

July 27, 1984

Docket No. 50-341

The Detroit Edison Company  
ATTN: Wayne H. Jens  
Vice President  
Nuclear Operations  
6400 North Dixie Highway  
Newport, MI 48166

Gentlemen:

This refers to the routine safety inspection conducted by Mr. J. P. Patterson and others of this office on June 25-29, 1984, of activities at the Enrico Fermi Atomic Power Plant, Unit 2, authorized by Construction Permit No. CPPR-87, and to the discussions of our findings with you and others of your staff at the conclusion of the inspection.

The enclosed copy of our inspection report identifies areas examined during the inspection. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of a selective examination of procedures and representative records, observations, and interviews with personnel.

No items of noncompliance with NRC requirements were identified during the course of this inspection.

Certain weaknesses were identified as a result of our observation of your emergency preparedness exercise. These weaknesses are listed in the enclosed Appendix. As required by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E, Section IV.F, any weaknesses that are identified need to be corrected. Accordingly, you are requested to submit a written statement within 30 days of the date of this letter describing your planned actions for correcting the weaknesses identified in the Appendix.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790(a), a copy of this letter and the enclosures will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room unless you notify this office, by telephone, within ten days of the date of this letter and submit written application to withhold information contained therein within thirty days of the date of this letter. Such application must be consistent with the requirements of 2.790(b)(1). If we do not hear from you in this regard within the specified periods noted above, a copy of this letter, the enclosures, and your response to this letter will be placed in the Public Document Room.

The responses directed by this letter are not subject to the clearance procedures of the Office of Management and Budget as required by the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980, PL 96-511.

IE-35

July 27, 1984

We will gladly discuss any questions you have concerning this inspection.

Sincerely,

C. J. Paperiello, Chief  
Emergency Preparedness and  
Radiological Protection Branch

Enclosures:

- 1. Appendix, Exercise Weaknesses
- 2. Inspection Report No. 50-341/84-15(DRSS)

cc w/encls:

- L. P. Bregni, Licensing Engineer
- P. A. Marquardt, Corporate Legal Department
- DMB/Document Control Desk (RIDS)
- Resident Inspector, RIII
- Ronald Callen, Michigan Public Service Commission
- Harry H. Voigt, Esq.
- D. Matthews, EPB, OIE
- W. Weaver, FEMA, Region VII
- Jennifer E. Puntenney

R111  
  
Patterson/rr  
07/26/84

R111  
  
Christopher

R111  
  
Phillips

R111  
RCK  
Knop

R111  
  
Paperiello  
7/27/84

## Appendix

### EXERCISE WEAKNESSES

1. Protective action recommendation formulation failed to incorporate reactor and containment conditions and prognosis for improvement (or degradation), evacuation time estimates, and plume passage time. Instead, dose assessment calculations were based on an eight-hour projected release rate. Procedures should be modified to ensure that all available information regarding dose assessment and reactor/containment conditions is factored into the formulation of protective action recommendations. (341/84-15-02)
2. Offsite monitoring teams were not provided with respiratory protection equipment. Although no radioiodines or particulates were present in the release, this equipment should be provided to ensure internal organ doses would be as low as reasonably achievable had radioiodines or particulates been present. (341/84-15-02)