Appendix A NRC3-09-0012

List of RAI Responses Contained in this Letter

List of RAI Responses Contained in this Letter

RAI Question	Subject	Attachment Number
GE1.1-1	General	1
GE2-1	General	
GE2-2	General	3
AE2.4.2-1	Aquatic Ecology	- 4
AQ3.6.3-3	Air Quality and Meteorology	5
BC10.4.2-1	Benefit-Cost Balance	6
CR4.1.3-1	Cultural Resources	. 7
CR4.1.3-2	Cultural Resources	8
CR4.1.3-5	Cultural Resources	9
HH5.3.4-1	Human Health	10
HH5.4.1-1	Human Health	11
HH5.4.1-2	Human Health	12
HH5.4.2-1	Human Health	13
HY2.3.1-5	Hydrology	· 14
HY2.3.1-6	Hydrology	15
HY2.3.1-9	Hydrology	16
HY2.3.1-11	Hydrology	. 17
HY2.3.1-12	Hydrology	18
HY2.3.1-13	Hydrology	19
HY4.6-1	Hydrology	20
HY4.6-2	Hydrology	21
HY4.6-3	Hydrology	22
HY5.3.2-1	Hydrology	23
HY5.3.2-3	Hydrology	24
HY5.3.2-4	Hydrology	25
HY5.3.2-5	Hydrology	26.
LU1.2-1c	Land Use	. 27
SE2.5.1-1	Socioeconomics	28
SE2.5.2-3	Socioeconomics	29
SE4.4.2-5	Socioeconomics	30
SE4.4.2-9	Socioeconomics	31

RAI Question	Subject	Attachment Number
TE2.4.1-3	Terrestrial Ecology	32
TE2.4.1-7	Terrestrial Ecology	33
TE4.3.1-3	Terrestrial Ecology	, 34
TE4.3.1-7	Terrestrial Ecology	35
TL4.1.2-1	Transmission Lines	36
TL4.1.2-2	Transmission Lines	37
TL4.1.2-3	Transmission Lines	38

Appendix B NRC3-09-0012

List of Future RAI Response Dates

List of Future RAI Response Dates

Response Date	RAI Question	Subject
8/31/2009	AE5.2.2-1	Aquatic Ecology
	AL9.3-1	Alternative Sites
	AQ2.7-5	Air Quality and Meteorology
•	AQ3.6.3-1	Air Quality and Meteorology
	CR4.1.3-3	Cultural Resources
	CR4.1.3-9	Cultural Resources
44	НН3.6.3-1	Human Health
	HY2.3.1-10	Hydrology
· · · · · ·	TE2.4.1-1	Terrestrial Ecology
9/30/2009	AC7.1-1	Accidents
	AC7.2-1	Accidents
· · · ·	AC7.2-2	Accidents
	AQ2.7-2 (moved from July)	Air Quality and Meteorology
· .	AQ2.7-4	Air Quality and Meteorology
	CR4.1.3-7	Cultural Resources
	FC5.7-2	Fuel Cycle
	HH5.4.1-3	Human Health
۰.	HY2.3.1-15	Hydrology
···· .	HY2.3.1-8	Hydrology
1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1	HY4.2.1-7	Hydrology
	HY4.2.1-8	Hydrology
	NO3.7-1	Noise
· · ·	NO4.4.1-1	Noise
	NO5.8.1-1	Noise
	TR7.4-1	Transportation
10/30/2009	GE2.2-1	General
· •,	AE4.3.2-1	Aquatic Ecology
:	AQ2.7-3	Air Quality and Meteorology
	AQ4.4.1-1	Air Quality and Meteorology
	AQ5.8.1-1	Air Quality and Meteorology
	AQ6.4-1	Air Quality and Meteorology
	BC10.4.2-2	Benefit-Cost Balance
	CR2.5.3-1	Cultural Resources
•	FC5.7-1	Fuel Cycle
and the second	, ,	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·

