

October 7, 2009

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. 14 RELATED TO  
THE SRP SECTIONS 13.03 AND 14.03.02 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 60 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](mailto:Jerry.Hale@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

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

Docket Nos. 052-033

eRAI Tracking Nos. 3575 and 3582

Enclosure:  
Request for Additional Information

October 7, 2009

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. 14 RELATED TO  
THE SRP SECTIONS 13.03 AND 14.03.02 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 60 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](mailto:Jerry.Hale@nrc.gov).

Sincerely,

*/RA/*

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

Docket Nos. 052-033

eRAI Tracking Nos. 3575 and 3582

Enclosure:  
Request for Additional Information

Distribution:

PUBLIC I.Berrios, NRO S.Samaddar, NRO K.Williams, NSIR  
NGE 1/2 R/F S.Green, NRO J.Hale, NRO J.Cruz, NRO  
M.Carpentier, OGC RidsNroDsraSbpb RidsNroDnrlNge2

**ADAMS Accession No. ML092800240**

OFFICE	SEB2	NSIR	OGC	NGE1/LPM
NAME	S.Samaddar	K.Williams	M.Carpentier	M.Tonacci
DATE	8/14/09	9/11/09	9/23/09	9/11/09

\*Approval captured electronically in the electronic RAI system.

**Request for Additional Information No. 3575 Revision 0**

Fermi Unit 3  
Detroit Edison  
Docket No. 52-033

SRP Section: 14.03.02 - Structural and Systems Engineering - Inspections, Tests, Analyses, and Acceptance Criteria

**14.03.02-1**

Section 2.4.1 ITAAC FOR BACKFILL UNDER CATEGORY I STRUCTURES of Part 10 ITAAC states that: "Not applicable since no compactable backfill will be placed under Fermi 3 Category I structures." Confirm that the above statement also applies to the supporting foundation medium for the FWSC structures. If not, discuss key elements of ITAAC that will be applied to the compactable backfill fill medium.

## Request for Additional Information No. 3582 Revision 1

Fermi Unit 3  
Detroit Edison  
Docket No. 52-033  
SRP Section: 13.03 - Emergency Planning

### 13.03-19

#### **SITE-1:** Assignment of Responsibilities (Organizational Control)

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b)(1), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.III., Appendix E.IV.A.8; NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard A, Evaluation Criterion A.1, 2, 3, 4

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2.

13.03-01-01 Section II.A.1.a.1, "State, Local and Provincial Governmental Agencies," identifies the Province of Ontario Canada as a participating organization; however, interactions with Ontario are not discussed. **Revise the Plan to include description of the interactions with the Province of Ontario, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-01-02 Section II.A.1.b, "Concept of Operations," (page II-4) identifies the State of Michigan Department of Community Health as a participating governmental agency. **Revise the Plan to include the Michigan State Department of Community Health in listing of participating agencies, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-01-03 Section II.A.1.b describes the roles of the State Police, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Community Health, DOE, EPA, and United States Coast Guard (USCG), but these organizations are not shown on Figure II.A-1. **Revise the Plan to include the State Police, Department of Environmental Quality, Department of Community Health, DOE, EPA, and USCG in figure II.A-1, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-01-04 Section II.A.1.b identifies the Monroe County Emergency Operations Center (EOC) in Monroe, Michigan and the Wayne County EOC in Romulus, Michigan. Figure II.A-1 shows a single county EOC. **Revise the Plan, figure II.A-1, to be consistent with Section II.A.1.b description of both Monroe and Wayne County EOCs, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-01-05 Appendix 2 includes certification letters, which indicate that the specific nature of emergency response arrangements will be established in agreements, and existing revised agreements, if and when the applicant proceeds with construction and operation of the new plant. **Revise the Plan to include copies of existing agreements with signature pages for organizations identified in Appendix 2 to show that these agreements delineate authorities, responsibilities, and action limits, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-20

#### **SITE-2:** On-site Emergency Response Organization

Basis: 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.A: 1, 2, 4, 5; NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Evaluation Criterion B1 through 9

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2.

