

**RESPONSE TO FREEDOM OF
INFORMATION ACT (FOIA) / PRIVACY
ACT (PA) REQUEST**

2000-334

1

RESPONSE
TYPE

FINAL



PARTIAL

REQUESTER

James Vassello

DATE

SEP 15 2000

PART I. -- INFORMATION RELEASED

- ☐ No additional agency records subject to the request have been located.
- ☐ Requested records are available through another public distribution program. See Comments section.
- ☐ **APPENDICES**
Agency records subject to the request that are identified in the listed appendices are already available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room.
- ☒ **APPENDICES**
A Agency records subject to the request that are identified in the listed appendices are being made available for public inspection and copying at the NRC Public Document Room.
- ☐ Enclosed is information on how you may obtain access to and the charges for copying records located at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC.
- ☒ **APPENDICES**
A Agency records subject to the request are enclosed.
- ☐ Records subject to the request that contain information originated by or of interest to another Federal agency have been referred to that agency (see comments section) for a disclosure determination and direct response to you.
- ☐ We are continuing to process your request.
- ☐ See Comments.

PART I.A -- FEES

AMOUNT *

\$ 79.00

* See comments
for details

You will be billed by NRC for the amount listed.



None. Minimum fee threshold not met.



You will receive a refund for the amount listed.



Fees waived.

PART I.B -- INFORMATION NOT LOCATED OR WITHHELD FROM DISCLOSURE

- ☐ No agency records subject to the request have been located.
- ☐ Certain information in the requested records is being withheld from disclosure pursuant to the exemptions described in and for the reasons stated in Part II.
- ☐ This determination may be appealed within 30 days by writing to the FOIA/PA Officer, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Clearly state on the envelope and in the letter that it is a "FOIA/PA Appeal."

PART I.C COMMENTS (Use attached Comments continuation page if required)

The actual fees for processing your request are:

2 hrs. professional search @ \$39.00 = \$78.00

Duplication of 5 pages @ \$0.20 per page = \$1.00

Total = \$79.00

SIGNATURE - FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT AND PRIVACY ACT OFFICER

Carol Ann Reed

APPENDIX A
RECORDS BEING RELEASED IN THEIR ENTIRETY

<u>NO.</u>	<u>DATE</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION/(PAGE COUNT)</u>
1.	12/21/83	Memorandum for V Benaroya from R Eberly, Subject: Trip Report: Fire Protection Site Audit - Callaway Nuclear Plant Unit 1 (5 pages)

Corrected File

DEC 21 1983

MEMORANDUM FOR: Victor Benaroya, Chief
Chemical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

THRU: Robert Ferguson, Section Leader
Chemical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

FROM: Randall Eberly
Chemical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

SUBJECT: TRIP REPORT: FIRE PROTECTION SITE AUDIT -
CALLAWAY NUCLEAR PLANT UNIT 1

Plant Name: Callaway Nuclear Plant Unit 1
Docket Numbers: 50-483
Licensing Stage: OL
Responsible Branch: LB #1; G. Edison, PM
Chemical Engineering Branch Reviewer: R. Eberly

Between October 17 and 20, 1983, we conducted our fire protection site audit at the Callaway Nuclear Plant, Unit 1. A representative of our consultant, Gage Babcock & Associates, participated.

As a result of the audit, we reached several agreements regarding the adequacy of the fire protection program. In addition, we expressed a number of concerns/questions pertaining to previous applicant commitments; the justification for particular fire protection designs; and the degree of compliance with our fire protection criteria. A summary of these issues is enclosed. The applicant agreed to respond to our concerns.

Randall Eberly
Chemical Engineering Branch
Division of Engineering

Enclosure: As stated

Contact: R. Eberly
x24302

cc: See next page

8401050135 831221
CF ADOCK 05000483
CF

AI

Victor Benaroya

- 2 -

DEC 21 1983

cc: R. Vollmer
D. Eisenhut
J. Taylor
V. Benaroya
R. Ferguson
O. Parr
R. Eberly
B. J. Youngblood
G. Edison
J. Holonich
T. Sullivan
S. Pawlicki
S. Ebnetter, Region I
I. Conlon, Region II
C. Norelius, Region III
G. Madsen, Region IV
P. Sternberg, Region V
B. Little, Callaway Site

Distribution
Central Fields
CMEB Reading
CMEB Plant

BE:CMEB
RE: Eberly:bjp
12/10/83

RE

DE: CMEB
RFerguson
12/2/83

V
DE: CMEB
VBenaroya
12/1/83

DE: AD: MCET
WVJohnston
12/1/83

Enclosure

Chemical Engineering Branch/Fire Protection Section Fire Protection Site Audit Callaway Nuclear Plant, Unit 1 Docket No. 50-483

Introduction

Between October 17 and 20, 1983, we conducted our fire protection site audit at the Callaway Nuclear Plant, Unit 1. A representative of our consultant, Gage Babcock and Associates participated.

