

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT	2
III.	APPLICANT’S REBUTTAL WITNESSES	3
IV.	DISCUSSION.....	3
A.	Response to NRC Staff Direct Testimony	3
B.	Response to Intervenors’ Presentation.....	4
1.	There Are No Deficiencies in the FEIS	4
2.	Transmission Corridor Impacts Are Outside the Scope of Contention 8.....	10
3.	The FEIS Treatment of the Mitigation Plan Satisfies NEPA	11
V.	CONCLUSIONS.....	13

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY) Docket No. 52-033-COL
(Fermi Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3))

**DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY’S REBUTTAL
STATEMENT OF POSITION ON CONTENTION 8**

I. INTRODUCTION

Pursuant to 10 C.F.R. § 2.1207(a)(1) and the Licensing Board’s Order (Modifying the Schedule), dated December 12, 2012, DTE Electric Company (“DTE” or “Applicant”) hereby submits this Rebuttal Statement of Position on Contention 8. This Rebuttal Statement of Position responds to the legal arguments, factual assertions, and supporting materials filed by the NRC Staff and the Intervenor on March 29, 2013.¹ This Rebuttal Statement of Position is supported by testimony from Peter Smith, Randall Westmoreland, and David Mifsud (“DTE Rebuttal Testimony”) (Exh. DTE000096) and the exhibits submitted concurrently. For the reasons set forth below, the NRC Staff analysis of potential impacts on the Eastern Fox Snake in the Final Environmental Impact Statement for Fermi 3 (“FEIS”) satisfies the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (“NEPA”). Contention 8 should be resolved in favor of DTE and the NRC Staff.

¹ “Intervenors’ Direct Examination and Case-In-Chief Presentation of Contention 8 (Eastern Fox Snake)” (“Intervenors’ Presentation”); “NRC Staff’s Initial Statement of Position on Contention 8” (“NRC Staff Position Statement”); “Prefiled Direct Testimony of J. Peyton Doub and David A. Week Regarding Contention 8” (“NRC Staff Testimony”).

II. SUMMARY OF ARGUMENT

As required by NEPA, the NRC Staff in the FEIS considered in depth the potential impacts on the Eastern Fox Snake from Fermi 3 site preparation and construction activities. The NRC Staff specifically took into account the mitigation measures described in *Fermi 3 Construction Habitat and Species Conservation Plan: Eastern Fox Snake (Elaphe gloydi)* (“Mitigation Plan”) (Exh. DTE000006), which has been reviewed and approved by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (“MDNR”). The FEIS reasonably concludes that there is a potential for MODERATE impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake if the mitigation is not implemented as described in DTE’s Mitigation Plan. The FEIS further concludes that the planned mitigation measures would reduce adverse effects on the Eastern Fox Snake, thereby leading to SMALL impacts.² By addressing the impacts on the Eastern Fox Snake in alternate circumstances — that is, both with and without implementation of the Mitigation Plan — the NRC Staff has taken the requisite hard look at potential Eastern Fox Snake impacts. As discussed in the FEIS, and as supplemented by the testimony and exhibits introduced in this hearing, the NRC Staff has “come to grips with all important considerations.”³

In their presentation, the Intervenors contend that the FEIS fails to comply with NEPA. But, rather than provide any expert testimony, the Intervenors merely allege various omissions in the FEIS and supporting documentation. These fail to show any material problem with the FEIS. The information that the Intervenors claim to be missing is, in fact, provided in the FEIS. And, the Intervenors’ argument that there are “no firm implementation arrangements” for the Mitigation Plan is contrary to the record. In any event, such arrangements are not

² FEIS at 4-47.

³ *Exelon Generation Co., LLC* (Early Site Permit for Clinton ESP Site), CLI-05-29, 62 NRC 801, 811 (2005).

required by NEPA. In the end, the Intervenors present nothing that calls into question the adequacy of the FEIS discussion or the reasonableness of the NRC Staff's conclusions regarding impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake. Contention 8 therefore should be resolved in favor of DTE and the NRC Staff.