Response Date	RAI Question	Subject
	UU4 5 2	Yuman Health
	$\Pi \Pi 4.5-2$	Human Health
		Human Haalth
· •	$\Pi\Pi J.11.7-1$	Human Health
		Human Health
	пп 3.4.4-1	Hudrology
	$\Pi 1 3.11 - 1$	Hudrology
· <		Land Lise
	LU4.4.2-1	Land Use
	NU4.4.1-2	
	SE4.4.2-10	Socioeconomics
•	SE4.4.2-6	Socioeconomics
	TE4.3.1-6	Terrestrial Ecology
	TR3.8-1	Transportation
	TR3.8-2	Transportation
	TR3.8-3	Transportation
	TR3.8-4	Transportation
,	TR3.8-5	Transportation
· · ·	TR4.8.3-2	Transportation
11/23/2009	GE1.2-1	General
•	GE1.2-2	General
	AC7.3-1	Accidents
	AQ2.7-1	Air Quality and Meteorology
· .	AQ3.6.3-2	Air Quality and Meteorology
	AQ5.3.3.1-1	Air Quality and Meteorology
	HH4.5-1	Human Health
	HH4.5-4	Human Health
	HH5.4.2-2	Human Health .
	НН5.4.3-1	Human Health
	HH5.4.3-2	Human Health
	HY4.2.1-10	Hydrology
	HY4.2.1-3	Hydrology
·	HY5.2-1	Hydrology
•	LU4.1.1-1 (moved from July)	Land Use
	SE2.5.2-1	Socioeconomics
	SF4 4 2-7	Socioeconomics

Response Date	RAI Question	Subject
	SE4.4.2-8	Socioeconomics
	TE2.4.1-10	Terrestrial Ecology
	TE4.3.1-5	Terrestrial Ecology
12/30/2009	GE1.2-3	General
	GE3.1-1	General
	GE4-1	General
(AE2.4.2-2 (partial response provided)	Aquatic Ecology
4	AE2.4.2-3	Aquatic Ecology
	AE2.4.2-4 (partial response provided)	Aquatic Ecology
	CR4.1.3-4	Cultural Resources
•	HY2.3.1-1	Hydrology
	HY2.3.1-2 (partial response provided)	Hydrology
	HY2.3.1-3	Hydrology
•	HY2.3.1-4	Hydrology
· · ·	HY2.3.1-7	Hydrology
	HY4.2.1-1	Hydrology
	HY4.2.1-11	Hydrology
	HY4.2.1-2	Hydrology
	HY4.2.1-4	Hydrology
•	HY4.2.1-5	Hydrology
	HY4.2.1-6	Hydrology
1	LU1.2-1b	Land Use
	SE2.5.2-2	Socioeconomics
	TE2.4.1-2 (partial response provided)	Terrestrial Ecology
	TE2.4.1-9	Terrestrial Ecology
	TE2.4.1-11 (partial response provided)	Terrestrial Ecology
	TE4.3.1-1	Terrestrial Ecology
	TE4.3.1-2	Terrestrial Ecology
	TE4.3.1-4	Terrestrial Ecology
. •	TR4.8.3-1	Transportation
12/30/2009	USACE-1	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers RAI
· ·	USACE-2	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers RAI

Attachment 1 NRC3-09-0012

Response to RAI letter related to Fermi 3 ER

RAI Question GE1.1-1

NRC RAI GE1.1-1

Provide a revised and more detailed (though still concise) Purpose and Need statement, clearly specifying the project purpose and identifying and justifying the need for the project.

Supporting Information

The Purpose and Need statement should establish and justify a clear need for a specified quantity of electricity (in Megawatts, baseload or otherwise) with a specified service area and timeframe. This type of discussion would establish a clear need for additional electricity from the outset and a project purpose to fully or partially fulfill that need, and would form the strong basis needed for the identification and analysis of alternatives to meet the purpose and need.

Section 1.1 of the Environmental Report (ER) provides the following statement of purpose for the proposed action: "The purpose of the proposed new nuclear power plant is to generate electricity for sale." Chapter'8 of the ER provides a discussion of the need for power. However, although the statement in Section 1.1 specifies a "purpose," it neither adequately nor fully expresses the purpose nor does it establish the "need" in ER Chapter 1 (in addition to addressing the need later in ER under Need for Power).

10 CFR 51 Subpart A, Appendix A (4) states: "The [purpose and need] statement will briefly describe and specify the need for the proposed action."

Guidance in Reg. Guide 4.2, Chapter 1 (first paragraph) states, "In Chapter 1 of its environmental report, the applicant should demonstrate the purpose of, and thus the benefits of, the proposed facility with respect to the power requirements to be satisfied, the system reliability to be achieved, or any other primary objectives of the facility and how these objectives would be affected by variations in the scheduled operation of the proposed station."