As a result of the audit, we expressed a number of concerns pertaining to previous applicant commitments; the justification for particular fire protection designs; and the degree of compliance with our fire protection criteria. The applicant has agreed to respond to our concerns.

1. Missile Resistant Fire Doors

In our SER, we stated that fire doors in fire barriers would be approved by Underwriter's Laboratories, Inc., and would carry the UL label. During our site visit, we noted several missile-resistant doors which are not labeled. The applicant indicated that the doors had not been fire tested due to their size, and that an engineering analysis had been performed to demonstrate the doors' thermal expansion behavior under fire exposure. The results of the analysis will be incorporated in the FSAR at a later date. Based on our preliminary review of the analysis, and subject to our final evaluation, we agreed that the missile resisting doors are an acceptable deviation from our guidelines in BTP CMEB 9.5-1, Section C.5.a.

2. Fire Protection for Safe Shutdown

The component cooling water pumps are located on the 2026' elevation of the auxiliary building. Partial sprinkler systems are provided for the corridor area around the pumps, however, there is a non-sprinklered area between the pumps which contains intervening combustibles, i.e., Balance-of-plant (BOP) cable trays. This configuration is not in accordance with Section C.5.b of BTP CMEB 9.5-1. The applicant

should either extend the sprinkler system into this area or provide cable tray fire stops to prevent the spread of flames along the cable trays.

3. Fire Detection System

In our SER, we stated that the plant fire detection system is installed in accordance with NFPA Standard 72D. During the site visit, we noted that the back-up power supply may not meet the recommendations of NFPA Standard 72D. The applicant was unable to show compliance, and verbally agreed to prepare an analysis showing how the existing primary/backup power supply circuitry compares to the requirements of NFPA Standard 72D.

4. Sprinkler Systems

In our SER, we stated that the automatic sprinkler systems would be designed to the recommendations of NFPA Standard 13. During the site visit, we noted that in some corridor area (e.g., Aux. Building corridor, elevation 1974' west side) the sprinkler heads are located at the ceiling, and there are a large number of cable trays, conduits, pipes, and vent ducts beneath the sprinkler heads. These obstructions may render the sprinkler system ineffective against a floor level exposure fire. The applicant should provide extended coverage heads beneath the obstructions in accordance with NFPA Standard 13, which is recommended by Section C.6.c of BTP CMEB 9.5-1.

5. Control Room

In our SER, we stated that ionization type smoke detectors would be installed in all control room cabinets and consoles containing redundant equipment. During our site visit, we noted that no smoke detectors are provided for safety-related cabinets in accordance with Section C.7.b of BTP CMEB 9.5-1. The applicant has verbally indicated that detection will be provided.

In the rear of the control room complex, smoke detection is provided at the ceiling level. It is our concern that due to the ceiling height, a substantial time delay could occur in detecting an incipient fire. The applicant should provide additional detectors at the top of the cabinets in this area to comply with NFPA Standard 72d, which is recommended by Section C.6.a of BTP CMEB 9.5-1.

6. Diesel Generator Rooms

In our SER, we stated that sprinkler systems would be installed in accordance with NFPA Standard 13. During our site visit, we noted that a pre-action sprinkler system is provided for the protection of the diesel generators. A large vent duct passes directly beneath many of the sprinkler heads. The sprinkler piping arrangement should be changed to avoid this obstruction, in accordance with NFPA Standard 13, and BTP CMEB 9.5-1, Section C.6.c. The diesel fuel oil day tanks are located in each diesel generator room. In our SER, we stated that a containment dike would be provided beneath each day tank to contain 110% of the fuel oil, however, during our visit, we noted that the top of the dike is beneath the tank. It is our concern that not all leaks would be contained by this configuration. The applicant should modify the dike to provide a more positive collection ability, such as by completely surrounding the day tank, in accordance with Section C.7.1 of BTP CMEB 9.5-1.