April 12, 2010

Mr. Jack M. Davis
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Detroit Edison Company
Fermi 2 – 210 NOC
6400 North Dixie Highway
Newport, MI 48166

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 30 RELATED TO THE SRP SECTION 12.03 – 12.04 FOR THE FERMI 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Davis:

By letter dated September 18, 2008, Detroit Edison Company (Detroit Edison) submitted for approval a combined license application pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion on the safety of the proposed application.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter. To support the review schedule, you are requested to respond within 45 days of the date of this letter. If changes are needed to the safety analysis report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, I can be reached at 301-415-8148 or by e-mail at jerry.hale@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Jerry Hale, Project Manager
ESBWR/ABWR Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 052-033

eRAI Tracking Nos. 4553

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

April 12, 2010

Mr. Jack M. Davis
Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear Officer
Detroit Edison Company
Fermi 2 – 210 NOC
6400 North Dixie Highway
Newport, MI 48166

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION LETTER NO. 30 RELATED TO THE SRP SECTION 12.03 – 12.04 FOR THE FERMI 3 COMBINED LICENSE APPLICATION

Dear Mr. Smith:

By letter dated September 18, 2008, Detroit Edison Company (Detroit Edison) submitted for approval a combined license application pursuant to 10 CFR Part 52. The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff is performing a detailed review of this application to enable the staff to reach a conclusion on the safety of the proposed application.

The NRC staff has identified that additional information is needed to continue portions of the review. The staff's request for additional information (RAI) is contained in the enclosure to this letter. To support the review schedule, you are requested to respond within 45 days of the date of this letter. If changes are needed to the safety analysis report, the staff requests that the RAI response include the proposed wording changes.

If you have any questions or comments concerning this matter, I can be reached at 301-415-8148 or by e-mail at jerry.hale@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,
/RA/
Jerry Hale, Project Manager
ESBWR/ABWR Projects Branch 1
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 052-033
eRAI Tracking Nos. 4553
Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information
Distribution:

PUBLIC	CPatel, NRO	NGE 1/2 R/F	SGreen, NRO
MCarpentier, OGC	RidsNroDsraSbpb	RidsNroDnrlNge2	D.Huyck, NSIR
ERoach, NRO			

ADAMS Accession No. ML101020190

OFFICE	NRO/CHPB	OGC	NGE1/LPM
NAME	ERoach	MCarpentier	CPatel
DATE	3/24/10	3/24/10	3/29/10

*Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Request for Additional Information No. 4553 Revision 1

Fermi Unit 3
Detroit Edison
Docket No. 52-033
SRP Section: 12.03-12.04 - Radiation Protection Design Features
Application Section: 12.4.7.1

12.03-12.04-5

In the response to RAI 12.03-12.04-3 (Letter NRC3-09-002, dated August 25, 2009), DTE proposed to include a summary of construction activities and bases of dose calculations in the FSAR Revision 2. In addition, the response referenced Sections 4.5 of COL application Part 3 (the Fermi 3 Environmental Report) as containing additional information on the basis, models, assumptions, and input data used to determine the estimated doses to construction workers. The Environmental Report, however, is a separate stand alone document and it is not part of the FSAR. Therefore, the staff cannot base its determination of reasonable assurance on material contained in the Environmental Report.

In order for the staff to make a determination of reasonable assurance that the FSAR contains sufficient information related to the bases, models, assumptions, and input data used in the assessment and calculation of construction worker dose, it is the staff's position that the applicant modify FSAR Section 12.4.7.1 to include supplemental information equivalent to what is contained in the Fermi 3 Environmental Report (COLA Part 3, Section 4.5) relating to construction worker dose estimates. FSAR Section 12.4.7.1 should be modified to include the following:

1) The calculated annual person-Sievert construction worker dose.

2) The bases, models, assumptions, and input data used to calculate construction worker dose.

3) A description of any dose reduction measures identified or taken as a result of the construction worker dose assessment process.

4) A discussion of how the guidance in RG 8.19 was used to perform the construction worker dose assessment. If RG 8.19 was not used, the FSAR should describe the specific alternative methods used.

5) A discussion of whether construction workers will be considered to be Members of the Public or occupational workers during construction of Fermi 3, and a description of how DTE will demonstrate compliance with the applicable requirements of 10 CFR 20 Subpart C or Subpart D.

6) A discussion of plans for radiological monitoring of the Fermi 3 construction site to verify construction worker dose estimates and to ensure that construction worker doses do not exceed the applicable limits. In the response to RAI 12.03-12.04-3, DTE provided a discussion of why the TLD location T-48 was chosen as the most representative location for estimating construction worker dose estimates. Although TLD location T-48 is located closer to the closest to the Fermi 3 power block, TLD location T-47 is located closer to Fermi 2.

7) Provide a justification as to why DTE should not base its estimated construction worker dose estimates on a TLD reading that is based on the average reading for these two TLD locations for the year with the highest TLD annual dose.

Provide a markup of the proposed FSAR changes in the response.