III. APPLICANT'S REBUTTAL WITNESSES

DTE's rebuttal testimony is presented by the same three witnesses that provided initial testimony: Mr. Peter Smith, Mr. Randall Westmoreland, and Mr. David Mifsud. A description of their qualifications was provided in DTE's Initial Statement of Position.⁴ Mr. Smith is the Director, Nuclear Development – Licensing and Engineering, for Fermi 3 and has overall responsibility for the Fermi 3 project. Mr. Westmoreland is the Licensing – Technical Expert for the Fermi 3 project. He has responsibility for managing the environmental portion of the Fermi 3 COL application, including other state and federal permits and approvals associated with Fermi 3. He managed development of the plans to mitigate potential impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake and directly participated in discussions with MDNR. Mr. Mifsud is a certified professional wildlife biologist, wetland scientist, and ecologist who has overseen and designed numerous projects focused on amphibians and reptiles in Michigan, including the Eastern Fox Snake.

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Response to NRC Staff Direct Testimony

DTE's expert witnesses agree with the NRC Staff Position Statement and the conclusions in the testimony of Mr. Doub and Mr. Weeks. The methodologies, assumptions, and conclusions in the NRC Staff testimony are in agreement with those of the DTE witnesses.

⁴ The detailed statements of qualification for Mr. Smith, Mr. Westmoreland, and Mr. Mifsud were included in Exhs. DTE000002, DTE000003, and DTE000004.

Because the NRC Staff reached similar conclusions regarding the reasonableness of the FEIS discussion of impacts to Eastern Fox Snakes, the NRC Staff testimony does not change (and, in fact, complements) the conclusions in the DTE Position Statement and DTE Testimony. To the extent that there are any differences between the NRC Staff and DTE testimony, those differences are not significant and do not affect the overall conclusion that the NRC Staff has taken a hard look at the impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake in the FEIS.

B. Response to Intervenor's Presentation

The Intervenor's assessment of the issues in Contention 8 was provided in the form a legal brief and was not accompanied by any expert testimony. The Intervenor wrongly claim that the FEIS omits information regarding potential impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake and incorrectly assert that the Mitigation Plan must be a binding commitment in the FEIS. Their factual and legal arguments are discussed below.

1. There Are No Deficiencies in the FEIS

The Intervenor's Presentation lists several examples of what, they claim, represent deficiencies in the NRC Staff's FEIS and in DTE's Mitigation Plan. However, as discussed below, none of the alleged deficiencies call into question the reasonableness of the FEIS discussion of Eastern Fox Snake impacts. Moreover, many of the supposed deficiencies relate to the reviews of the project conducted by MDNR. Those reviews are outside the scope of this proceeding, which is limited to compliance with NEPA.⁵

⁵ The requirements of State law are for State bodies to determine, and are beyond the jurisdiction of NRC adjudicatory bodies. *Northern States Power Company* (Tyrone Energy Park, Unit 1), ALAB-464, 7 NRC 372, 375 (1978).

a. MDNR Reviews

After citing statements on the MDNR website describing the MDNR review process, the Intervenors claim that “there will be no enforcement of the mitigation efforts outlined in the FEIS.”⁶ This is a gross misunderstanding of MDNR’s role and responsibility for species protection in Michigan. The statement on the MDNR website cited by Intervenors (at 8) reiterates that Michigan laws on threatened and endangered species remain in place. In the statement cited by the Intervenors, MDNR states only that it will now charge persons requesting environmental reviews for projects that have a potential impact on an endangered or threatened species (*i.e.*, “there will now be a cost to the requestor for these services”). This change does not affect MDNR’s ability to enforce restrictions on “take” of threatened or endangered species. To the contrary, MDNR confirms that it is still responsible for issuing permits and taking enforcement action relative to “take” of threatened or endangered species.

The Intervenors also claim that DTE “is not known to have requested a Natural Features Inventory review” of the Fermi 3 project.⁷ But, DTE did, in fact, request a Michigan Natural Features Inventory (“MNFI”) review.⁸ As the FEIS indicates (at 2-49), DTE contacted MDNR and consulted the MNFI database regarding the presence of known or potential occurrences of State-listed threatened and endangered animals and plants in the project area in 2007. From the MNFI database, MDNR identified several species of interest, including the

⁶ Intervenors’ Presentation at 10.

⁷ *Id.* at 8.

⁸ DTE Rebuttal Testimony at ¶14.