13.03-02-01 Section II.B.1, "Onsite Emergency Organization," states that details of the normal plant organization are provided in plant administrative procedures. **Revise the Plan to include the title of the procedure and a description of the normal plant operating organization, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-02 Section II.B.5, “Interfaces Between Functional Areas,” states that Figure II.A-1, “Emergency Operations Center Interrelationships,” (page II-12) illustrates interfaces between site functional areas of emergency response activity and Corporate Headquarters, but Figure II.A-1 does not show Corporate Headquarters. **Revise the Plan, Figure II.A-1, to show Corporate Headquarters interface with other functional areas, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-03 Table II.B-2, “Emergency Response Organizational Functional Responsibilities” describes the responsibilities for offsite dose projections, but does not describe transmitting the results of the dose projections to the appropriate authorities consistent with 10 CFR 50 Appendix E IV.A.4. **Revise the Plan to include a description of the transmission of dose projection results to State and local authorities, NRC, and other appropriate governmental entities, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-04 Section II.B.7, “Support from Contractor and Private Organizations,” and Section II.B.8, “Local Emergency Response Support,” identify support organizations, but do not describe employees with special qualifications for coping with emergency situations. **Revise the Plan to include identification by position and title employees and non-employees having special qualifications for coping with emergency situations, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-05 Figure II.A-1, “Emergency Operation Center Interrelationships” (page II-12) illustrates the interfaces between and among the site functional areas of emergency response activity, Corporate Headquarters, State of Michigan, Monroe and Wayne Counties, Province of Ontario, and Federal agencies. However, Figure II.A-1 does not identify the TSC, OSC, and EOF. **Revise the Plan, Figure II.A-1, to include the TSC and OSC, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-06 Section II.B. “Emergency Response Organization” (page II-13), states the details regarding ERO position descriptions, responsibilities, and major tasks of ERO staffing required for initial emergency response actions and provisions for timely augmentation of on-shift personnel are described in the Emergency plan implementing procedures. **Revise the Plan to include the title of the ERO staffing EPIP. In addition, describe the controls required to allow lower level documents to contain emergency response plan information (i.e. 10 CFR 50.54(q) commitment for Plan changes), or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-07 Table II.B.1 “Minimum Staffing Requirements for Emergencies” describes the Notification/Communication function staffing as “may be provided by shift personnel assigned other functions and not included in the total.” **Revise the Plan, Table II.B.1, to describe the Notification/Communication area consistent with NUREG-0654 table B-1 description, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-08 Table II.B.1 describes the Radiological Accident Assessment and Support of Operational Accident Assessment function being staffed by one on shift Rad/Chem technician. NUREG-0654 table B-1 staffing describes two Radiochemistry/ Chemistry technicians. **Revise the Plan, Table II.B.1, description of the on shift Rad/Chem technician to be consistent with NUREG-0654 table B-1 description, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-09 Table II.B.1 in the Plant System Engineering, Repair and Corrective Actions section does not list the following areas of expertise, Core/Thermal Hydraulics, maintenance expertise for Electrical, I&C, and Mechanical and Rad Waste Operator. **Revise the Plan, Table II.B.1, Plant System Engineering, Repair and Corrective Actions section list to areas of expertise to be consistent with NUREG-0654 table B-1 listing, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-10 Site Access Control and Personnel Accountability area of Table II.B.1 does not list the major task “firefighting communications.” **Revise the Plan, Table II.B.1, description for Site Access**