The CEQ regulations state, in 40 CFR 1502.13 Purpose and need, "The statement shall briefly specify the underlying purpose and need to which the agency is responding in proposing the alternatives including the proposed action."

Furthermore, since the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (the "Corps") is a cooperating agency for the Fermi 3 Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), a Purpose and Need Statement is required to also meet the Corps' requirements under the Clean Water Act, Section 404(b)(1), and the associated Corps Guidelines. This is needed to support the alternatives analysis to be evaluated as part of the Corps' Section 404 review process. The Corps requires that the applicant provide the Purpose and Need Statement for its project.

Purpose and need should be viewed as two parts of a whole:

- 1. There is a problem that needs to be addressed (project purpose); and
- 2. Need is the evidence that the problem actually exists.

Thus, the project need must be a part of purpose and need statements. For the NRC, this would mean that the need for power analysis would be briefly summarized and included as part of the purpose and need statement in ER Chapter 1. Also, the purpose and need statement should be written so as not to focus on a particular alternative, but instead to allow for the identification of more than one possible alternative to potentially meet the "need."

Response

Purpose

The purpose of the project is fourfold:

- 1. Generate electricity for sale that will reliably aid in satisfying the forecasted energy and capacity needs of Detroit Edison customers;
- 2. Provide new baseload electric generation capacity to compensate for the expected
- retirement of existing, aging baseload generating units;
- 3. Provide price stability by minimizing reliance on imported power into the Detroit Edison service territory; and
- 4. Utilize an electric generation technology that is less subject to price fluctuations resulting from either fuel or regulatory drivers, provides fuel diversity, and reduces reliance on fossil fuel and their attendant environmental impacts.

The above purpose is in-line with Detroit Edison's mission to provide reliable and affordable electrical power.

Need

Construction of a new electric generating facility is needed to provide reliable, affordable power to address Michigan's expected future peak electric demand.

Chapter 8 of the Environmental Report provides detailed discussion outlining the need for power and the related benefits to be generated by the proposed facility. The need for power was assessed by balancing the current and forecasted demand against the current and forecasted supply, while demonstrating that an adequate reserve margin is maintained. Reference Chapter 8 and 9 for a complete description of:

- Section 8.1 Description of the power system, an overview of the pertinent service area, and a discussion of regional relationships;
- Section 8.2 Description of the analysis performed to determine current and forecasted energy needs in the State of Michigan;
- Section 8.3 Description of the analysis performed to determine energy supply resources;
- Section 8.4 Description of the assessment of the need for power; and
- Section 9.1 Description of the no-action alternative.

The need for power assessment is derived from the Michigan 21st Century Electric Energy Plan (Plan). The Plan was prepared and issued by the Michigan Public Service Commission pursuant to Executive Directive No. 2006-02. The Plan reached several significant conclusions including:

- Michigan's peak electric demand is forecasted to grow at approximately 1.2 percent per year for the next 20 years;
- There is a need for additional electric generating resources in order to preserve electric reliability and provide affordable energy over the next 20 years. This modeling outcome is confirmed even in the presence of increased use of energy efficiency and renewable resources;
- The projected electric demand will not be satisfied through the expansion of transmission nor access to external markets; and
- There is need for regulated baseload capacity to prevent natural gas prices from driving up wholesale costs and market prices for an increasing number of hours each year.

The above conclusions were based upon key factors such as the current age of baseload units and newer electric generating units' reliance on natural gas. As indicated above, the Plan concluded that the State of Michigan has a current need for new baseload capacity and the need is projected to increase. Michigan's current baseload generating units are an average of more than 48 years old. The average age of Detroit Edison's coal-fired generation units is 44 years old. The last new baseload plant in the State of Michigan began commercial operation more than 18 years ago. The assessment assumes that older, less efficient units, totaling 3755 MW of capacity, will be retired by 2025.

Further, new baseload electric production is needed due to the fact that recently constructed electric generation units in Michigan have been limited to natural gas-fired facilities. Natural gas-fired units currently represent approximately 29 percent of the Michigan's generating capacity. Dependence upon natural gas-fired units has exposed Michigan to volatile electricity prices driven by fluctuating fuel market prices.

Attachment 2 NRC3-09-0012

Response to RAI letter related to Fermi 3 ER

RAI Question GE2-1

NRC RAI GE2-1

Provide copies of handouts used during the Fermi 3 general site audit tour.

Supporting Information

These handouts contain information not available elsewhere. The handouts are needed for the impact analysis and for citation in the EIS.

