Fermi2LRANPEm Resource

From: Keegan, Elaine
Sent: Monday, March 23, 2015 12:53 PM
To: Randall D Westmoreland
Subject: Draft Round 3 RAIs
Attachments: FermiSamaround3.pdf

Randy,

Attached is the draft of the SAMA RAIs - Round 3. We would like to have a call to talk about the draft questions with you later this week, either Thursday afternoon or anytime on Friday. After the call, I will finalize the RAI and send a letter with the RAI request. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Elaine

ELAINE M KEEGAN
SR. PROJECT MANAGER
DIVISION OF LICENSE RENEWAL, NRR
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
301-415-8517

Hearing Identifier: Fermi2_LR_NonPublic
Email Number: 270

Mail Envelope Properties (Elaine.Keegan@nrc.gov20150323125200)

Subject: Draft Round 3 RAIs
Sent Date: 3/23/2015 12:52:43 PM
Received Date: 3/23/2015 12:52:00 PM
From: Keegan, Elaine

Created By: Elaine.Keegan@nrc.gov

Recipients:
"Randall D Westmoreland" <westmorelandr@dteenergy.com>
Tracking Status: None

Post Office:

Files	**Size**	**Date & Time**
MESSAGE	504	3/23/2015 12:52:00 PM
FermiSamaround3.pdf	75207	

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

Fermi Round 3 RAIs

1. RAI 2 (relating to response to RAI 2.e)

The response to this RAI 2 (relating to response to RAI 2.e)does not account for the underestimation of the risk of Class IIA sequences discussed and evaluated in response to RAI 3. The maximum impact of the unaccounted for the 3.14E-09/year, using the same consequence assumptions as in RAI 3, is $27,400 ($68,600 including uncertainty). This needs to be addressed either in RAI 2 response, or probably more effectively in the RAI 3 response.

2. RAI 3 (relating to response to RAI 2.g.iii)

a) In Table 3-5 (p. 14) the cost of SAMA 152 is erroneously given as $1,000,000. The cost should be $100,000 (ER Table D.2-1). Please perform a refined analysis similar to those provided in Table 3-6.

b) The inclusion of the 3.14E-09/year undercounting of Class IIA discussed in RAI 2 will impact the adjusted cost benefits in Table 3-6. Please account for this undercounting.

3. RAI 5 (relating to response to RAI 5. a. ii, 5. a. vi, 5. a. vii, 6.h and 7.a)

The primary purpose of the RAI was to determine how the cost-benefit calculations performed in response to the original RAIs were performed with respect to the external events multiplier. The response for each of the RAI subsections included the statement that the analysis was performed using the same methodology as described in the ER. For all but one (6.h) it was also stated that "The same external event multiplier used in the ER was applied to this evaluation." Please confirm that the external event multiplier of 11 was used for all the cited analyses including 6.h?

4. Specify the US permanent population, Canadian permanent population, and total transient population that sum to the total estimated population of 6,055,678 reported in Table D.1-22 of the environmental report. Provide tables showing the spatial distribution of these three population components. Justify that the total population and its spatial distribution modeled in the SAMA analysis will not underestimate offsite population doses and offsite economic cost risks, considering prevailing winds blowing from the west to southwest and the corresponding potential for atmospheric plume migration to the east to northeast. Explain how the population distribution and economic values were implemented in the SAMA analysis to account for the non-US population and non-US land areas. Provide supporting WinMACCS code inputs and outputs that confirm offsite population doses and offsite economic cost risks have not been underestimated.

5. To support an NRC evaluation of potential replacement power costs from a temporary suspension of Fermi 3 power generation during site cleanup and decontamination activities following a severe accident at the Fermi 2 plant, confirm that 1655 MWe is an appropriate value for the Fermi 3 power output or recommend a more appropriate value.