

October 27, 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. 46 RELATED TO
THE SRP SECTION 17.5 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 30 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
BWR Projects Branch
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 052-033

eRAI Tracking Nos. 5142

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

October 27, 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. 46 RELATED TO
THE SRP SECTION 17.5 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 30 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
BWR Projects Branch
Division of New Reactor Licensing
Office of New Reactors

Docket Nos. 052-033

eRAI Tracking Nos. 5142

Enclosure:

Request for Additional Information

Distribution:

PUBLIC NGE 1/2 R/F SGreen, NRO MCarpentier, OGC
RidsNroDsraSbpb RidsNroDnrlNge2 R Rasmussen, NRO

ADAMS Accession No. ML103000172 NRO-002

OFFICE	CQVB	OGC	NGE1/PM
NAME	R. Rasmussen	M. Carpentier	JHale
DATE	10/14/10	10/14/10	10/27/10

***Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.**

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Request for Additional Information No. 5142 Revision 1

SRP Section: 13.06.01 - Physical Security - Combined License

13.06.01-52

There is an inconsistency between COL PSP Revision 2 drawing, Figure 1-3, against the response drawing to RAI 13.06.01-21 COL Information Item 13.6-16-A (Bullet Resistant Enclosures (BRE)) in the August 30, 2010 letter.

- A. Which drawing is accurate to the site layout for BREs? 2) If the drawing in response to RAI 13.06.01-21 is to be used as the most updated drawing in Fermi 3's next revision for BRE locations, justify the change in the number of BREs, along with their locations and how this conclusion was reached for your protective strategy. 3) Update the appropriate sections of the Physical Security Plan and Safeguards Contingency Plan.
- B. How are you meeting the defense in depth for interdiction?
- C. How are you accounting obstructions in the fields of fire?
- D. It is noticed that there are changes to this drawing in regard to the operating reactor BREs. What is the methodology used to determine this change?

Regulatory Basis: 10 CFR 52.79(3). The final safety analysis report must demonstrate that all requirements and restrictions set forth in the referenced design certification rule, other than those imposed under subsection 50.36b, must be satisfied by the date of issuance of the combined license. Any requirements and restrictions set forth in the referenced design certification rule that could not be satisfied by the time of issuance of the combined license, must be updated to account for site-specific design information an any design changes or departures.

10 CFR 52.79(a)(35)(i) A physical security plan, describing how the applicant will meet the requirements of 10 CFR part 73 (and 10 CFR part 11, if applicable, including the identification and description of jobs as required by § 11.11(a) of this chapter, at the proposed facility). The plan must list tests, inspections, audits, and other means to be used to demonstrate compliance with the requirements of 10 CFR parts 11 and 73, if applicable; 10 CFR 73.55(b)(3)(i) Ensure that the capabilities to detect, assess, interdict, and neutralize threats up to and including the design basis threat of radiological sabotage as stated in § 73.1, are maintained at all times.

10 CFR 73.55(b)(3)(ii) Provide defense-in-depth through the integration of systems, technologies, programs, equipment, supporting processes, and implementing procedures as needed to ensure the effectiveness of the physical protection program.