

September 19, 2008

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: FERMI 2 – RE: GENERIC LETTER 2008-01, “MANAGING GAS ACCUMULATION IN EMERGENCY CORE COOLING, DECAY HEAT REMOVAL, AND CONTAINMENT SPRAY SYSTEMS,” PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE COURSE OF ACTION (TAC NO. MD7827)

Dear Mr. Davis:

On January 11, 2008, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued Generic Letter (GL) 2008-01, “Managing Gas Accumulation in Emergency Core Cooling, Decay Heat Removal, and Containment Spray Systems” (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML072910759). The GL requested licensees to submit information to demonstrate that the emergency core cooling, decay heat removal, and containment spray systems (hereinafter referred to as the “subject systems”) are in compliance with the current licensing and design bases and applicable regulatory requirements, and that suitable design, operational, and testing control measures are in place for maintaining this compliance.

In accordance with Section 50.54(f) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), GL 2008-01 required that each licensee submit the requested information within 9 months (hereinafter referred to as the “9-month submittal”) of the date of the GL. The GL also stated that if a licensee cannot meet the requested 9-month response date, the licensee is required to provide a response within 3 months (hereinafter referred to as the “3-month submittal”) of the date of the GL, describing the alternative course of action it proposes to take, including the basis for the acceptability of the proposed alternative course of action.

By letter dated April 11, 2008, Detroit Edison (the licensee) submitted a 3-month response to GL 2008-01 for Fermi 2. The NRC staff’s assessment of the responses for Fermi 2 is contained in the enclosure to this letter.

The NRC staff reviewed the licensee’s proposed alternative course of action and the associated basis for acceptance and concluded that for Fermi 2, with the exception of the clarifications and associated requests discussed in the enclosure, they are acceptable. This letter allows the licensee to implement its proposed alternative course of action provided that implementation is consistent with the clarifications and associated requests discussed in the enclosure.

J. Davis

- 2 -

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me at (301) 415-2048.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Justin C. Poole, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-341

cc: See next page

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please feel free to contact me at (301) 415-2048.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Justin C. Poole, Project Manager
Plant Licensing Branch III-1
Division of Operating Reactor Licensing
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-341

cc: See next page

Distribution:

PUBLIC	RidsNrrLABTully
LPL3-1 R/F	RidsNrrDorLpl3-1
RidsOgcRP	RidsNrrDorIDpr
JWermeil, NRR	RidsAcrsAcnw&mMailCenter
MMurphy, NRR	RidsRgn3MailCenter
DBeaulieu, NRR	RidsNrrPMFermi2
SSun, NRR	WLyon, NRR

ADAMS Accession Number: **ML081560766**

OFFICE	LPL3-1/PM	LPL3-1/LA	PGCB/BC	DSS/DD	LPL3-1/BC
NAME	JPoole	BTully	MMurphy	JWermeil	LJames
DATE	09 / 05 /08	09 / 05 /08	09 / 09 /08	09/ 05 /08	09 / 19 /08

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Fermi 2

cc:

David G. Pettinari
Legal Department
688 WCB
Detroit Edison Company
2000 2nd Avenue
Detroit, MI 48226-1279

Mr. Joseph H. Plona
Vice President - Nuclear Generation
Detroit Edison Company
Fermi 2 - 210 NOC
6400 North Dixie Highway
Newport, MI 48166

Michigan Department of Environmental
Quality
Waste and Hazardous Materials Division
Radiological Protection and Medical Waste
Section
Nuclear Facilities Unit
Constitution Hall, Lower-Level North
525 West Allegan Street
P.O. Box 30241
Lansing, MI 48909-7741

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Resident Inspector's Office
6450 N Dixie Highway
Newport, MI 48166

Mr. M. V. Yudasz, Jr., Director
Monroe County Emergency Management
Division
965 South Raisinville Road
Monroe, MI 48161

Ronald W. Gaston
Manager, Nuclear Licensing
Detroit Edison Company
Fermi 2 - 200 TAC
6400 North Dixie Highway
Newport, MI 48166

Supervisor - Electric Operators
Michigan Public Service Commission
P.O. Box 30221
Lansing, MI 48909

Wayne County Emergency Management
Division
10250 Middlebelt Road
Detroit, MI 48242

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ASSESSMENT OF 3-MONTH RESPONSE

TO GENERIC LETTER 2008-01

FERMI 2

DOCKET NO. 50-341

1. Background

On January 11, 2008, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued Generic Letter (GL) 2008-01, "Managing Gas Accumulation in Emergency Core Cooling, Decay Heat Removal, and Containment Spray Systems" (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML072910759). The GL requested licensees to submit information to demonstrate that the emergency core cooling, decay heat removal, and containment spray systems (hereinafter referred to as the "subject systems") are in compliance with the current licensing and design bases and applicable regulatory requirements, and that suitable design, operational, and testing control measures are in place for maintaining this compliance. Specifically, the GL requested licensees to provide: (1) a description of the results of evaluations that were performed in response to the GL; (2) a description of all corrective actions that the licensee determined were necessary; and (3) a statement regarding which corrective actions were completed, the schedule for completing the remaining corrective actions, and the basis for that schedule.