Response

During the environmental audit held February 2 through February 6, 2009 a general site tour was conducted and handouts were provided to help describe the site and orient the participants. A copy of the handout used to support this tour has been provided. Note that the handout identifies point 3 on the map as "Cooling Tower Location" and point 4 on the map as "Proposed Cooling Tower Location"; the location indicated by point 4 now reflects the cooling tower's location in the revised configuration.

n

NRC3-09-0012 RAI Question GE2-1

Enclosure 1

Fermi 3 General Site Audit Handouts (following 2 pages)

Fermi General Site Tour

- 1. Training Center and Proposed Administrative Campus
- 2. Quarry Lakes
- 3. Cooling Tower Location
- .4. Proposed Cooling Tower Location
- 5. South Eagle-Nesting Area
- 6. Lake Erie
- 7. Water Intake, Discharge, and Barge Slip

8. Fermi 1 and Fermi 2

- 9. Future Fermi 3 Location
- 10. Fermi 2 Cooling Towers
- 11. North Eagle Nesting Area
- 12. Warehousing, Parking, and Proposed New Areas

Fermi General Site Tour



Attachment 3 NRC3-09-0012

Response to RAI letter related to Fermi 3 ER

RAI Question GE2-2

NRC RAI GE2-2

Provide electronic versions of all Environmental Report Rev. 0, September 2008 (the "ER") figures in .jpeg, .png, or .tif format at a resolution of at least 300 dpi.

Supporting Information

Electronic versions of the figures used in the ER at sufficiently high resolution would facilitate production of the EIS and prevent the need for redrafting figures.

Response

Electronic versions of all Environmental Report Rev. 0 figures in .tif format at a resolution of at least 300 dpi were provided in a Detroit Edison letter to the NRC (NRC3-09-0019).

Attachment 4 NRC3-09-0012

1

Response to RAI letter related to Fermi 3 ER

RAI Question AE2.4.2-1

NRC RAI AE2.4.2-1

Provide copies of correspondence with Federal and State agencies (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service [USFWS], Michigan Department of Natural Resources [DNR], Ohio DNR, Canadian agencies, etc.) regarding potential impacts to aquatic species and monitoring studies for Fermi 3.

Supporting Information

Discussions with agencies regarding Fermi 3 and threatened and endangered species were mentioned in the text of the ER(Sections 2.4.1.2.1 and 2.4.1.2.2, for example), but references were not provided. At the site audit, it was mentioned that written records of discussions with these agencies existed, but are not publically available. This correspondence is needed for the impact analysis to be presented in the EIS.

Response

A list of discussions addressing threatened and endangered aquatic species is available for review by NRC staff and their contractors at several Detroit Edison locations. These discussions include those with staff at universities who are knowledgeable on the subject of aquatic ecology.

Attachment 5 NRC3-09-0012

Response to RAI letter related to Fermi 3 ER

RAI Question AQ3.6.3-3

NRC RAI AQ3.6.3-3

Provide a copy of the figure used during the air quality/meteorology tour (titled "DTE Fermi Site") that included locations of existing and proposed air emission sources.

Supporting Information

During the air quality/meteorology tour at the site audit, Detroit Edison handed out the scaled map titled "DTE Fermi Site," showing locations of existing and proposed emission sources. This information is not available elsewhere and is needed for air quality and noise impact analyses to be presented in the EIS.

Response

A figure titled "DTE Fermi Site" was utilized during the environmental audit held February 2 through February 6, 2009 to show the approximate locations of the existing and proposed emissions sources for the Fermi site as they were known at the time of the audit. A copy of this figure has been provided in this transmittal.

Since the audit, relevant changes to air emissions sources have been made which this figure does not reflect: the natural draft cooling tower has been relocated, and two ancillary diesel powered generators have been added to the plant configuration.

NRC3-09-0012 RAI Question AQ3.6.3-3

Enclosure 1

Figure – DTE Fermi Site (following 1 page)



** Coordinates are displayed in UTM NAD 83

DTE Fermi Site

Attachment 6 NRC3-09-0012

Response to RAI letter related to Fermi 3 ER

RAI Question BC10.4.2-1

NRC RAI BC10.4.2-1

Provide an updated and citable source of monetized benefits and costs.

Supporting Information

All monetized benefits and costs in the ER are presented in 2006 dollars. With the exception of operating costs, no source document is provided in this section.

