

From: Akhavannik, Huda
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2012 3:32 PM
To: 'Richard Wassenaar'
Subject: RE: Teleconference for 2/29 10 am

I accidentally wrote 1/29 instead of 2/29 in the subject line...

From: Akhavannik, Huda
Sent: Monday, February 27, 2012 3:31 PM
To: 'Richard Wassenaar'
Subject: Teleconference for 1/29 10 am

Hi Richard,

Here is a call in number for the teleconference:

Number: 888-790-2010
Passcode: 58915

Here is summary of what we plan to discuss during our teleconference:

F-430:

For response 1.2.b, we want to be sure the weights specified in the table, other than those we pointed out in the RAI, are correct. Specifically, does the "total nominal weight" entries for the upper and lower heads need to change? When making the drawing changes, did you confirm that the other weights remain unchanged?

For response 1.3, we believe that Section 7.3.1, item #2 will also need updating to include the new configuration.

Staff is having internal discussion about your response to RAI 1.4. We will probably discuss it more during the teleconference.

For response 2.1, we are unsure what is preventing movement of the source when the shipping tube is not present.

Editorial note: The top two paragraphs on page 4 of 19 of the submittal reference Figure 2. Should these be referencing Figure 1?

F-431:

For response 1.4.b, the drawing showing the top bracing for the GC1000 with the modified top doesn't appear to have the notch for the rotor spot that the top bracing does for the un-modified GC1000. Should there be a notch in the top bracing for the rotor spot for both versions of the GC1000?

For response 1.4.d, the maximum weights for both Gammacells have been updated in the table in the drawing. However, it would seem that the maximum payload weight and maximum total

weight should also change. Yet, they are the same as before. Are both supposed to be the design weight?

For response 1.4.f, the tolerances are missing on sheet 1 of 2. Sheet 2 of 2 appears to be missing a tolerance for dimensions specified to only a single decimal place. Does it mean that there is no tolerance? If there is a tolerance, that tolerance should be given in the drawing.

Staff is having internal discussion for your response to RAI 1.5. Similar to RAI 1.4 of the F-430, we will discuss more during the teleconference.

I think most likely we will be having a second round of RAIs to address these issues.

Huda Akhavannik

NMSS/SFST/LB

301-492-3273