

NRC FORM 699 (9-2003)		U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION		DATE 08/07/2012
CONVERSATION RECORD				TIME 11:00am
NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU See Below.		TELEPHONE NO. 800-369-3344		TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> VISIT <input type="checkbox"/> CONFERENCE <input type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING
ORGANIZATION Croft Associates Limited				
SUBJECT RAI Conference Call				
SUMMARY (Continue on Page 2)				
<p>NRC: Chris Allen, JoAnn Ireland, Michele Sampson Croft: Sarah Marshall, Robert Vaughn University of Missouri Research Reactor: Michael Flagg</p> <p>A draft of the request for additional information (RAI) letter had been distributed prior to the phone call. Croft Associates had supplied proposed responses to the RAI letter prior to the phone call. Staff associated with the Structural and Materials questions indicated prior to the phone call that their questions had been adequately addressed and that they did not need to participate in the phone call.</p> <p>The phone call started at approximately 11:00 A.M. Eastern Standard Time. After making Croft Associates aware that staff had discovered some typographical errors in Sections 2.3.1 and 2.6.2 of the Safety Analysis Report, a discussion of the General Information RAIs commenced. As staff began discussing their response to the first RAI, Croft proposed to provide a draft version of a revised licensing drawing with the important to safety information included. Staff indicated that this would be acceptable, but stressed that a review of the draft would only focus on the format of the drawing. In discussing the second RAI, Croft indicated that the symbol used on the drawing was called out in the standard associated with the O-ring. They stated that they would review standard to see if the drawing could be modified to maintain consistency, but emphasized their belief that conformance to the standard was more important. Croft also stressed their belief that the chance to misinterpret the symbol was small because they often interacted with the fabricator. During discussions of the third RAI, Croft identified that the American National Standards Institute (ANSI) N14.5 leak test was performed at the component stage of packaging fabrication. They also clarified what portion of the packaging was machined as well as the timing of the machining relative to performance of the leak test. Staff indicated that because the component was machined after performance of the fabrication leak test, it did not meet the purpose of the ANSI N14.5 fabrication leak test. Croft indicated they would modify their RAI response. For the fourth RAI, Croft proposed an alternative method of presenting the codes used to design and fabricate the packaging; however, staff indicated that further internal discussions were necessary regarding locating the codes. Staff stated that they would contact Croft on this issue by the following week. Staff also acknowledged that Croft intended to correct the error identified by the Maintenance RAI.</p> <p>Continue on Page 2</p>				
ACTION REQUIRED Contact Croft about locating codes used in the design and fabrication of packaging.				
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION Chris Allen		SIGNATURE <i>William C. Allen</i>		DATE 08/09/2012
ACTION TAKEN Provide guidance on locating codes used in the design and fabrication of packaging.				
TITLE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION Joanne Ireland		SIGNATURE OF PERSON TAKING ACTION <i>Joanne Ireland</i>		DATE 8/09/2012

CONVERSATION RECORD (Continued)**SUMMARY** *(Continue on Page 3)*

After a review of the RAIs and the Croft responses were completed, Croft indicated they had no comments. The call was completed at approximately 11:30 A.M.

Continue on Page 3