**Control and Personnel Accountability to be consistent with NUREG-0654 table B-1 description, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-11 Table II.B.1 has a footnote that describes the asterisk notation used in the table to mean "May be provided by shift personnel assigned other functions and not included in the total." There is no further description of who the other shift personnel are or what their qualifications would be to allow them to perform the given function. **Revise the Plan to include description of other shift individuals that may fulfill position described by the asterisk, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-12 Figure II.B-1 "Control Room" position block diagram describes on shift Maintenance personnel; The Plan does not describe shift maintenance personnel anywhere else. **Revise the Plan to include a description of the staffing of maintenance personnel on shift to match figure II.B-1 "Control Room" position block diagram, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-13 Figure II.B-1 "Control Room" position block diagram describes a control room communicator position. No description of the control room communicator position was found else where in the plan. **Revise the Plan to include a description of the control room communicator position, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-14 Figure II.B-2 "Operational Support Center" (OSC) position block diagram shows the following positions that are not described in the Plan: Assistant OSC Coordinators; RET Leader; Maintenance Coordinator; Radiation Protection and Maintenance Personnel. **Revise the Plan to include the descriptions of these OSC positions, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-15 Figure II.B-3 "Technical Support Center" (TSC) position block diagram shows the following positions that are not described in the Plan: TSC and NRC Communicator; Administrative Support, Onsite RET, Emergency Status Engineers, Technical Communicator. **Revise the Plan to include descriptions of these TSC positions, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-16 Figure II.B-4 "Emergency Operations Facility" (EOF) position block diagram shows the following positions that are not described in the Plan: Offsite RETs; Liaisons to State of MI. Wayne and Monroe Counties; Communicators, Administrative Personnel, Status Board Clerks. **Revise the Plan to include descriptions of these EOF positions, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-17 Section A.1.b "Concept of Operations" (page II-3) describes the Shift Manager/Emergency Director as having the responsibility to direct initial notification of protective action recommendations and activate the ERO. Table II-B-2 "Emergency Response Organization Functional Responsibilities" does not list this responsibility. **Revise the Plan's descriptions of the Shift Manager/Emergency Director responsibilities to be consistent, or a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-19 Table II-B-2 "Emergency Response Organization Functional Responsibilities" assigns the call in responsibility for the ERO to the ED in the TSC. The TSC ED is part of the augmenting ERO. **Revise the Plan to explain how a position in the augmenting ERO could perform the call in of the augmenting ERO, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-20 Section B.3 "Emergency Director Responsibilities" (page II-15) describes the Emergency Officer as having the responsibility for offsite notifications to the state, counties, and provincial agencies (NRC notifications normally stay in the Control Room); issuing Protective Action Recommendations (PAR's); ensuring information released to the news media is accurate; and committing company resources. Table II-B-2 does not give the Emergency Officer responsibility to

notify offsite emergency response authorities of PARs. **Revise the Plan's descriptions of Emergency Director responsibilities to be consistent, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-02-21 Section B.3 "Emergency Director Responsibilities" (page II-15) describes the Emergency Officer as having the unique responsibility, which may not be delegated, to direct notification of and make protective action recommendations to governmental authorities responsible for implementing offsite emergency response actions. Table II-B-2 "Emergency Response Organization Functional Responsibilities" does not list these responsibilities. **Revise the Plan's descriptions of the Emergency Officer position responsibilities to be consistent, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-21

**SITE-3:** Emergency Response Support and Resources

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b)(3); Appendix E, IV.A.6;7; NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard C, Evaluation Criterion C.1, C.2, C.3, C.4.

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirement A and B; Acceptance Criterion 1, 2

13.03-03-01 Section C, "Emergency Response Support and Resources," does not describe provisions for Federal, State, and local emergency personnel such as office space available. **Revise the Plan to include a description of the provisions for Federal, State, and local emergency personnel, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-22

**SITE-5:** Notification Methods and Procedures

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b)(5), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.D.1, 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.D.3, 10 CFR 50.72(a)(3), 10 CFR 50.72(c)(3), NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard E, Evaluation Criterion E.1,2,3,4,5,6,7

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirement A, B, C, D, E, F Acceptance Criterion 1-31

13.03-05-01 Section E, "Notification Methods and Procedures," (page II-46) states the Province of Ontario is notified immediately after the NRC which is informed not later than one (1) hour after the time of initial classification or escalation. Therefore the Province of Ontario could be notified greater than an hour after the time of classification or escalation. **Revise the Plan's described timing for the notification of the Province of Ontario, or provide a justification for why how this meets the intent of early notification of the public.**