Response

The information on the monetized benefits as described in Environment Report (ER) Section 10.4.1.1 is source referenced from ER Section 4.4.2 and ER Section 5.8.2. In ER Section 4.4.2, publicly available data from the Department of Energy publication *Nuclear Plant Construction Infrastructure Assessment* was used to approximately estimate the total wages to be paid. In addition, the U.S. Department of Labor website, "May 2007 State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates—Michigan," was used to derive the total direct construction wages for the Fermi 3 project. In ER Section 5.8.2, the average direct salary for the Fermi 3 operational and workforce staff was based on wage data from the U.S Bureau of Labor Statistics.

Construction Cost information can be found in Part I of the COLA. The information provided is based a number of studies that have been conducted by government agencies, universities, and other entities and includes a significant contingency to account for uncertainty.

A discussion of decommissioning funds can be found in Attachment C of Part I of the COLA. The decommissioning funding plan was developed pursuant to the methodology set out in 10 CFR 50.75(c).

> Attachment 7 NRC3-09-0012

Response to RAI letter related to Fermi 3 ER

RAI Question CR4.1.3-1

NRC RAI CR4.1.3-1

Provide copies of all past, present, and future correspondence and documentation of discussions between the applicant, or its consultants, and the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), regarding cultural resources and/or historic properties in the direct and/or indirect areas of potential effect (APEs) for Fermi 3, and Fermi 1 and 2 as they relate to Fermi 3.

Supporting information

Comments from the SHPO on the findings of the Phase I reports conducted for the project, including comments on National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligibility of those cultural resources identified within the archaeological and architectural APEs for the project, were not available at the time that the ER was prepared. This information will be used to complete the NEPA analysis and to support compliance with Section 106. Note that personal correspondence can be provided in reading rooms.

Response

Copies of correspondence documentation that have been discussed between Detroit Edison, its consultants, and SHPO, regarding cultural resources and/or historic properties in the direct and/or indirect areas of potential effect (APEs) for Fermi 3, and Fermi 1 and 2 as they relate to Fermi 3 that are included with this response and are listed below.

- Letter from Donald J. Weir (CCRG) to Brian D. Conway (SHPO), "RE: Request for Project Consultation", dated September 10, 2007
- Letter from Brian D. Conway (SHPO) to Donald J. Weir (CCRG), "RE: ER06-683 Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant – Potential New Facility, Monroe County (NRC)", date November 07, 2007
- Letter from Donald J. Weir (CCRG) to Robert O. Christensen (SHPO), "RE: ER06-683 Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant Project Area Clarification", date January 11, 2008
- Letter from Brian D. Conway (SHPO) to Donald J. Weir (CCRG), "RE: ER06-683 Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant – Potential New Facility, Monroe County (NRC)", date March 24, 2008
- Letter from Randall Westmoreland (DECo) to Brian D. Conway (SHPO), "RE: ER06-683 Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant – Proposed New Facility, Monroe County (NRC) Phase I Cultural Resources Evaluation", date July 29, 2008
 - The "Phase 1 Cultural Resources Evaluation of the Fermi Atomic Power Plant Unit 3 (Fermi 3) Project, Frenchtown and Berlin Townships, Monroe County, Michigan", identified in the above letter was provided in Detroit Edison's response to RAI CR4.1.3-6.

- Letter from Peter Smith (DECo) to Brian D. Conway (SHPO), "RE: ER06-683, Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant-Proposed New Facility, Monroe County (NRC) Preliminary National Register of Historic Places Evaluation, Fermi 1; Maritime Site Sensitivity Study, date April 9, 2009
 - The "Preliminary National Register of Historic Places Evaluation, Fermi 1", identified in the above letter will be provided in Detroit Edison's response to RAI CR4.1.3-9.

Three additional documents will be available on or before August 7, 2009 for review by NRC staff and their contractors at several Detroit Edison locations.

Detroit Edison will provide all future correspondence and documentation of discussions between Detroit Edison, its consultants, and SHPO to the NRC up to the issuance of the draft EIS.

