

August 24, 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. 41 RELATED TO
THE SRP SECTION 13.03 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 45 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. 4342

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

August 24, 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. 41 RELATED TO
THE SRP SECTION 13.03 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 45 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. 4342

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

Distribution:

PUBLIC NGE 1/2 R/F SGreen, NRO MCarpentier, OGC
RidsNroDsraSbpb RidsNroDnrlNge2 K Williams, NSIR
ADAMS Accession No. ML102360272 NRO-002

OFFICE	NSIR	OGC	NGE1/PM
NAME	K. Williams	M. Carpentier	JHale
DATE	4/13/10	4/14/10	8/24/10

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

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

Request for Additional Information No. 4905

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

13.03-55

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 1.1. The proposed AC for 1.1 does not describe the existence of staff to provide 24hr/day ERO manning of communications links, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 1.1. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 1.1 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 1.1 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-56

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 2.1. The proposed Acceptance Criterion for 2.1 does not describe the existence of staff to provide augmentation of on-shift staffing, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 2.1. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 2.1 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 2.1 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.0-57

Acceptance Criterion 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 both state the specific EAL parameters are identified in ITA Section 4.1. No specific EALs or parameters are identified in ITA section 4.1. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 4.1.1 and 4.1.2 to include specific parameters identified in the EALs, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-58

EP Program Element 5.2 states "The means exist to notify emergency response personnel." The applicants "Inspections, Test, Analyses" section states "A test will be performed of the capabilities," the applicants acceptance criterion (AC) for 5.2 states "notification of the Fermi 3 emergency response organization has been performed," but does not describe any specific acceptance criteria for the test to be considered successful in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 5.2. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 5.2 to describe specific acceptance criteria for the test to be considered successful, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-59

The applicant's Program Element 5.3 "Inspections, Test, Analyses" and "Acceptance Criteria" (AC) sections are not in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1 for Program Element 5.3. The applicant's "Inspections, Test, Analyses" section states "NOTE: The means to notify and provide instructions to the populace within the plume exposure EPZ is addressed by Acceptance Criteria 14.1.1.2". The applicant's acceptance criterion for 14.1.1.2 does not address demonstration of the means to notify and provide instructions to the populace within the plume exposure, or provide any objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure. **Revise Table 2.3-1 to add "Inspection, Test and Analyses" section method and acceptance criterion for program element 5.3 consistent with RG 1.206, Table C.II.1-B1, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-60

The applicant's acceptance criterion for 6.1.2 describes communications being established between the TSC and radiological emergency teams, but does not describe communications between the radiological emergency team and the EOF as described in the Fermi 3 plan (page II-77) in accordance 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 6.1. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 6.1.2 to include communications to the EOF as described in the plan, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-61

The applicant's Acceptance Criterion for 8.2.3 describes the EOF ventilation system as including an HVAC system with HEPA filters, but does not describe its ability to isolate the EOF or function in a manner comparable to the control room and TSC systems consistent with table 2 "Relation of EOF Location to Habitability Criteria" in NUREG-0696 in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 8.2.2. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 8.2.3 to include description of the EOFs ventilation system consistent with table 2 of NUREG-0696, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-62

The applicant's acceptance criterion for 8.2.7 does not identify the specific capabilities of the EOF's means to acquire, display and evaluate radiological, meteorological, and plant system data pertinent to determining offsite protective measures, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 8.2.4. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 8.2.7 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 8.2.7 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-63

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed the following acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program elements 8.3, 8.4, 8.5 and 8.6:

- a. The proposed AC for 8.3 states the emergency plan implementing procedures provide a process to initiate emergency measures, consistent with emergency plant implementing procedure, "Emergency Classification." This AC does not describe the means (i.e., the equipment), specific capabilities to initiate emergency measures consistent with Appendix 1 of NUREG-0654/FEMA-REP-1, Rev. 1.
- b. The proposed AC for 8.4 states emergency plan implementing procedures provide a methodology to acquire data from, or for emergency access to, offsite monitoring and analysis equipment. This AC does describe what EPIP will describe the means and their capabilities to acquire data from, or for emergency access to, offsite monitoring and analysis equipment.
- c. The proposed AC for 8.5 states emergency plan implementing procedures provide for offsite radiological monitoring equipment in the vicinity of Fermi 3. This AC does not describe what EPIP will describe the means or the specific capabilities of the offsite radiological monitoring equipment in the vicinity of Fermi 3.
- d. The proposed AC for 8.6 states emergency plan implementing procedures include provisions for obtaining meteorological information consistent with section II.H.7 of the Fermi 3 Emergency Plan. This AC does not describe the what EPIP will be used to provide the meteorological information consistent with Appendix 2 of NUREG-0654/FEMAREP- 1, Rev. 1
- e. Each of the above listed AC's are also missing objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure, in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria.