### 13.03-23

**SITE-6** Emergency Communications

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b)(6), Planning Standard F; 10 CFR, Appendix E. IV.E.9; 10 CFR 50, Appendix E. IV.E.9; Generic Letter 91-14; 10 CFR 50.72(a)(4); NUREG 0654/FEMA-REP1; Evaluation Criterion F.1, F.2, F.3., Generic Letter 91-14, Bulletin 80-15,

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A, B and F; Acceptance Criteria 1, 2, 6, 12, 23, 29, 30

13.03-06-01 Section II.F.1.a.5, "NRC Telephones," states that the ENS, HPN, RSCL, PMCL, ERDS, MCL, and the LAN are separate telephone lines dedicated for communications with the NRC at Fermi 3. **Revise the Plan to include a description of guaranteed power to the emergency communications equipment, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-24

#### Site 7: Public Information

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b) (7); 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.D.2; NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard G, Evaluation Criterion G.1, G.2, G.3, G.4, G.5

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2

13.03-07.01 10 CFR 50.47(b) (7) requires principal points of contact with the news media be established in advance. **Revise the Plan to include a list of the principal news media points of contact (i.e. local EAS station information) for dissemination of information during an emergency, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-07.02 The JIC is described as located at the Monroe County Community College however; there is no letter of agreement with the community college provided in the plan. **Revise the Plan to include a letter of agreement with the community college, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-07.03 Section G.4, "Information Exchange," states emergency information will be coordinated between the Joint Information Center (JIC), the Emergency Operations Facility (EOF), the Corporate Communication Office, Federal, State, local and Canadian spokespersons. **Revise the Plan to include a description of the designated spokespersons, by title or position that will have access to information, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-07.04 Section G.5, "News Media Training," states the emergency plans and information concerning radiation are provided in news media training; however, the points of contact for the release of public information are not discussed. **Revise the Plan to include a description by title or position plant points of contact for the release of public information, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-25

#### SITE 8: Emergency Facilities and Equipment

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b)(8); 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.E.1 through 3; 10 CFR 52.79(a)(17), Three Mile Island Requirements; Appendix E.IV.E.4; Appendix E.IV.E.8; Appendix E.VI Emergency Response Data System; Appendix E.VI. Maintaining Emergency Response Data System; 10 CFR 50.34(f) (2) (xxv); 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.G.; Supplement 1 to NUREG-0737, "Clarification of TMI Action Plan Requirements," NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard H, Evaluation Criterion H1 through H12

