

NRC FORM 699 (9-2003)		U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION		DATE <b>11/09/2006</b>
<b>CONVERSATION RECORD</b>				TIME <b>12:30pm</b>
NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU <b>Dr. Kris Singh</b>		TELEPHONE NO. <b>856-797-0922</b>	TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> VISIT <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING	
ORGANIZATION <b>Holtec International</b>				
SUBJECT <b>License Amendment Request - Structural Issues Associated with HI-STORM 100U</b>				
SUMMARY (Continue on Page 2)				
<b>NRC Attendees: Ed Hackett, Gordon Bjorkman, Christopher Regan</b>				
<p>NRC called Holtec International to outline the status of the technical review for Holtec LAR 1014-3 and the issues associated with the seismic analysis for the HI-STORM 100U. The staff considered analysis of multiple VVM's on a subgrade concrete basemat more reflective of the true dynamic during a seismic event than what had been proposed by Holtec. Dr. Singh was concerned that providing, what he called a "representative case" analysis using multiple VVM's on a subgrade pad would not necessarily provide the information necessary to bound any facility wishing to use the design and that each utility would still be obligated to perform it's own analysis to ensure that seismic loads on the MPC were not exceeded. The staff indicated that a "representative case" would still have to be provided to address aspects of the soil to structure interaction beyond what was originally provided in response to the staffs RAI, specifically analysis that considered multiple VVM's on a concrete pad, flexibility of the concrete pad, and a more realistic model of the SSI problem. The staff also cautioned that calling the analysis a representative case would not necessary reflect the intent of the analysis, the main purpose being to show, via analysis, that the appropriate dynamics have been evaluated during a seismic event. The staff believed that Holtec had not done this satisfactorily.</p> <p>The staff then laid out the option for Holtec to withdraw the application and/or withdraw the underground portion of the application to permit the staff a partial approval of the application, i.e., an increase in thermal capacity of the above ground storage design. Dr. Singh did not indicate if Holtec would agree to either option. Dr. Singh proposed to continue the review by providing additional information in response to the staffs concerns. Dr. Singh requested the staff provide Holtec with a detailed description of the "representative case" such that Holtec could perform the necessary analysis. The staff agreed to provide Holtec with a summary of the outstanding concerns but could not commit at this time to providing Holtec with a representative case description.</p> <p>The staff agreed to arrange for a public meeting after Thanksgiving to discuss the technical details, with a conference call to be held next week to briefly summarize the technical details of the issues for the Holtec technical staff.</p>				
<i>Continue on Page 2</i>				
ACTION REQUIRED None				
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION <b>C. Regan</b>		SIGNATURE	DATE <b>11/09/2006</b>	
ACTION TAKEN None				
TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION		SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	DATE	