

**From:** Rani Franovich  
**To:** Robert L Gill Jr  
**Date:** 11/21/02 9:37AM  
**Subject:** Re: Fire Protection Scoping Meeting Summary

Thanks for the comments, Bob. Some of them are appropriate, but some are focused on the disagreement itself. Since the handout from Duke is attached, Duke's position is plain for the public to see. The only opportunity for the staff's position to be clear to the public is to provide that in the summary. I understand your concern that it seems one-sided, but consider the handout to be "Duke's side."

As to the last comment, I believe it accurately depicts the staff's view as it was presented in the meeting. Remember that this is a summary of the meeting, and while Duke does not agree with the staff, the staff's view must be presented.

Thanks again for the comments.  
Rani

>>> "Robert L Gill Jr" <rgill@duke-energy.com> 11/20/02 09:43AM >>>

Rani,  
The following are the collective comments from Duke concerning the subject document provided by your email of 11/16/2002. Thank you very much for the opportunity to review this meeting summary.

Tom Matthews is the individual from Fort Calhoun Station whom you did not list.

The Open Items are not numbered correctly. They should be 2.3.3.19-1, -2, -3, -4, -5, and -6.

The text of your Open Item 2.3.3.19.2-3 should be in Open Item 2.3.3.19-4.

The entire memo should be edited to remove opinions such as "too narrow" and "mis-characterized" and just report the facts and statements made by all in attendance. You could simply use "The staff disagrees with Duke..." where appropriate.

Discussion Paragraph: The statement concerning defense-in-depth elements "to prevent, detect and suppress fires wherever they occur in the plant" goes well beyond the definition of defense-in-depth contained in Appendix R, II.A which states in part:

"The fire protection program shall extend the concept of defense-in-depth to fire protection in fire areas important to safety, with the following objectives..."

Open Item 2.3.3.19-1: We believe that we also discussed exposure hazards to safety related areas from yard hazards with the conclusion that there were no credible hazards in the yard.

Open Item 2.3.3.19-2: We believe that the statement: "Duke had mis-characterized a critical element..." may be a bit too strong an opinion by the staff.

Open Item 2.3.3.19-4: The staff states: "The staff reviewed the applicant's proposed response to this item and indicated that, if the

turbine building contained any fire exposure hazards, the fire barrier would not be sufficient to mitigate the effects of a fire." The Fire Hazards Analysis for each station, which is part of the CLB, comes to a different conclusion and supports the response provided. The staff is in effect challenging the CLB as a part of the license renewal review.