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1, 2, 4, 5, 12, 25, and 26

13.03-08.01 Section H.1.b, "Technical Support Center," (page II-61) states that the Technical Support Center (TSC) is located in the Electrical Building within the Protected Area; however, the distance to the control room is not identified. **Revise the Plan to include information describing if the TSC is within a 2 minute walking distance of the Control Room, in accordance with NUREG-0696, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-08.02 Table II.B-1, "Minimum Staffing Requirements for Emergencies," (page II-19), lists the TSC staffing of the Emergency Director, Communicator, Radiation Protection Advisor within 30 minutes and the Technical Engineer or Nuclear Safety Advisor and Support Engineer within 60 minutes, but does not describe the staffing of core/thermal hydraulics, electrical and mechanical technical support. **Revise the Plan to include information describing how the TSC staffing meets NUREG-0737 Supplement 1, for core/thermal hydraulics, electrical and mechanical technical support, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-08.03 Table II.B-1, "Minimum Staffing Requirements for Emergencies," (page II-19 & 20), lists the TSC minimum staffing of the Emergency Director, Communicator, Radiation Protection Advisor to be within 30 minutes and the Technical Engineer or Nuclear Safety Advisor and Support Engineer to be within 60 minutes. NUREG-0696 describes TSC staffing to be complete for full functional operation within 30 minutes. **Revise the Plan's response times listed on Table II.B-1 to be consistent with NUREG-0696, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-08.04 Section H.1.b, "Technical Support Center," (page II-61) states that TSC personnel have access to up-to-date as-built drawings, up-to-date applicant, State and local emergency management plan records, etc. **Revise the Plan to include plant operating records in the records available to TSC personnel, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-08.05 Table II.B-1, "Minimum Staffing Requirements for Emergencies," (page II-19), lists the EOF staffing, including Communicator, Emergency Officer, Radiation Protection Coordinator, and Radiological Emergency Team (RET) Sampler or Radiation Protection (RP) Technician, all with 60 minute augmentation times. **Revise the Plan to describe how the 60 minute augmentation time for EOF staffing meets the goal of 30 and 60 minutes in Table 2 NUREG-0737, Supplement 1, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-08.06 Section H.1.d, "Emergency Operations Facility (EOF)," states that the EOF is sized for about 40 people. Using a minimum of 75 square feet per person, in accordance with NUREG-0696, the minimum EOF size would be 3000 square feet for 40 persons, while ITAAC 5.2. Acceptance Criteria 5.2.1 addresses confirmation that the EOF has at least 2625 square feet of floor space. **Revise the Plan's description of EOF minimum size of 2625 square feet to be consistent with NUREG-0696 for 40 persons, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-08.07 The location of the EOF is shown on Figure I-3 "Fermi Site Layout" (page I-6) as being within the Owner Controlled Area (OCA) boundary. Figure II-J-1 "Fermi Owner Controlled Area" does not show the EOF as being within the OCA. **Revise the Plan to include a consistent location description for the EOF in regards to figures I-3 and II-J-1, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-08.08 Section H.1.d "Emergency Operations Facility (EOF)" (page II-64) describes the location of the EOF as being approximately 6000 feet southwest of Fermi 3 site on owner-controlled property. Figure I-3 "Fermi Site Layout" indicates the EOF is located significantly less than 6000 feet southwest from the proposed Fermi 3 site. **Revise the Plan to give a consistent description for the location of the EOF, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-26

**SITE-9:** Accident Assessment

**Basis:** 10 CFR 50.34(f)(2)(viii), 10 CFR 50.47(b)(9); 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.B; 10 CFR 52.79(a)(17), Three Mile Island Requirements; NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard I, Evaluation Criterion I.1 through I.11; Supplement 1 to NUREG-0737, Section 6.1.b - Control Room Post-accident sampling capability

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirement A; Acceptance Criteria 1, 4, 5, 25, and 27

13.03-09-02 Section I "Accident Assessment" does not describe post-accident sampling capability. **Revise the Plan to include description of post-accident sampling capability consistent with 10 CFR 50.34(f) (2) (viii), or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-27

#### **SITE-10: Protective Response**

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b)(10), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV; NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard J, Evaluation Criterion J.1 through 12; RIS 2003-12, "Clarification of NRC Guidance for Modifying Protective Actions."

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2

13.03-10.01 Section J.1 "Onsite Notification" describes individuals located outside of the Protected Area (PA) but inside the Owner Controlled Area (OCA) are informed through audible warnings provided by warning systems and the activities of the Security Force and if needed, local law enforcement personnel. There is no description of why the local law enforcement may be required. **Discuss why the audible warnings provided by warning systems and the activities of the Security Force may not be successful in notifying individuals outside the PA but inside the OCA.**