Eastern Fox Snake, that were known to occur on or near the Fermi site and that may be impacted by the project.⁹

b. Mitigation Measures

The Intervenors also raise a number of issues relating to DTE's Eastern Fox Snake Mitigation Plan and the wetland mitigation required by the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality ("MDEQ") and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. But, as discussed below, each of the supposed omissions or deficiencies are, in fact, addressed in the Mitigation Plan and the FEIS.

The Intervenors argue that there is "no discussion of the environmental qualities" of the 19.5 acres at the Fermi site that will be restored following construction.¹⁰ However, Appendix C of the Mitigation Plan (Exh. DTE000006) describes on-site habitat restoration and enhancement, including the 19.5 acres referenced by the Intervenors. The Mitigation Plan explains that onsite restoration will emphasize creation of Eastern Fox Snake habitat, including foraging grounds, basking sites, shelter, snags, hibernacula, and nesting sites. The Mitigation Plan explains that invasive species will be removed to enhance and improve habitat viability for snakes and other wildlife. DTE will also restore temporarily disturbed areas with regionally indigenous species and would restore the contours, hydrology, and vegetation of temporarily impacted wetlands following construction.¹¹

⁹ Letter from L. Sargent, MDNR, to Dr. R. Brooks, B&V, dated November 28, 2007 (Exh. DTE000100).

¹⁰ Intervenors' Presentation at 9.

¹¹ FEIS at 4-23 and 4-38. The FEIS explains (at 4-5) that "[v]egetation stabilization and restoration methods would comply with applicable laws, regulations, permit requirements and conditions, good engineering and construction practices, and recognized environmental best management practices (BMPs)." And, the FEIS (at 4-6) notes that

The Intervenors also argue that there is “no analysis or discussion of whether the removal of some Eastern Fox Snakes formerly inhabiting the Fermi 3 construction footprint and moving them onto undeveloped nearby land, might cause an overcrowding effect.”¹² This is not a valid concern. As DTE’s expert witness, Mr. Mifsud, testifies, the Eastern Fox Snake can support relatively high densities where habitat is suitable, including locations on the Fermi site.¹³ Mr. Mifsud explains that Eastern Fox Snakes are also somewhat communal and can often be found in the same burrows and hibernacula.¹⁴ Moreover, prior to relocating any snakes, habitat at the release point will be evaluated to determine suitability, including the potential for overcrowding. Absent information that a significant issue has been overlooked, licensing boards also do not sit to “flyspeck” the FEIS or to add minor details or nuances to the analysis.¹⁵

The Intervenors complain about a lack of a topographical description of the offsite wetland mitigation area (*e.g.*, vegetative cover, wetland, and wetland types) or a detailed investigation of soil contamination.¹⁶ But, contrary to the Intervenors’ assertions, the *Fermi 3 Aquatic Resource Mitigation Strategy and Final Design* (Exh. DTE00009R), which is included in the FEIS as Appendix K, contains a detailed description of the offsite wetland mitigation area.

“[t]emporarily disturbed areas would be restored to their existing topographic and hydrological conditions and be planted with natural vegetation once no longer needed.”

¹² Intervenors’ Presentation at 9.

¹³ DTE Rebuttal Testimony at ¶16. In contrast to the expert testimony provided by Mr. Mifsud, the Intervenors have provided no information, much less any expert support, to suggest that overcrowding is a concern.

¹⁴ *Id.*

¹⁵ *Hydro Resources, Inc.* (P.O. Box 15910, Rio Rancho, NM 87174), CLI-01-04, 53 NRC 31, 71 (2001).

¹⁶ Intervenors’ Presentation at 9-10.

For example, Figure 16 shows the vegetative cover types found at the mitigation site, including a mix of wetlands such as emergent marsh, floodplain forest, southern shrub-carr, and wet meadow, and uplands such as old field, successional shrub and forest. And, Figures 19 and 20 show the locations of wetlands at the mitigation area. The *Fermi 3 Aquatic Resource Mitigation Strategy and Final Design* also contains a detailed description of soil types, vegetative and wildlife communities, hydrology, and existing wetlands at the offsite wetland mitigation area. There is no evidence of soil contamination at the wetland mitigation area.¹⁷ And, in any event, the MDEQ Permit (Exh. DTE000010) at Paragraph 35 requires the wetland to be free of “oil, grease, debris, and all other contaminants” and covered by at least six inches of high-quality topsoil.

