

From: "Tom Thompson" <TThompson@nacintl.com>
To: Tim McGinty <TJM1@nrc.gov>
Date: Mon, Jul 10, 2000 3:52 PM
Subject: Re: MY RAI 4-9

Tim,

The Response referred to is Response No. 13 that was transmitted to the NRC by NAC letter ED20000505 on April 18, 2000. (This is the same letter that transmitted the SAR Revision UMSS-00C changed pages.) Specifically, the fourth and fifth paragraphs of the NAC Response address the topic of the current RAI 4-9.

Additional information based on NAC's understanding that the 6/29/00 RAI applies to MY site specific spent fuel:

Maine Yankee variably enriched fuel assemblies are limited to two batches of fuel. These two batches were exposed to a maximum burnup less than 30,000 MWd/MTU, with neither of the batches being burned more than two cycles. Based on the data provided in the SAR, fuel at burnups less than or equal to 30,000 MWd/MTU may be loaded at 5 years cool time at any enrichment greater or equal to 1.9 w/o 235U. The variably enriched rods in the Maine Yankee fuel assembly are enriched over 3.4 w/o 235U (with axial blankets on one of the variably enriched batches of 2.6w/o). Therefore, the minimum allowable cool time for the variably enriched Maine Yankee fuel assemblies is not dependent upon the enrichment considered, average or minimum.

I hope this is helpful.

Tom

Tim McGinty <TJM1@nrc.gov>
07/10/00 11:13 AM

To: TThompson@nacintl.com
cc:
Subject: MY RAI 4-9

Tom:

On a 7/7 conference call with NAC and Maine Yankee, NAC indicated that you have already responded with the necessary information to make a conclusion for RAI 4-9 that was recently issued. Charley/Bill mentioned RAI

C/57

supplemental response #1, issue #13, as drawing the necessary
nexus/conclusion for us.

Please point out how this has already been answered for me, I am having
trouble finding it.

Tim

CC: "Licensing Task Force" <Licensing_Task_Force@nacin...