Lynne S Goodman

Created By: goodmanl@dteenergy.com

Recipients:

"Perkins, Leslie" <Leslie.Perkins@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None
"James, Lois" <Lois.James@nrc.gov>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office: dteenergy.com

Files	Size	Date & Time
MESSAGE	3135	9/5/2014 3:28:43 PM

Options

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