The Intervenors further argue that that there is no description of the process by which the restoration of the 107 acre field to wetland habitat will be achieved, what types of revegetation would be sought, or what types of wetlands will be restored.¹⁸ This concern reflects nothing more than a lack of familiarity with the FEIS and the wetland mitigation. The FEIS contains a detailed and comprehensive analysis of the restoration process, including wetland types and revegetation plans in the FEIS. The *Fermi 3 Aquatic Resource Mitigation Strategy and Final Design* explains that restoration and enhancement activities will emphasize heterogeneity in microtopography, vegetation, and hydrology to maximize diversity and

¹⁷ DTE Rebuttal Testimony at ¶17. The Intervenors have presented no expert testimony or other evidence to suggest a need for an in-depth investigation of soil contamination nor have they provided testimony or evidence to suggest that contamination, even if present, would adversely impact Eastern Fox Snakes.

¹⁸ Intervenors’ Presentation at 10.

ecological resilience of wetland habitat.¹⁹ Wetland mitigation has been designed to specifically replace the functions and values provided by the wetlands adversely affected by construction and preconstruction activities at the Fermi site. The planned mitigation wetland will exceed the MDEQ's primary mitigation goal, which is to replace lost wetlands at an average acreage replacement ratio of 3:1. Table 2, *Wetland Impacts, Ratios, and Proposed Mitigation*, identifies the types of wetlands and the acreage of each wetland type being restored.²⁰

The Intervenors also argue that there is no timetable for the offsite mitigation to take place.²¹ But, that is also not true. A summary of activities for each construction year and an approximate timeline is provided in *Fermi 3 Aquatic Resource Mitigation Strategy and Final Design*.²² The MDEQ Wetland permit issued to DTE (Exh. DTE000010) also contains conditions related to the timing of authorized activities. Paragraph 34 states that “[t]he mitigation grading, planting, and introduction of hydrology shall be constructed prior to or concurrent with initiating any other permitted activities.”

Lastly, the Intervenors argue that there is no commitment to having the offsite mitigation wetland area available contemporaneously to the removal of the Eastern Fox Snakes from the Fermi site.²³ As DTE's witness explains (at ¶20), whether and when Eastern Fox Snakes can be relocated to the offsite mitigation area depends on the state of the habitat at the time of relocation. Prior to relocating any snakes, the habitat at the release point will be

¹⁹ Exh. DTE00009R at 2-3. This same information can be found in the FEIS at K-9 to K-10.

²⁰ Exh. DTE00009R at 39; FEIS at K-48.

²¹ Intervenors' Presentation at 10.

²² Exh. DTE00009R at 18-20; FEIS at K-26 to K-27.

²³ Intervenors' Presentation at 10.

evaluated to determine its suitability. In any event, there is ample available habitat at the Fermi site for releasing Eastern Fox Snakes collected prior to and during preconstruction and construction activities, independent of the status of the offsite wetland mitigation.²⁴

At bottom, the Intervenor's claims of deficiencies or omissions in the FEIS are unsupported by any expert testimony and, in many cases, are simply wrong. As the testimony of DTE's witnesses and accompanying exhibits demonstrate, the FEIS has addressed the potential impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake and described in detail the onsite and offsite wetland mitigation. The NRC Staff has considered appropriate factors and drawn reasonable conclusions from the available data.

2. *Transmission Corridor Impacts Are Outside the Scope of Contention 8*

The Intervenor's also introduce arguments relating to the impacts on the Eastern Fox Snake within the offsite transmission corridor that will be constructed by ITCTransmission.²⁵ But, issues relating to the offsite transmission corridor are outside the scope of Contention 8, as admitted. Only site preparation and construction at the Fermi site, not the transmission corridor, were discussed in the original contention.²⁶ And, in LBP-11-14, the Board confirmed that the scope of Contention 8 is limited to site preparation and construction impacts at the Fermi site. This conclusion regarding the scope of Contention 8 is also consistent with Intervenor's own subsequent treatment of transmission-related impacts on the Eastern Fox Snake

²⁴ DTE Rebuttal Testimony at ¶20.

²⁵ Intervenor's Presentation at 13.