13.03-10.02 Section J.1 "Onsite Notification" states individuals within the Protected Area (PA) are notified within about 15 minutes of the declaration of any emergency requiring individual response actions, such as accountability or evacuation, but no description of protective actions timeliness for individuals outside the PA but within the Owner Controlled Area (OCA). RIS 2002-14 describes the evaluation criteria for the planning standard §50.47(b)(10) are based, in part, on NUREG-0654, "Criteria for Preparation and Evaluation of Radiological Emergency Response Plans and Preparedness in Support of Nuclear Power Plants," Section II.J.1 "Each licensee shall establish the means and time required to warn or advise onsite individuals and individuals who may be in areas controlled by the operator, including: a. Employees not having emergency assignments; b. Visitors; c. Contractor and construction personnel; and d. Other persons who may be in the public access areas on or passing through the site or within the owner controlled area." **Revise the Plan to include a description consistent with RIS 2002-14 for demonstrating the understanding of the required time to notify persons outside the PA but within OCA, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.03 Figure II.J-2, "Evacuation Routes and Assembly Areas," shows evacuated personnel will be directed to assemble at the Newport Service Center, Dixie Warehouse, and Trenton Channel Power Plant, or will be sent home. However, the listing in Appendix 2, "Certification Letters," does not include letters from assembly locations committing to provide services. **Revise the Plan to include letters of agreement from the Newport Service Center, Dixie Warehouse, and Trenton Channel Power Plant, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.04 Section J.2 "Evacuation Routes and Transportation" states evacuation of site personnel is via personal vehicles. Should any individual onsite does not have access to a personal vehicle, arrangements will be made for transportation with another evacuating individual. **Revise the Plan to include the name of the responsible group for arranging transportation of individuals without vehicles, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.05 Section J.7 "Protective Action Recommendations and Bases" describes Protective Action Recommendation (PAR) to be evacuation of protective action areas and shelter the remaining EPZ, no description of the potential use of sheltering affected areas if conditions make evacuation dangerous or the consideration for the use of KI consistent with NUREG-0654, Supplement 3, 10 CFR 50.47(b)(10) and RIS 2004-13. **Revise the Plan's description of potential PAR actions to be consistent with NUREG-0654, Supplement 3, 10 CFR 50.47(b)(10) and RIS 2004-13, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.06 Appendix 5, "Evacuation Time Estimate Summary," includes a map showing evacuation areas, but no map(s) identifying evacuation routes, pre-selected radiological sampling and monitoring points, and relocation centers in host areas.

13.03-10.06.1 **Revise the Plan to include a map in the Emergency Plan that identifies evacuation routes, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.06.2 **Revise the Plan to include a map that identifies the pre-selected radiological sampling and monitoring points, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.06.3 **Revise the Plan to include a map that identifies the relocation centers in host areas, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.07 Section J.8, "Evacuation Time Estimates," states Appendix 5 of the Plan summarizes population distributions. Appendix 5 "Evacuation Time estimate Summary" contains population by PAA but not by sector. **Revise the Plan to include population information in a sector format consistent with NUREG-0654 J.10.b, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-10.08 Neither Section J.7 "Protective Action Recommendations and Bases" or section J.10 "Protective Measures Implementation" address Protective Action Recommendations (PAR) for the province of Ontario consistent with 10 CFR 50.47(b) (10). **Revise the Plan's description of the areas that PARs are made and implemented for, to include the province of Ontario, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### **13.03-28**

**SITE-12:** Medical and Public Health Support

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b) (12), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.E.5, 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.E.7; 10 CFR 50.47(b) (12); NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard L, Evaluation Criterion L.1 through 4.

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2

13.03-012-01 Section L.1 "Hospital and Medical Support" (page II-93) describes agreements with Mercy Memorial Hospital and Oakwood Southshore Medical Center are maintained on file by the Fermi 3 Emergency Preparedness Department and listed in Appendix 2 of the Plan.

NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, B.9 states, in part, copies of the arrangements and agreements reached with contractor, private, and local support agencies shall be appended to the plan. **Revise Plan to be consistent with planning standard B.9, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### **13.03-29**

**SITE-13:** Recovery and Reentry Planning

Basis: 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.H, NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Planning Standard M, Evaluation Criterion M.1-4.