In accordance with Section 50.54(f) of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR), GL 2008-01 required that each licensee submit the requested information within 9 months (hereinafter referred to as the "9-month submittal") of the date of the GL. The GL also stated that if a licensee cannot meet the requested 9-month response date, the licensee is required to provide a response within 3 months (hereinafter referred to as the "3-month submittal") of the date of the GL, describing the alternative course of action it proposes to take, including the basis for the acceptability of the proposed alternative course of action.

2. Licensee's Proposed Alternative Course of Action

By letter dated April 11, 2008, Detroit Edison (the licensee) submitted a 3-month response to GL 2008-01 for Fermi 2. The licensee stated they cannot meet the requested 9-month schedule for submitting the requested information because walkdowns of the GL subject systems of Fermi 2 cannot be completed because portions of the GL subject systems are inaccessible during power operation. These sections of piping are inaccessible for the following reasons: (1) the need to erect scaffolding; (2) need to remove insulation from piping; (3) locations of segments in high radiation areas; and (4) location of segments inside primary containment.

The licensee also stated that all other GL actions will be completed during the 9-month timeframe prescribed in the GL (i.e., by October 11, 2008). As an alternative course of action, the licensee plans to complete walkdowns of those areas only accessible during an outage during the next refueling outage for Fermi 2 scheduled to start in the spring of 2009. The licensee's letter dated April 11, 2008, listed the following commitment:

Enclosure

- Detroit Edison will provide all requested information in GL 2008-01 within 9 months of the date of the GL with the exception of information related to portions of the systems that are inaccessible during plant power operation. Detroit Edison will provide the remainder of the requested information by July 31, 2009.

The licensee stated that the alternative course of action is acceptable based on the following:

1. evaluation programs,
2. operating experience,
3. system walkdowns, and
4. periodic testing.

Based on the above considerations, the licensee stated that the proposed alternative course of action should be acceptable since it will provide a high level of confidence in the ability of the subject systems to perform their intended safety function. As such, the licensee concluded that completing performance of the detailed walkdowns of a portion of piping sections outside of the requested 9-month timeframe is an acceptable alternative course of action.

3. NRC Staff Assessment

The NRC staff finds that, with the exception of the clarifications and associated requests discussed below, that the licensee's proposed alternative course of action is acceptable based on the above-described operating experience, testing, evaluation programs, and system walkdowns associated with managing gas accumulation at Fermi 2.

The NRC staff notes an example where the licensee's 3-month submittal dated April 11, 2008, does not clearly describe the content and/or schedule for the 9-month submittals. Specifically, although the licensee's submittal stated it would provide the remainder of the GL requested information by July 31, 2009, it is not clear if that schedule is within 90 days following startup from the Fermi 2 refueling outage that is scheduled to start in the spring of 2009.

The NRC staff requests the licensee to submit the information requested in GL 2008-01 as follows:

- (1) 9-Month Initial Submittal - For the portions of the subject systems that are accessible prior to the Fermi 2 refueling outage scheduled to start in the spring of 2009, provide all GL requested information to the NRC by October 11, 2008.
- (2) 9-Month Supplemental (Post-Outage) Submittal - Except for the long-term items described below, provide all remaining GL requested information for the subject systems to the NRC by July 31, 2009, or within 90 days following startup from the next refueling outage scheduled to start in the spring of 2009, at Fermi 2, whichever is sooner.

For each of these two submittals (the 9-month initial and supplemental submittal), and consistent with the information requested in the GL, the licensees should provide: (1) a description of the results of evaluations that were performed in response to the GL; (2) a description of all corrective actions that the licensee determined were necessary; and (3) a

statement regarding which corrective actions were completed, the schedule for completing the remaining corrective actions, and the basis for that schedule.

The NRC staff noted that the licensee's submittal dated April 11, 2008, did not mention other potential long-term actions that are identified in the GL. For instance, the industry is assessing whether it is necessary to perform pump testing to determine the allowable limits on ingested gas volume in pump suctions, as well as the need to develop an analysis capability to adequately predict void movement (entrapped gas) from piping on the suction side of the pumps into the pumps. It is unlikely this industry effort will be complete for the 9-month initial or supplemental submittals. Further, technical specification changes may be necessary to reflect the improved understanding achieved during response to the GL, but these cannot be fully developed for the 9-month initial or supplemental submittals. A Technical Specifications Task Force Traveler may provide a generic example that can be adopted by licensees. The NRC staff requests that the licensee address in its 9-month submittal how it plans to track such long-term actions (e.g., Corrective Action Program and/or commitment tracking). The NRC plans to perform follow up inspections of licensee responses to GL 2008-01 at all plants using a Temporary Instruction inspection procedure.