²⁶ "Petition of [Intervenor] for Leave to Intervene in Combined Operating License Proceedings and Request for Adjudication Hearing," dated March 9, 2009, at 97-98. The Intervenor's also did not mention Eastern Fox Snake impacts in the transmission corridor in its response to DTE's summary disposition motion. "Intervenor's Memorandum in Opposition to DTE's 'Motion for Summary Disposition of Contention 8,'" dated December 6, 2010. Instead, the Intervenor's focused solely on impacts at the Fermi site.

in more recent filings, including the Intervenor’s proposed contentions based on the DEIS and the FEIS.²⁷

Moreover, regardless of the scope of Contention 8, the FEIS specifically addresses impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake in the transmission corridor. The FEIS acknowledges the potential presence of Eastern Fox Snakes in the offsite transmission corridor and concludes that “the impacts from construction and preconstruction activities for Fermi 3 on terrestrial resources on the Fermi site and transmission line corridor would be SMALL to MODERATE.”²⁸ The Intervenor has provided no information or expert testimony that disputes the FEIS conclusion.

3. *The FEIS Treatment of the Mitigation Plan Satisfies NEPA*

The Intervenor also reiterates arguments regarding the need for enforceable mitigation as part of the FEIS.²⁹ But, these arguments are misplaced. NEPA does not impose a substantive obligation on federal agencies to require mitigation of environmental impacts. In *Methow Valley*, the Supreme Court specifically differentiated an agency’s procedural obligation to discuss mitigation in sufficient detail (to ensure that environmental consequences have been fairly evaluated) from any substantive requirement to actually develop and adopt a detailed mitigation plan.³⁰ The Court explained: “[b]ecause NEPA imposes no substantive requirement

²⁷ Both the original proposed Contention 23, which was rejected by the Board in LBP-12-12, and the new/resubmitted Contention 23 alleged insufficient consideration of impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake in the transmission corridor. The clear implication is that the Intervenor themselves did not consider transmission-related impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake to be within the scope of Contention 8.

²⁸ FEIS at 4-44, 4-47.

²⁹ *Id.* at 11-12.

³⁰ *Robertson v. Methow Valley Citizens Council*, 490 U.S. 332, 352 (1989).

that mitigation measures actually be taken, it should not be read to require agencies to obtain assurances that third parties will implement particular measures.”³¹

Other cases addressing the need for mitigation have reached similar conclusions.³² In one case, *Concerned Citizens on I-190 v. Sec. Of Trans.*, 641 F.2d 1 (1st Cir. 1981), the plaintiffs complained that an EIS relied on “undocumented and unrealistic hopes” for mitigation measures. While noting that most of the mitigation measures were not required by any law, the Court nevertheless found that disclosure of the potential hazard and possible mitigation measures in the EIS, taken as a whole, demonstrated a clear recognition of the problem, provided notice of its significance to those who read the EIS, and evinced a concern for and a commitment to the mitigation of such danger. The Court concluded that the EIS satisfied NEPA — even absent any formal assurance that the mitigation measured actually be implemented. Here, the FEIS undoubtedly recognizes the potential for impacts to Eastern Fox Snakes, provides notice to the public of its potential significance, and discusses DTE’s commitment to mitigation measures.³³ The FEIS discussion therefore satisfies NEPA.

³¹ *Id.* at 353, n.16.

³² *See, e.g., Nat’l Parks & Conservation Ass’n v. U.S. Dep’t of Trans.*, 222 F.3d 677, 681 n.4 (9th Cir. 2000) (“Contrary to National Parks’ assertion, a mitigation plan need not be legally enforceable, funded or even in final form to comply with NEPA’s procedural requirements.”); *Laguna Greenbelt, Inc. v. U.S. Dep’t of Transp.*, 42 F.3d 517, 528 (9th Cir. 1994) (“NEPA does not require a fully developed plan that will mitigate all environmental harm before an agency can act; NEPA requires only that mitigation be discussed in sufficient detail to ensure that environmental consequences have been fully evaluated.” (citations omitted)); *Cnty. of Rockland v. FAA*, 335 Fed.Appx. 52 (D.C. Cir. 2009) (“NEPA does not impose a ‘substantive requirement that a complete mitigation plan be actually formulated and adopted’ before agency can act”) (quoting *Methow Valley*, 490 U.S. at 352); *Communities, Inc. v. Busey*, 956 F.2d 619, 626 (6th Cir. 1992) (relying on *Methow Valley* in holding that identification and discussion of various potential measures to mitigate the environmental impact is adequate under NEPA).