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirement A; Acceptance Criterion 1

13.03-13.01 Section M, "Reentry and Recovery Planning," states that detailed information describing reentry and recovery activities is included in emergency plan implementing procedures (page II-95), but the title of the procedure needs to be identified. **Revise the Plan to include the procedure(s) by title, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-13.02 Section M.2.d. (page II-98) describes a Public Information Coordinator (position title) as having the responsibility of disseminating information about the recovery to the media and coordinating with all public information groups. Figure II.M-1 "Recovery Organization (Basic Frame Work)" does not show this Coordinator position. **Revise the Plan, Figure II.M-1 and or section M.2.d, to provide a consistent description for the position title responsible for disseminating information about the recovery to the media, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-13.03 Section M.1.a. "Evaluating Reentry Conditions," (page II-95) describes under "Reentry during the emergency phase of an accident" in part. "All reentry activities conducted during an emergency are authorized by the Emergency Coordinator and coordinated with OSC personnel." The Emergency Coordinator position is not described in the Plan. **Revise the Plan to include a description of the Emergency Coordinator position and revise figure II-M-1 Recovery Organization (Basic Frame Work) to include the Emergency Coordinator position, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-30

#### SITE-14: Exercises and Drills

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b) (14), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.F.2, 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.F.2, NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1; Planning Standard N, Evaluation Criterion N.1.through N.5,

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2

13.03-14.01 Section N.5, "Drill and Exercise Critiques," (page II-106) describes the critique and evaluation process following an exercise or drill, but does not describe remedial exercises performed if the emergency plan is not satisfactorily tested. **Revise the Plan to include remedial exercise information consistent with 10 CFR 50 Appendix E.IV.F.2.f, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-14.02 Section N.2.a "Communication Drills," describes the communications drills performed and the frequency of testing, but does not describe communications testing with Federal Emergency Response Organizations (EROs) and States within the ingestion pathway. **Revise the Plan to describe the testing of communications with Federal EROs and states within the ingestion pathway consistent with NUREG-0654 N.2.a, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-14.03 Section N.2.e, "Radiation Protection Drills," (page II-105) describes the radiation protection drills that will be performed. There is no description of a drill to demonstrate the use of the post-accident sampling capability. **Revise the Plan to include a description of the drill to demonstrate the use of the post-accident sampling capability consistent with NUREG-0654 N.2.e (2), or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-31

#### SITE-15: Radiological Emergency Training

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b) (15), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV. F.1, Appendix E.IV. F.2.g; NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1 Planning Standard O, Evaluation Criterion O.1. through 5.

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2

13.03-15.01 Section O.2 "Onsite Emergency Response Training" describes the training program scope, nature, and frequency of the required training and qualification measures, but does not describe specialized initial training and periodic retraining programs for the specific categories of emergency personnel identified is needed consistent with 10 CFR 50 Appendix E.IV.F.1 and NUREG-0654 O.4. **Revise the Plan to describe the scope, nature and frequency of specialized initial training and retraining consistent with 10 CFR 50 Appendix E.IV.F.1 and NUREG-0654 O.4, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-32

**SITE-16:** Responsibility for Planning Effort: Development, Periodic Review, and Distribution of Emergency Plan.

Basis: 10 CFR 50.47(b) (16), 10 CFR 50, Appendix E.IV.G, NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1; Planning Standard P, Evaluation Criterion P.1-10.

SRP ACCEPTANCE CRITERIA: Requirements A and B; Acceptance Criteria 1 and 2

13.03-16-01 Section P.8 “Emergency Plan Audits” (page II-113) states that Detroit Edison’s frequency of periodic audits, based on assessment of performance as compared to performance indicators, “may not be less than once every 24 months” [quotations marks used to add emphasis]. 10 CFR 50.54(t) (1) (ii) requires audit intervals based on performance indicators are “not to exceed 24 months” [quotations marks used to add emphasis]. **Revise the Plan audit frequency description to be consistent with 10 CFR 50.54(t) (1) (ii), or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

### 13.03-33

**ITAAC-** Fermi unit 3 COLA

Regulatory Basis: 10 CFR 52.80 (a)