NRC3-09-0012 RAI Question CR4.1.3-1

Enclosure 1

Detroit Edison and SHPO Correspondence (following 64 pages)



September 10, 2007 J-0584/R-0693

Mr. Brian Conway State Historic Preservation Office Michigan Historical Center Department of History, Arts and Libraries P.O. Box 30740 702 W. Kalamazoo St. Lansing, MI 48909-8240

RE: Request for Project Consultation

Dear Mr. Conway:

Commonwealth Cultural Resources Group, Inc. (CCRG) was retained by Black & Veatch, Overland Park, Kansas, to undertake cultural resource investigations in support of a possible licensing submittal to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) on behalf of Detroit Edison (DTE). Detroit Edison has not made a commitment to construct or locate a new nuclear power plant at the Enrico Fermi Nuclear Generating Station. DTE has only requested the performance of the necessary studies and investigations to support possible future decisions, including the potential submittal of a Combined Operating License Application to the NRC.

Based on the following information, CCRG is seeking comment from the Michigan State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on the potential effects on cultural resources by the proposed project for purposes of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, guidance within the NRC's NUREG-1555 Environmental Standard Review Plan for Historic Properties, and other federal legislation. It is the intention of the project team to complete a full Section 106 review for the project, following the advice and recommendations of the SHPO.

The potential site of a new facility is the existing Enrico Fermi Nuclear Generating Station site located in Monroe County, Michigan (Figure 1). The potential project site incorporates the existing power plant facility and land currently owned by DTE. If constructed, the new facility would be located within this project area. For archaeological resources, the project area is limited to within the footprint of the project site (Figure 2). Following the NRC's Environmental Standard Review Plan, the project area for the historic above-ground resources has been

Main Office: 2530 Spring Arbor Road Jackson, Michigan 49203 • (517) 788-3550/Fax (517) 788-6594 New York Office: 2495 Main Street Room 448 Buffalo, New York 14214 • (716) 831-9003/Fax (716) 831-9003 Wisconsin Office: P.O. Box 1061 Minocqua, Wisconsin 54548 • (715) 358-5686/Fax (715) 358-6656

www.ccrginc.com



Mr. Brian Conway September 26, 2007 Page 2

determined to be 10 miles (mi) (16 kilometers [km]) beyond the location of the project site (Figure 3 and Appendix A).

A search of the Michigan Office of the State Archaeologist records revealed that there are four sites recorded within the archaeology Area of Potential Effects (APE) (see Figure 2), although none are recorded in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). These sites are enumerated in Table 1.

Site Number	Name	Location	Period	NRHP Status
		NW SE Section 16		More information
20MR207	Holmquist M-33	T6S/R9E	Prehistoric	needed
		S1/2 S/12 SE SW		
		Section 16 and		
		N1/2 N1/2 NE NW		
· .		Section 21		More information
20MR702	Fermi II	T6S/R9E	Prehistoric	needed
2 - S.		W1/2 NW NE		
	í -	Section 30		More information
20MR703	Gustafson	T6S/R10E	Archaic period	needed
·		NE NW NW		
**		Section 18	Nineteenth	More information
20MR746	Webb	T6S/R10E	Century	needed

Table 1. Previously Documented Archaeological Sites within the Project APE

In addition to the sites noted above, CCRG also identified a letter report regarding the project area prepared in 1972. This letter, written by James B. Griffin, Director of the University of Michigan, Museum of Anthropology, indicated that a visit was made to the site of the Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant Unit 2. As the result of this investigation, Griffin noted that the area had been altered and, "any Indian remains which might have been there have either been removed or covered up" (J. B. Griffin to Dr. S. A. Milstein, letter dated 25 May 1972, Office of the State Archaeologist, State Historic Preservation Office, Lansing, Michigan).

A preliminary investigation has revealed that there are no previously recorded above-ground historic properties within the footprint in which the proposed project will be constructed. There are 13 properties within a 10 mi (16 km) radius of the project location that have been previously recorded on the NRHP. Table 2 enumerates these resources and their locations. Also appended to this document is a series of topographic maps illustrating the entire 10 mi (16 km) APE and noting the location of each of the listed properties.

COMMONWEALTH CULTURAL RESOURCES GROUP, INC.