Revise the Acceptance Criterion for 8.3, 8.4, 8.5 and 8.6 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 8.3, 8.4, 8.5 and 8.6 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.

13.03-64

The Acceptance Criteria for 9.1 acceptance criterion:

- a. Is prefaced with the phrase "A report exists that confirms..." but does not describe the type or scope of the report. **Provide a description of the type and scope of the "report" cited acceptance criteria for 9.1, including how the report will serve to provide accurate and reliable confirmation that the acceptance criteria has 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. See ITACC response for use of this phrase and associated acceptance criteria, ADAMS ML082830168 (page 120 and 121).**
- b. References selected monitoring parameters identified in the EALs listed in the ITA Section 4.1. The ITA section for 4.1 does not contain any EALs with monitoring parameters. **Revise the Acceptance Criterion for 9.1 to provide the EALs with monitoring parameters, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**
- c. Does not include criteria to be used in evaluating the means to provide initial and continuing radiological assessment throughout the course of an accident. The criterion describes exercise objective topics, not specific capabilities and measureable acceptance criteria.

Revise the Acceptance Criterion for 9.1 to provide acceptance criteria to be used in evaluating the means to provide initial and continuing radiological assessment throughout the course of an accident in accordance with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 9.1 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.

13.03-65

RAI 13.03-17-08 was asked to address the missing description of the applicant's means to determine the magnitude of a release of radioactive materials based on plant system parameters and effluent monitors. The applicant's response stated a methodology has been established to determine source term of releases, but did not describe the means or specific capabilities to determine the source term of releases of radioactive material. This is in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 9.2. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 9.2 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 9.2 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-66

The Acceptance Criteria for 9.3 does not describe the means or specific capabilities to continuously assess the impact of the release of radioactive materials to the environment, accounting for the relationship between effluent monitor readings, and onsite and offsite exposures and contamination for various meteorological conditions, or provide objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance 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 9.3. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 9.3 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 9.3 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-67

The acceptance criteria (AC) for 9.5 does not describe the means or specific capabilities to determine release rates and projected doses assessment when instrumentation is off-scale or inoperable, or provide objective AC by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 9.5. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 9.5 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 9.5 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-68

The acceptance criteria (AC) for 9.6 does not describe the means or specific capabilities for field monitoring within the plume exposure EPZ, or objective AC by which to judge success or failure in accordance 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 9.6. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 9.6 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 9.6 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-69

The Acceptance Criteria for 9.7 does not describe the means or specific capabilities to make rapid assessment of actual or potential magnitude and locations of any radiological hazards through liquid or gaseous release pathways, or provide objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, “Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)” Acceptance Criteria 9.7. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 9.7 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 9.7 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-70

The Acceptance Criteria for 9.9 does not describe the means or specific capabilities to estimate integrated dose from the projected and actual dose rates, and for comparing these estimates with the EPA protective action guides (PAGs), or provide objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance 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 9.9. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 9.9 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 9.9 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-71

The Acceptance Criteria for 10.1.1 acceptance criterion is prefaced with the phrase “A report exists that confirms...” but does not describe the type or scope of the report. **Provide a description of the type and scope of the “report” cited, 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. See ITACC response for use of this phrase and associated acceptance criteria, ADAMS ML082830168 (page 120 and 121).**

13.03-72

The Acceptance Criteria for 10.1.2 acceptance criterion:

- a. Is prefaced with the phrase “A report exists that confirms...” but does not describe the type or scope of the report. **Provide a description of the type and scope of the “report” cited, 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. See ITACC response for use of this phrase and associated acceptance criteria, ADAMS ML082830168 (page 120 and 121).**
- b. Does not describe instructions being provided to individuals outside the protected area, but within the Owner Controlled Area in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, “Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)” Acceptance Criteria 10.1. **Revise acceptance criteria to include a description of specific capability to provide both warnings and instructions to individuals outside the protected area, but within the Owner Controlled Area, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-73

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 10.2. The proposed acceptance criteria for 10.2 does not describe the means or specific capabilities to perform radiological monitoring of people evacuated from the site, or provide objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 10.2. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 10.2 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 10.2 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-74

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 11.1. The proposed acceptance criterion for 11.1 does not describe the means or specific provisions for onsite radiation protection, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 11.1. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 11.1 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 11.1 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-75

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 11.2. The proposed acceptance criteria for 11.2 does not describe the means or specific provisions to provide 24-hour-per-day capability to determine the doses received by emergency personnel and maintain dose records, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 11.2. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 11.2 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 11.2 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-76

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 11.3. The proposed acceptance criteria for 11.3 does not describe the means or specific provisions for decontaminating relocated onsite and emergency personnel, including waste disposal, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 11.3. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 11.3 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 11.3 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-77

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 11.4. The proposed acceptance criteria for 11.4 does not describe the means or specific provisions to provide onsite contamination control measures, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 11.4.

