

From: Robert Martin
To: Reckley, William
Date: Fri, Feb 8, 2002 11:07 AM
Subject: Re: FSARs

NRM

Bill, there is no CD for the Catawba UFSAR because Duke hasn't sent us one yet. They won't until ~ June 2002. The UFSAR is the whole thing as updated through their last amendment on Oct 8, 2000. I don't know what the agency's position is on who has the official copy of the UFSAR - is it the PDR? Does the PDR put the amendments in? I suppose PMs customarily maintain a copy but I would doubt if we wish to call that one an "official copy". Just trying to add clarifications here.

>>> William Reckley 02/08/02 10:58AM >>>

The PDR did not have a copy of the Catawba FSAR on a CD. I'll confirm that what we end up with on the Public CD is the last revision.

>>> Rani Franovich 02/08/02 10:39AM >>>

Bob,

Your research is very helpful to me. Thanks a bunch for letting me know.

Bill,

From Bob Martin's note it would appear that we do not have the official UFSAR on CD for Catawba. Nonetheless, we should verify that the version being redacted is the most current rev. Please confirm that you are in the process of redacting the version on the license renewal CD that I gave to you earlier this week. I'll check with the PDR to ensure that the CD contains the most current rev. of the UFSAR.

Thanks-

Rani

>>> Robert Martin 02/08/02 10:02AM >>>

Catawba has not done so yet, but will submit UFSAR revisions by CD about June 2002 timeframe. Last Catawba UFSAR update was October 8, 2000, ADAMS # ML003758434. I put copy of first 3 pages in mail to you.

>>> Rani Franovich 02/08/02 08:42AM >>>

Hi Bill,

I spoke with Bob Gill of Duke Energy late yesterday to let him know of our efforts to make the Catawba and McGuire UFSARs available to the public. I passed along the implication that their assistance in identifying figures and information currently in the UFSARs that may be related to physical protection may be needed. I did not sense much responsiveness from Bob. Either the Duke folks involved in license renewal are not much concerned with the ASLB's interest in these documents and their accessibility; or they simply are not the right group in Duke to assist us in this effort. My suspicion is the latter of the two.

If you think we may need assistance from Duke, perhaps you and I should discuss the nature of their desired contribution. Would they do a "peer review" of figures or information we determine fits into the physical security category? Or would we ask them to do a wholesale review of the UFSARs? And are we justified in going to the sites (suggested by Bob Gill to be the appropriate place) to request their assistance with such a short-fuse item?

Just some things to consider. Wold like to get your thoughts on them.

>>> William Reckley 02/07/02 01:26PM >>>

You might warn the licensee that we are looking at the FSARs and that they might want to do the same. We don't have specific criteria but the most suspect items are currently arrangement drawings (e.g., Fig 3-110) which when added together, give info on equip locations, routes between pts, etc. I am checking with OGC on how we will actually do the retractions. It is possible that we will need something from the licensee that states that they have determined that the subject figures/info currently in the FSARs are (in light of 9/11) are related to the facilities' physical protection and is now considered proprietary in

L-139

accordance with 10 CFR 2.790(d). This is a provision that we have not used in the past and involves defining some level of information (such as the layout drawings and perhaps some PRA material that gives critical combinations of equipment) as being related to physical protection and therefore proprietary. I'll be back in touch but a conversation with the licensee may be in order now just because we don't have much time to resolve these issues.

I'll drop by the earlier comsecy but the SRM basically supercedes anything that it said.