

From: Rani Franovich > nrl
To: Robert Martin
Date: Thu, Mar 7, 2002 10:34 AM
Subject: Re: TELECOMMUNICATION WITH DUKE ENERGY CORPORATION TO DISCUSS REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION PERTAINING TO THE NRC STAFF'S REVIEW OF SECTION 2.4.2 OF THE LICENSE RENEWAL APPLICATION

Hey Bob,

Thanks for the note. Since the conference call summary itself provides no specific security information, it is innocuous. Additionally, the same information was provided in the actual RAI (issued in January), which was merely quoted in the summary. But you raise a good question about the UFSARs. Here is the answer:

The staff recently reviewed the Catawba and McGuire UFSARs (to facilitate the hearing process on the renewal project) to delete potentially sensitive information (particularly that which may pertain to physical protection). The redacted versions of the UFSARs are now available from the PDR.

I believe that the staff followed guidance (issued in SRM - COMSECY 01-0030 on January 25, 2002) provided by the Commission to determine what, in the UFSARs, should be removed from the publicly available copy. If the information referenced conference call summary meets the criteria specified by the Commission, then it should be unavailable in the copy provided for public consumption.

Rani

>>> Robert Martin 03/07/02 10:02AM >>> nrl

Rani, do we really need to call attention to the FSAR figure that identifies security fence boundaries in item 2.4.2? That information probably should not be in the FSAR in the first place. Calling further attention to it compounds the issue.

Do you have the option of recalling and revising this telecom record?

>>> Sonary Chey 03/07/02 09:03AM >>> nrl
Please see attached document: ML020660073

Thanks

Sonary

CC: Chandu Patel; Christopher Grimes; Mary Pat Siemien; Pao-Tsin Kuo; Stephen Hoffman; William Reckley

L-157