

From: Charles Marschall *RIV*
To: *NRR* Alexion, Thomas; Nease, Rebecca; Salley, Mark *NRR*
Date: 4/9/03 6:58AM
Subject: Re: ANO Regulatory Conference

Mark,

I understand why you made the decision you made, and I didn't intend to question it. What I really want to know is: Can we change the classification? I would imagine you've seen the letter from Entergy asking for information on the CFAST modelling of their fire areas. I'm trying to get them an answer by Friday (4/11) so that we can keep moving forward towards a Regulatory Conference. That attachment to the TIA response would supply answers to some of their questions. Under today's rules for classifying documents, would we still consider the attachment "sensitive"?

Thanks,

Charlie

>>> Mark Salley 04/08/03 04:28PM >>> *NRR*

I believe we did that for a number of reasons including:

1. Its a pre-decisional matter
2. If the inspection of a NPP identifies a potential fire vulnerability, and we can show where & how big a fire you need to cause unacceptable consequences, then from a security standpoint, its conservative & prudent to mark it sensitive.

Those were our concerns & we tried to error conservative.

MHS

Mark Henry Salley P.E.
Fire Protection Engineer
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington D.C.

Phone: (301) 415-2840
FAX: (301) 415-2300
E-Mail: MXS3@NRC.GOV

>>> Thomas Alexion 04/08/03 11:19AM >>> *NRR*
Charles,

Good question. I also see that it is marked as sensitive in ADAMS, which is unexpected to me (in addition to non-public, which is expected). SPLB - can you tell us why you have the July 18, 2002, memo marked as sensitive in ADAMS?

Tom

>>> Charles Marschall 04/08/03 11:09AM >>> *RIV*
Tom,

Attachment 3 is marked "Sensitive". Are you sure it's okay to send that to the licensee?

Charlie

OK

4/14/1

>>> Thomas Alexion 04/08/03 10:02AM >>>
Rebecca,

NRR

DLPN
JK

Naeem Iqbal (Plant Systems Branch, NRR) tells me that Attachment 3 to the 09/25/02 NRR TIA response to Region IV contains the information the licensee is asking for in Items 1 and 3 of the licensee's 04/02/03 letter (i.e., CFAST inputs, assumptions and results for zones 99M and 98J; and sensitivity analysis for zone 99M). The accession number for Attachment 3 is ML021990405 (July 18, 2002 memo from Weiss to Reinhart on Supplemental Fire Modeling).

Doug Coe (Inspection Program Branch, NRR) tells me that it is acceptable to provide the licensee with information that shows how we did our analyses, and that Region IV should reply by letter to the licensee's 04/02/03 letter (if Region IV decides to provide information), and anything we give to ANO should also be placed in the PDR. I understand from Naeem that SPLB doesn't have any concern with providing Attachment 3 (or portions of it, if this is more appropriate) to the licensee.

I tried to call you to explain the above. Call me if you have any questions.

Tom

>>> Rebecca Nease 04/07/03 09:43AM >>>

R-1V

I hear you're coordinating the HQ attendance at the reg conference. Thanks. Do you need any help? I'm in the ofc this week and can help if you need anything. Do you know who's coming, yet?

Did you get the letter from ANO asking for info? If not, I can fax it to you. Is John Hannon's group going to provide answers to #1?

CC:
See-Meng

Gramm, Robert; IQBAL, Naeem; Minns, John; Qualls, Phil; Weiss, Eric; Wong,