

NRC FORM 699 (9-2003)		U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION		DATE 11/23/2011
CONVERSATION RECORD				TIME 1:00pm
NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU See below.		TELEPHONE NO.		TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> VISIT <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING
ORGANIZATION Pacific Gas and Electric (PG&E)				
SUBJECT Discussion of Venting of Greater Than Class C Waste Canister				
SUMMARY (Continue on Page 2)				
Attendees: William Allen (NRC), Chris Bajwa (NRC), Matt Gordon (NRC), David Sokolsky (PG&E) and Larry Pulley (PG&E)				
<p>After initiating the phone call at approximately 1 P.M. (EST), PG&E asked the NRC to state its concern about the hydrogen levels which would be generated in the greater than Class C waste canister (GWC) as indicated in their Request for Additional Information (RAI) response (ML112521432). The NRC explained that the radiolysis analysis provided in response to the first RAI in ML112521432 indicated that flammable and/or explosive levels of hydrogen would be present in the GWC when it was finally shipped off-site. Therefore, the NRC intended to incorporate a restriction in the Humboldt Bay operating license to vent the GWC prior to shipment. When questioned by PG&E as to the ignition source during transport, the NRC in addition to mentioning different cask handling methods, the NRC stated that it was not a good practice to ship radioactive material with flammable and/or explosive levels of hydrogen.</p> <p>PG&E explained that since the containment building in which both the GWC and spent fuel canisters had been vented after loading would have been dismantled by the time the waste was shipped off-site, they would have no method of venting the GWC without endangering workers, the public and/or the environment. (Although not stated explicitly during the phone call, the radioactive material vented would have come from contamination in the pool water which was transferred to the inner surface of the GWC.) Alternative loading methods were considered, but none were considered mutually acceptable. Therefore, PG&E stated their intention to discuss this development with Holtec International, the GWC vendor, and develop another solution to loading the greater than Class C waste. Consequently, they requested that a second RAI letter be issued. The second RAI letter was requested to justify making future changes to the site Safety Analysis Report.</p> <p>The call ended at approximately 1:45 P.M. (EST).</p>				
<i>Continue on Page 2</i>				
ACTION REQUIRED				
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION William C. "Chris" Allen		SIGNATURE <i>William C. Allen</i>		DATE 11/29/2011
ACTION TAKEN				
TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION		SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION		DATE