Mr. Brian Conway September 26, 2007 Page 3

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	City/Township/		ID Number/
Name	Address	County	Listed NRHP	Map Location
Custer, George	SW corner of Elm and			
Armstrong Equestrian	North Monroe (M-125)			
Monument	streets	Monroe/Monroe	12/9/1994	1/26
Detroit River Light	Lake Erie, 3.75 miles SE	Rockwood		
Station	of Millerville Beach	vicinity/Monroe	8/4/1983	2/19
	Roughly bounded by the			
East Elm – North	River Raisin, Lorain,			
Macomb Street Historic	Monroe and Macomb		RICHORD .	
District	Streets	Monroe/Monroe	5/6/1982	_3/26
Jefferson Avenue	Jefferson Avenue over	Brownstown		
Bridge	Huron River	Township/Wayne	2/10/2000	4/12
Loranger, Edward,		Monroe		
House	7211 S Stoney Creek Rd	vicinity/Monroe	5/31/1984	5/15
McCielland, Governor		· · · · ·		
Robert House	47 E Elm St	Monroe/Monroe	9/3/1971	6/26
Navarre-Anderson	West of Monroe at North		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Trading Post	Custer (M-130) and			· ·
	Raisinville Roads	Monroe/Monroe	7/31/1972	7/20
Nims, Rudolph House	206 W. Noble Ave	Monroe/Monroe	10/18/1972	8/26
	Boughly bounded by the	•		
	River Raisin, Navarre,			
	Wedsworth, LaPlaisance,			,
Old Village Historic	Seventh, Washington,			
District	Monroe, and Third Sts.	Monroe/Monroe	5/6/1982	9/26
Saint Mary's Church			· · ·	
Complex	Elm Ave and M-125 (N.		1	
	Monroe Avenue)	Monroe/Monroe	5/6/1982	10/26
Sawyer House				
	320 E. Front St	Monroe/Monroe	11/23/1977	11/26
South Pointe Drive	Pointe Drive over Swan			[]
Bridge	Island Canal	Grosse Ile/Wayne	3/15/2000	12/6
Weis Manufacturing	Union and Seventh			
Company	Streets	Monroe/Monroe	10/26/1981	13/26

 Table 2. NRHP Listed Properties within the Project APE

An additional nine properties have been determined eligible within this area, but not formally listed on the NRHP. Presented in Table 3 is a complete list of the identified, but not listed

COMMONWEALTH CULTURAL RESOURCES

Mr. Brian Conway September 26, 2007 Page 4

resources. These properties are also noted on the appended topographic maps, using alphabetical designations to distinguish them from those properties listed on the NRHP.

			Date Determined	ID Number/Man
Name	Address	City/County	Eligible	Location
		Frenchtown		
	5046 Williams Road	Twp/Monroe	11/09/1995	A/23
	•	Frenchtown		
2187 Hurd Road	2187 E Hurd Road	Twp/Monroe	11/18/1998	B/22
	Gibraltar Road over			
Gibraltar Road Bridge	Waterway Canal	Gibraltar/Wayne	09/29/1995	C/5
Horse Island Drive		•		
Bridge	Over Horse Island Bayou	Gibraltar/Wayne	1992	D/5
Horse Island Drive				E/5
Bridge	Over Adams Bayou	Gibraltar/Wayne	07/01/1992	
Horse Island Drive				F/5
Bridge	Over Adams Bayou	Gibraltar/Wayne	07/01/1992	
Monroe Armory	15483 S Dixie Highway	Monroe/Monroe	11/07/2002	G/26
	Over Conrail and Raisin			
I-75 Bridge	River	Monroe/Monroe	04/12/2004	H/27
St. Mary's Academy				
Historic District	610 W. Elm	Monroe/Monroe	1981	I/21 & 26

 Table 3. Properties Determined Eligible for Listing on the NRHP within the Project APE

If you have any additional questions or comments on this project, please feel free to contact either me or Elaine Robinson at CCRG. The CCRG telephone number is 800-731-3550. Elaine Robinson's extension is 23 and mine is 12.

Sincerely, 'éleir

Donald J. Weir, RPA President







Figure 2. Archaeological Resources Project Area/Area of Potential Effect and Previously Recorded Archaeological Sites within One Mile



Figure 3. Above-Ground Resources Project Area and Area of Potential Effect

APENDIX A

NRHP-LISTED AND NRHP-ELIGIBLE ABOVE-GROUND RESOURCES WITHIN THE ABOVE-GROUND RESOURCES AREA OF POTENTIAL EFFECT



Project Area, Project APE, and Map Index



Map 1. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 2. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 3. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 4. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 5. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 6. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 7 NRHP Listed and NR HP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 8. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 9. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 10. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 11. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 12. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 13. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 14. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 15. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 16. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 17. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 18. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect



Map 19. NRHP Listed and NRHP Eligible Above-Ground Properties within the Above-Ground Resources Area of Potential Effect