

NRC FORM 699 (9-2003)		U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION		DATE 06/13/2006
CONVERSATION RECORD				TIME 1:00pm
NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU Evan Rosenbaum, Stephan Anton, Alan Soler		TELEPHONE NO. 856-797-0900		TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> VISIT <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING
ORGANIZATION Holtec International				
SUBJECT License Amendment Request 3 - Clarification of NRC Request for Additional Information #2				
SUMMARY (Continue on Page 2)				
<p>Holtec Attendees (including above): Indresh Rampall, Debu Mitra-Majumdar, Loius Hinojosa NRC Attendees: Christopher Regan, Jorge Solis, Larry Campbell, Gordon Bjorkman, Geoff Hornseth, Robert Shewmaker</p> <p>Holtec International called NRC to request clarification of several RAIs from the staff's letter to Holtec dated June 6, 2006. The specific RAI's were 2-2, 3-1, 3-6, 3-10, 3-11, 3-13, 3-14, 3-15, 4-1, 4-2, and 12-4.</p> <p>2-2. Holtec indicated that the information requested could be found in Table 9.I.1 Item #4 of the FSAR. The staff indicated that this would address the RAI</p> <p>3-1 Holtec questioned the intent of the RAI. The staff clarified that shrinkage cracks during fabrication were a concern if the intent of the barrier was to act as a corrosion inhibitor. The staff stated that some kind of reinforcement (road mesh) would be necessary.</p> <p>3-6 Holtec indicated that had prepared a supplemental analysis using 2 casks and using the existing methodology with 1 cask in response to this RAI. The staff clarified that the concern is relative to what appears to be disagreeing approaches in the application regarding credit for a pad for a single storage module versus a pad used for multiple modules coupled with the analyses for different sites with different seismic characteristics. The staff indicated that Holtec must clarify what are the bounding analyses and criteria to be used by a prospective user of the design when performing the 72.212 site evaluation.</p> <p>3-10 Holtec asked if supplying the Input/Output files for CALC 07 would address the RAI. The staff stated that supplying these files would answer the question.</p> <p>3-11 The staff clarified the RAI by stating that additional information, most notably diagrams or drawings indicating the exact location of the concrete corrosion barrier would address this RAI</p>				
<i>Continue on Page 2</i>				
ACTION REQUIRED None				
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION C. Regan		SIGNATURE 		DATE 06/14/2006
ACTION TAKEN None				
TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION		SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION		DATE

CONVERSATION RECORD (Continued)

SUMMARY (Continue on Page 3)

3-13 The staff clarified that this RAI could be responded to in the same manner as RAI 3-12. The intent of the two RAI's is the same, that is, specifying the exact nature of the methods used and the criteria outlined by each methodology.

3-14 The staff clarified that a response to this RAI is similar to the information requested by RAI 3-11.

3-15 Holtec questioned whether this RAI contradicted the information requested in RAI 3-1. Specifically, that RAI 3-1 was suggesting the use of reinforcement for the concrete corrosion barrier and RAI 3-15 indicated that use of reinforcement may not be suitable for use. The staff clarified that RAI 3-1 was to address shrinkage cracking issues during fabrication. RAI 3-15 was to provide for a more appropriate citation for concrete to reinforcement interface reactions given that the citation speaks to direct contact between steel and concrete whereas the suggested design includes an epoxy coating at the interface. The staff also indicated that the RAI response should address and include more detail regarding the potential for damage and repair to the epoxy coating during fabrication.

4-1 Holtec conveyed to the staff that providing the thickness dimension would be feasible, providing the grid spacer height would be difficult. Holtec stated they did not have ownership of the information to allow providing the grid spacer height to the staff but was pursuing obtaining the data from the designer. The staff indicated that three options were viable to get the information to the staff 1) obtain permission from the designer to get the information to the staff, 2) Holtec permit the staff to review the information as part of an inspection, and 3) provide an alternate, but bounding, analysis in lieu of the specific grid spacer height dimension. Option 2 was deemed not timely enough given Holtec's requested schedule for approval.

4-2 The staff clarified the approach taken to the Holtec data provided and that although the staff was able to confirm the values that when the analysis residuals were pushed and the computer analysis run longer different results were obtained. Holtec understood the intent of the RAI.

12-4 Holtec indicated that the language "long-term storage" has been defined in the HI-STORM FSAR. The staff noted that defining "long-term storage" for use at an "interim storage" facility may not be appropriate. The staff cautioned Holtec regarding use of this terminology. Holtec agreed to take this under advisement and in response to the RAI.

Continue on Page 3