SRP Acceptance Criteria: Requirement E; Acceptance Criterion 23

13.03-17-13 [Basis 10 CFR 52.80, 10 CFR 50.47(b)(14)] COL application, Part 10 ITAAC, Table 2.3-1 Acceptance Criterion 8.1.1.2 does not identify specific onsite exercise objectives and associated acceptance criteria. This is not consistent with the corresponding RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, “Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)” Acceptance Criteria 14.1.1. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 8.1.1.2 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 14.1.1 acceptance criterion, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-17-14 [Basis 10 CFR 52.80, 10 CFR 50.47(b)(14)] COL application, Part 10 ITAAC, Table 2.3-1 Acceptance Criterion associated with program element 8.1 does not include an ITAAC consistent with Acceptance Criteria 14.1.3 in RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, “Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC).” **Revise Acceptance Criterion for program element 8.1 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 14.1.3 acceptance criterion, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-17-15 [Basis 10 CFR 52.80] COL application, Part 10 ITAAC, Table 2.3-1, “ITAAC For Emergency Planning,” each acceptance criterion is prefaced with the phrase “A report exists that confirms...” **Provide a description of the type and scope of the “reports” cited in ITAAC Table 2.3-1, including how the report will serve to provide accurate and reliable confirmation that the acceptance criteria have been met for the as-built facility, or revise the ITAAC table to remove the phrase “A report exists that confirms...,” from the acceptance criteria.**

13.03-17-16 [Basis 10 CFR 52.80, 10 CFR 50.47(b)(8)] COL application, Part 10 ITAAC, Table 2.3-1 Acceptance Criterion 5.1.4 does not require the TSC to have habitability comparable to the control room under accident conditions. This is not consistent with the corresponding RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, “Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)” Acceptance Criteria 8.1.3. **Revise the TSC habitability acceptance criteria to be consistent with the Table C.II.1-B1 Acceptance Criterion for 8.1.3 (including addressing the bracketed criteria), or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-17-17 [Basis 10 CFR 52.80, 10 CFR 50.47(b)(8)] COL application, Part 10 ITAAC, Table 2.3-1 Acceptance Criterion 5.1.6 does not require the need for identification of the specific OSC location to be

separate from the control room, or the identification of specific OSC capabilities. This is not consistent with the RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 8.1.6. **Revise acceptance criteria to be consistent with the Table C.II.1-B1 Acceptance Criterion for 8.1.6 (including addressing the bracketed criteria), or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

#### 13.03-34

##### **SITE-17:** Hostile Action Based Considerations

Basis: 10 CFR 52.79(a) (41); 10 CFR 50.72(a)(3) and (c)(3); 10 CFR 73.71(a)

SRP Acceptance Criteria: Requirements F and G; Acceptance Criteria 29; Review Procedures 17 and 22.

NRC Regulatory Issue Summary 2006-12, Endorsement of Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) Guidance "Enhancements To Emergency Preparedness Programs For Hostile Action" describes one of the enhancements as a more timely notification of the NRC for a security related emergency at a nuclear power plant. The NEI guidance further describes the enhancement as an accelerated NRC call, requesting licensees to change appropriate plans and procedures to ensure the NRC is called and notified of security related attacks within approximately 15 minutes from discovery of a security-based event. The Fermi 3 plan has no identification of, or description of an accelerated NRC call process to be used for a security related event. **Revise the Plan to include a description of an accelerated NRC call for security related event, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**

#### 13.03-35

##### Application Review and Acceptance

Basis: 10 CFR 50.33(g) 10 CFR 50.47(c) (2), Section I of Appendix E to 10 CFR Part 50; 10 CFR 52.77 SRP Requirements E and H; Acceptance Criteria 9 and 10

The Detroit Edison (DTE) application for Fermi Unit 3 does not contain the radiological emergency response plan for the state Ohio, nor does it contain a letter of certification from the state of Ohio consistent with 10 CFR 50.33(g). **Revise the DTE application for Fermi Unit 3 to include the Ohio state radiological emergency response plan and letter of certification, or provide a justification for why this is not needed.**