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

CONVERSATION RECORD

DATE: 02/19/2009

TIME: 2:00pm

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU	TELEPHONE NO.
Terry Grebel, et. al.	866-489-0573

ORGANIZATION: PG&E

SUBJECT: Request for Additional Information for Amendment 1 to SNM-2511 (Docket No. 72-26)

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

SUMMARY *(Continue on Page 2)*

NRC Participants: Geoffrey Hornseth, Zhian Li, Peter Lien, Jimmy Chang, Eric Benner, John Goshen

PG&E Participants: Terence Grebel, Gregory Heggli, Jearl Strickland, Chris Pendleton, Rich Haglar, Tammy Moran (Holtec), Evan Rosenbaum (Holtec), Kelly Kozink (Holtec)

Purpose of Call: Discuss the NRC's request for additional information (RAI) pertaining to PG&E's application to amend materials license SNM-2511 for the Diablo Canyon independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI), to facilitate PG&E's understanding of the RAI.

Discussion: The phone call participants discussed each question contained in the NRC's RAI. The paragraph numbering below corresponds to the question number in the RAI (ML090490079).

Confinement:
7. PG&E confirmed that they would be revising either Technical Specification (TS) 3.1.1 (and its bases), or TS Section 4.2 as necessary to correct the number of weld passes performed from 2 to at least 3.
8 - 9. The attendees discussed that the NRC was asking whether new design limits were established for the HI-STORM system pressure due to the shortening of the inner canister.
10. PG&E was clear that the NRC was looking for a calculation package, and indicated that this would be included in the response to question 1 of the RAI.
11. PG&E stated that they had asked Holtec to include additional conservatisms (beyond those in the HI-STORM certificate) in Holtec International Report HI-2053376, and that they would explain whether the moles of gas would change between the normal condition and the 100% blockage condition in their response.

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED

NRC: no action required

PG&E: respond to RAI

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION	SIGNATURE	DATE
Shana Helton	Shana R. Helton	02/20/2009

ACTION TAKEN

TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION	DATE

CONVERSATION RECORD (Continued)

SUMMARY *(Continue on Page 3)*

Materials:

12. PG&E will be adding proposed language to the TS.

13. PG&E will be adding proposed language to the TS, and will point out that p.5.1-10 of the Diablo Canyon ISFSI Safety Analysis Report (SAR) addresses unloading operations.

14. PG&E has a procedure to require Holtec to do shop leakage testing; this information and any necessary SAR change pages will be included in their response to the RAI.

Criticality:

6. PG&E stated that their response to the RAI would demonstrate that solubility and plate-out are not of concern when the canister is full of water for greater than 48 hours. PG&E also stated that if the canister were full of borated water for a prolonged sit time, that the time-to-boil constraints would require recirculation of water in the cask, which would then require boron concentration surveillances to occur. PG&E also discussed that heat-up of the water in the cask would not have a significant impact on the boron concentration.

Thermal:

1. PG&E will provide all requested calculations, along with an affidavit for those proprietary calculations.

2. PG&E and Holtec discussed the hypothetical reflecting cylinder used in the calculations to simulate the cask in the cask transfer facility, and committed to providing a better description of this modeling technique in PG&E's RAI response.

3. PG&E committed to clarifying their methodology in their RAI response. Specifically, PG&E will either demonstrate that the value for delta-Tblock is conservative, or will do a calculation specific to the shortened canister. Additionally, PG&E will justify that the temperature can be expressed in three components.

4. PG&E committed to clarifying their methodology in their RAI response. Specifically, PG&E will address the basis of the 22 hr time limit in the cask transfer facility, and will discuss the boundary condition assumptions.

5. PG&E understood the question and what type of response was necessary.

END OF CONVERSATION RECORD; NO CONTINUATION ON P. 3

Continue on Page 3