

May 28, 2009

MEMORANDUM TO: Nader Mamish, Deputy Director
Licensing and Inspection Directorate
Division of Spent Fuel Storage and Transportation
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: B. Jennifer Davis, Senior Project Manager **/RA/**
Licensing Branch
Division of Spent Fuel Storage and Transportation
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF APRIL 16, 2009, MEETING WITH TRANSNUCLEAR,
INC., TO DISCUSS THE SECOND REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL
INFORMATION FOR AMENDMENT 11 TO THE STANDARDIZED
NUHOMS® SYSTEM (TAC NO. L24080)

PURPOSE:

For Transnuclear, Inc. (TN) staff, and U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff to discuss the second Request for Additional Information (RAI) for Amendment 11 to the Standardized NUHOMS System, dated March 27, 2009 (ML090540196).

MEETING SUMMARY:

The meeting took place on April 16, 2009, from 1:00 p.m. to 5:00 p.m., at the NRC's Executive Boulevard Building in Rockville, MD. Attendees included TN staff, NRC's Division of Spent Fuel Storage and Transportation (SFST) staff, and several members of the public. An attendance list is enclosed (Enclosure 1). The meeting began with introductions, introductory remarks by SFST staff and TN staff, and then moved into a discussion about the Amendment 11 review and the associated RAIs.

In TN's opening remarks they presented three goals for Amendment 11: (1) come to closure, (2) standardized technical specifications (TS), and (3) use the OS197L cask. The original customer has decided to update their crane, so there is no longer an immediate need for the light-weight transfer cask; however TN does see possible uses. In addition, they plan to add provisions for modifying the cask for sites with 100-ton crane capacity. (See Enclosure 2.) Finally, TN staff expressed dissatisfaction that the review has taken so long to complete.

The TN staff then proposed a modified approach for Amendment 11. They plan to respond to the second round RAIs, and complete the Amendment 11 review process for a de-rated OS197L cask for use with a 100-ton or greater crane by restricting the maximum total decay heat of the dry storage canister (DSC) to approximately 13 kW/DSC, and restricting the decay heat of the peripheral fuel assemblies to approximately 400 watts per fuel assembly.

The NRC staff agreed that the new approach sounded promising, but pointed out that since TN is modifying their approach at this stage, it is important that they submit information that is as clean and clear as possible. TN staff indicated that there will be some new calculations

associated with the modified proposal, but that the current Amendment 11 Safety Analysis Report (SAR) analysis does bound the new approach.

The meeting then moved into a discussion of specific RAI questions. The TN staff binned the questions into five categories: (1) Five RAIs with Potential for Industry Wide Implications (which they are discussing with the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)), (2) 12 RAIs which were editorial, (3) 25 RAIs which need clarification, (4) Eight RAIs related to calculation packages, and (5) 17 other RAIs. None of the RAIs require new calculations under the existing application, but new calculations may be necessary for the revised approach.

Given the revised approach, there was limited detailed discussion of the RAI questions. General discussion included NRC staff asking "what is the cask system versus the cask?" and some discussion related to "what belongs in TS or the Certificate of Compliance, versus what is in the SAR?"

Ultimately, the NRC staff agreed that the new approach sounds promising, but that they will need to review the new material when submitted. The TN staff may request a meeting to discuss the proposed revised responses prior to submittal.

The members of the public in attendance did not have any questions or comments.

No regulatory decisions were made at the meeting.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Jennifer Davis at (301) 492-3371 or BJennifer.Davis@nrc.gov.

Docket No.: 72-1004
TAC No.: L24080

Enclosures:
As stated

associated with the modified proposal, but that the current Amendment 11 Safety Analysis Report (SAR) analysis does bound the new approach.

The meeting then moved into a discussion of specific RAI questions. The TN staff binned the questions into five categories: (1) Five RAIs with Potential for Industry Wide Implications (which they are discussing with NEI), (2) 12 RAIs which were editorial, (3) 25 RAIs which need clarification, (4) Eight RAIs related to calculation packages, and (5) 17 other RAIs. None of the RAIs require new calculations under the existing application, but new calculations may be necessary for the revised approach.

Given the revised approach, there was limited detailed discussion of the RAI questions. General discussion included NRC staff asking “what is the cask system versus the cask?” and some discussion related to “what belongs in TS or the Certificate of Compliance, versus what is in the SAR?”

Ultimately, the NRC staff agreed that the new approach sounds promising, but that they will need to review the new material when submitted. The TN staff may request a meeting to discuss the proposed revised responses prior to submittal.

The members of the public in attendance did not have any questions or comments.

No regulatory decisions were made at the meeting.

If you have any questions or comments, please contact Jennifer Davis at (301) 492-3371 or BJennifer.Davis@nrc.gov.

Docket No.: 72-1004
TAC No.: L24080

Enclosures:
As stated

April 16, 2009
ATTENDANCE LIST

<u>Name</u>	<u>Affiliation</u>
Ray Lorson	NRC/SFST
Eric Benner	NRC/SFST
Larry Campbell	NRC/SFST
Christopher Regan	NRC/SFST
Jennifer Davis	NRC/SFST
Elizabeth Thompson	NRC/SFST
Bob Einziger	NRC/SFST
Bob Tripathi	NRC/SFST
Chris Bajwa	NRC/SFST
Mike Call	NRC/SFST
Shana Helton	NRC/SFST
Kimberly Ropon	NRC/SFST
Tara Neider	TN
Jayant Bondre	TN
Don Shaw	TN
Peter Shih	TN
Prakash Narayanan	TN
Carlyn Greene	Ux Consulting
Everett Redmond	NEI

**ENCLOSURE 2:
TN SLIDES, "AMENDMENT 11 TO COC 1004 RAI #2**