³³ The key is that the FEIS provide the public and the decision maker with accurate information comparing the proposed action and its alternatives. *Calvert Cliffs 3 Nuclear*

Lastly, to the extent that the Intervenors attempt to rely on Council on Environmental Quality (“CEQ”) guidance applicable to an Environmental Assessment (“EA”) and a Finding of No Significant Impact (“FONSI”), their argument misses the mark. The CEQ Guidance does not alter the approach to mitigation articulated by the Supreme Court in *Methow Valley* and applied to the FEIS in this proceeding.³⁴ The CEQ guidance does not suggest that, for an FEIS, the agency must require that mitigation actually be implemented. Instead, the CEQ guidance applies only in cases where an agency is relying on mitigation to reduce the severity of impacts to a level such that the agency can reach a FONSI (and therefore not prepare an EIS). Regardless, the NRC Staff conservatively considered in the FEIS the impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake both with and without the planned mitigation, concluding that the potential impacts would be SMALL or MODERATE, respectively.³⁵

V. CONCLUSIONS

For the reasons set forth above, as supported by the accompanying testimony and evidence, the NRC Staff has taken the requisite “hard look” at potential impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake from site preparation and construction activities associated with Fermi 3. By

Project LLC and UniStar Nuclear Operating Services LLC (Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3), LBP-10-24, 72 NRC ___, ___ (slip op. at 50) (December 28, 2010).

³⁴ The CEQ Guidance itself notes that it “does not change or substitute for any law, regulation, or other legally binding requirement and is not legally enforceable.” “Final Guidance for Federal Departments and Agencies on the Appropriate Use of Mitigation and Monitoring and Clarifying the Appropriate Use of Mitigated Findings of No Significant Impact,” 76 Fed. Reg. 3843, 3846 n.5 (Jan. 21, 2011). And, the NRC, as an independent regulatory agency, is not bound by CEQ regulations. *Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corp.* (Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station), ALAB-876, 26 NRC 277, 284 n.5 (1987).

³⁵ As DTE’s witness, Mr. Smith, has indicated throughout this proceeding, DTE intends to implement the Mitigation Plan regardless of the NRC Staff’s treatment in the FEIS. DTE Rebuttal Testimony at ¶22; DTE Direct Testimony at ¶55.

considering the potential impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake from Fermi 3 site preparation and construction activities, and by evaluating measures to reduce impacts to the Eastern Fox Snake, the NRC Staff has met its obligation under NEPA as a matter of law. The NRC Staff has “come to grips with all important considerations,” including the effectiveness of the Mitigation Plan. The NRC Staff also has considered the views of MDNR, which is the expert State agency that has responsibility for threatened species under Michigan law. The NRC Staff’s ultimate conclusions took into account the Mitigation Plan developed by DTE and reasonable and realistic assumptions regarding MDNR activities (*e.g.*, need for a “take permit” and enforcement authority). In any event, the NRC Staff conservatively discussed the impacts on the Eastern Fox Snake both with and without the Mitigation Plan. The Licensing Board should resolve Contention 8 in favor of DTE and the NRC Staff.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ signed electronically by
David A. Repka
Tyson R. Smith
Winston & Strawn LLP
1700 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

COUNSEL FOR DTE ELECTRIC
COMPANY

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

BEFORE THE ATOMIC SAFETY AND LICENSING BOARD

In the Matter of:)
)
DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY) Docket No. 52-033-COL
)
(Fermi Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 3))

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that copies of “DTE ELECTRIC’S REBUTTAL STATEMENT OF POSITION ON CONTENTION 8” and “WRITTEN REBUTTAL TESTIMONY OF DTE ELECTRIC COMPANY WITNESSES PETER SMITH, RANDALL WESTMORELAND, AND DAVID MIFSUD ON CONTENTION 8” in the above captioned proceeding have been served via the Electronic Information Exchange.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ signed electronically by
Tyson R. Smith
Winston & Strawn LLP
1700 K Street, NW
Washington, DC 20006

COUNSEL FOR DTE ELECTRIC
COMPANY

Dated at Washington, District of Columbia
this 29th day of April 2013