Revise Acceptance Criterion for 11.4 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 11.4 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.

13.03-78

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 12.2.

The proposed acceptance criteria for 12.2 does not describe the means or specific provisions for onsite first aid capability, or objective acceptance criteria by which to judge success or failure in accordance with RG 1.206, Appendix B, Table C.II.1-B1, "Emergency Planning – Generic Inspections, Test, Analysis, and Acceptance Criteria (EP-ITAAC)" Acceptance Criteria 12.2. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 12.2 to be consistent with Table C.II.1-B1 program element 12.2 acceptance criterion, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**

13.03-79

The Acceptance Criteria for 14.1.1.1:

- a. Uses the phrase "A report exists that confirms..." but does not describe the type or scope of the report. **Provide a description of the type and scope of the "report" cited, 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. See ITACC response for use of this phrase and associated acceptance criteria, ADAMS ML082830168 (page 120 and 121).**
- b. Under "Performance Criterion" for Accident Assessment and Classification 1.a describes success as correctly identifying the emergency classification within 15 minutes of the time the initiating condition(s) or EAL is identified, the timeliness requirement for emergency classification is from the time the information that an initiating condition is met or an EAL is exceeded is available to the decision maker, not from when he or she identifies the information. **Revise the performance criteria to correctly describe the timeliness requirement to be from the time the information is available, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**
- c. Under B, Notifications, objective number 2, "Performance Criteria" a and c describe that the applicant will demonstrate their ability to notify state and local government agencies beginning no later than 15 minutes of an emergency declaration and the NRC beginning no later than 60 minutes. The timeliness requirement for notification of offsite stakeholders and the NRC of an emergency declaration is within 15 minutes and no later than 60 minutes respectively. **Revise the objective and corresponding Performance Criteria to correctly describe the timeliness requirement for notification of offsite stakeholders to state**

notification is to be complete within 15 minutes and no later than 60 minutes for the NRC of an emergency declaration, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.

- d. Under B, Notifications, there is no objective, or performance criteria for demonstrating the capability of the applicants prompt notification system (PNS) for the public to operate as designed when required. **Revise Acceptance Criterion to include an exercise objective and performance criteria for demonstration of the applicant's PNS, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**
- e. Under C, Emergency Response, there is no objective, or performance criteria for demonstrating the capability of the applicant to demonstrate their capability to prepare for 24 hour staffing of the ERO. **Revise Acceptance Criterion to include an exercise objective and performance criteria for demonstration of the applicant's capability to provide 24 hour staffing of the ERO, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**
- f. Under E, Radiological Assessment and Control, objective 6 states the applicant will demonstrate the ability to make the decision whether to issue KI to onsite emergency workers. Making the decision specific to "onsite" emergency workers appears to exclude offsite monitoring team members from the decision. **Clarify or revise Radiological Assessment and Control, objective 6 to include all applicant emergency workers whose estimated thyroid dose would exceed 25 rem committed dose equivalent or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**
- g. Under E, Radiological Assessment and Control, objective 7 and Performance Criteria "c" the applicant states they will demonstrate the ability to develop appropriate protective action recommendations (PARs) and notify appropriate authorities beginning no later than 15 minutes after development. The timeliness requirement for notification of appropriate authorities with a PAR is within 15 minutes, not beginning within 15 minutes. **Revise the objective and performance criteria to correctly describe the timeliness requirement for notification of appropriate authorities with a PAR to be complete within 15 minutes, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**
- h. Under G, Evaluation, objective 1 the applicant states they will demonstrate the ability to conduct a post-exercise critique to determine areas requiring improvement and corrective action, but there is no corresponding performance criteria use of the corrective action program. **Add performance criteria for the use of the corrective action program in conjunction with the post-exercise critique, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**
- i. Acceptance Criteria for 14.1.2.1, 14.1.2.2 and 14.1.2.3 are prefaced with the phrase "A report exists that confirms..." but does not describe the type or scope of the report. **Provide a description of the type and scope of the "report" cited, 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. See ITACC response for use of this phrase and associated acceptance criteria, ADAMS ML082830168 (page 120 and 121).**

13.03-80

RAI 13.03-17-01 was asked to address a number of generic ITACC items not included in the applicant's Table 2.3-1, "ITAAC For Emergency Planning" in Part 10 "ITAAC" of the Fermi unit 3 COL Application. The applicant's response, in part, proposed acceptance criteria (AC) for EP Program element 16.1. The proposed acceptance criteria for 16.1 emergency response plan distribution list of organizations and appropriate individuals with responsibility for implementation of the plans is missing the Province of Ontario (page II-1 in the Fermi Plan) and the State of Michigan Department of Health (page II-4 in the Fermi Plan). 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 16.1. **Revise Acceptance Criterion for 16.1 to include the Province of Ontario and the State of Michigan Department of Health, or provide an acceptable justification for why this is not needed.**