

From: David Tang
To: E. William Brach, Earl Easton, Eric Leeds, Jack...
Date: Tue, Jul 11, 2000 8:46 AM
Subject: Re: Analysis of NAC-UMS RAI's

Tim, On 4-10, Subsection 4.5.1.1.9 makes reference to a "steel cage," which could have been an editorial/omission/oversight.

Please note the following: (1) in Subsection 2.1.3.1.1, "Damaged Fuel Lattices," the SAR is very clear to require: "[T]he CF1 and CA3 lattices are placed in a Maine Yankee fuel can for storage," and (2) in Subsection 11.2.16, "Damaged Fuel Assembly Hardware Evaluation," the SAR is very specific: "...an assembly with one or more missing support grids up to an unsupported length of fuel rod of 60 inches."

In other words, the term "Standard Fuel Assemblies with Damaged Lattices," is not defined in Subsection 2.1.3.1, "Maine Yankee Site Specific Spent Fuel," and it shows up mysteriously in Subsection 4.5.1.1.9. However, Subsection 3.4 of the draft SER has made a safety finding of the "Maine Yankee Intact Spent Fuel with Damaged Assembly Hardware."

You may want to expand your clarifications to reflect the above.

David

>>> Tim McGinty 07/10 4:32 PM >>>
Interested SFPO parties:

Attached is the MY RAI, as issued. Each RAI has an italicized discussion as to why the information is appropriate to be asked, and how it is consistent with the SRP. Also, each RAI has a discussion pertinent to whether or not we already have the information.

I believe it is accurate, but Ron and David (for 4-10 in particular), I need you to look it over.

This information is intended for our use in briefing Bill Kane tomorrow, I will gladly incorporate comments.

Tim

C/60