NRC FORM 699 (9-2003) U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

CONVERSATION RECORD

DATE: 11/14/2006

TIME: 3:15pm

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU	TELEPHONE NO.
Alan Soler, Evan Rosenbaum, Stefan Anton	856-797-0922

ORGANIZATION: Holtec International

SUBJECT: License Amendment Request - Structural Issues Associated with HI-STORM 100U

TYPE OF CONVERSATION
- ☐ VISIT
- ☐ CONFERENCE
- ☑ TELEPHONE
  - ☐ INCOMING
  - ☑ OUTGOING

SUMMARY *(Continue on Page 2)*

NRC Attendees: Ed Hackett, Gordon Bjorkman, Christopher Regan, Bob Shewmaker, Michel Call, Robert Nelson

NRC called Holtec International to reiterate the status of the technical review for the Holtec staff regarding the Holtec LAR 1014-3 application and the issues associated with the seismic analysis for the HI-STORM 100U presented to Kris Singh in a conference call on 11/09/06. In summary, 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. Holtec echoed Dr. Singhs concern that providing, 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 stated 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. Again, 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. The staff noted that the use of LS-DYNA for the seismic analysis may not be the most suitable platform for the analysis in question and that Holtec might consider using SASI as being more appropriate and efficient. The staff also noted that the BILL of Materials specifications in the FSAR and in the RAI response was incomplete and that staff had identified some missing critical dimensions.

The staff reiterated the options proposed 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. Based on the aforementioned discussions the Holtec staff now had a better understanding of the staff's concerns. The staff repeated that any method used may not need to be bounding of all facilities but that the analysis should be a realistic characterization of an ISFSI implementing the HI-STORM 100U design.

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED

None

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION	SIGNATURE	DATE
C. Regan		11/14/2006

ACTION TAKEN

None

TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	DATE