

**From:** Simon [shsiung@swri.org]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, May 25, 2011 7:04 AM  
**To:** Bartlett, Matthew; 'Simon'; Asadul Chowdhury; Sircar, Madhumita; 'John Miller'; thomasjh@comcast.net  
**Cc:** Guardiola, Maria  
**Subject:** Summary of Call between INIS and the Seismic/Structural reviewers regarding follow-up to RAI responses

---

**From:** Bartlett, Matthew [<mailto:Matthew.Bartlett@nrc.gov>]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, May 24, 2011 7:38 AM  
**To:** Simon; Asadul Chowdhury; Sircar, Madhumita; John Miller; [thomasjh@comcast.net](mailto:thomasjh@comcast.net)  
**Cc:** Guardiola, Maria  
**Subject:** Summary of Seismic/Structural Call with INIS

Summary of Call between INIS and the Seismic/Structural reviewers regarding follow-up to RAI responses

On Monday May 16, 2011 the NRC staff held a conference call with International Isotopes Inc. (INIS) to discuss the seismic and structural review. The purpose of the call was to request clarification on several RAI responses that INIS had previously provided.

The NRC structural reviewer requested information on flooding. INIS's written response to RAI SS-2 indicates Department of Energy (DOE) standards were used to evaluate the flood hazards. However, INIS' response did not explain why flooding is not a hazard to the INIS facility. The NRC requests additional technical justification for the conclusions drawn regarding flooding. The NRC staff also requests clarification on how berms/dams are used to prevent site flooding and whether these measures should be declared IROFS. The NRC staff also requests the applicant to provide the associated technical basis.

The NRC seismic reviewers noted that RAI 7 has 6 sub-parts. INIS stated that the details for sub-parts 1-5 will not be available until the detailed design and site characterization are completed. The NRC reviewers clarified that detailed information was not needed, but rather information on the methodology (e.g. computer codes, soil analysis, etc.) that will be used to develop the design and site characterization. Information on the methodology would resolve the outstanding issues. This type of methodology information should be available prior to the detailed design or site characterization.

INIS proposed conducting a conference call or site visit between the NRC seismic reviewers and the INIS seismic staff to discuss the RAIs. Prior to such a call/meeting a written request for the additional information (second round of RAIs) will be provided to INIS by NRC. The NRC seismic reviewers also noted that RAI 7 sub-part 3 and 4 were identical. INIS indicated this typo should be corrected.

Sincerely,

Matt Bartlett  
Project Manager

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission  
NMSS/FCSS/AFCB  
(301)-492-3119