

NOTE TO: FILE

DOCKET NOS: 71-9279
71-9218

SUBJECT: 2/8/13, 1:00PM, CONFERENCE CALL WITH NUCLEAR WASTE PARTNERSHIP, LLC TO DISCUSS SECOND ROUND REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION ON THE TRUPACT-II AND HALFPACT TRANSPORTATION PACKAGES

Participants: NRC/NMSS/SFST DOE Nuclear Waste Partnership, LLC
Meraj Rahimi Mike Lastra Todd Selmer
Huda Akhavannik James Rhoades Brad Day
Nate Jordan Mike Brown Steve Porter
Joe Borowsky

Staff and Nuclear Waste Partnership, LLC (NWP) discussed future second round requests for additional information (RAIs) for the TRUPACT-II and HalfPACT packages. Staff had questions in the shielding and thermal technical disciplines. Staff spent a majority of the teleconference discussing the shielding RAIs. During the shielding discussion, the methodology used by the applicant to determine the most limiting allowable activity was discussed. Management and staff agreed that the approach placing a concentrated source in the center of the payload cavity to establish allowable activities based on applicable regulatory requirements in Part 71 could not be considered as the most credible bounding approach, given information provided in the SAR. The applicant agreed to either provide adequate comparable pre-shipment and post-shipment package dose rate data to support their method, or submit additional analyses to address the most limiting condition discussed above.

Staff and NWP also discussed the use of interpolation for DCF values for gamma energies from 2.0 MeV to 10 MeV. The applicant mentioned that most, if not all, of the material packaged in the payload were below 2.0 MeV. However, the applicant is opposed to placing a limit for items approved for transportation in the TRUPACT-II and HalfPACT packages, citing the future need to possibly allow materials with higher energies up to 10 MeV. Since items proposed for the TRUPACT-II and HalfPACT packages are allowed to exceed 2.0 MeV in some cases, the applicant has agreed to provide data consistent with higher gamma energy ranges (e.g., 5.0 MeV, 10 MeV, etc.) and revise the Figures 5.5-5 and 5.5-6 to include data out to 10 MeV.

With regard to the thermal RAIs, staff and NWP discussed whether the temperatures within the ICV remain below the allowable values during hypothetical accident conditions (HAC) if the optional OCV O-ring seal is not installed. Additionally, staff requested clarification on the “no payload” mass calculation presented in Section 5 of CCO-CAL-0003. The applicant has agreed to provide clarifying statements to the SAR to provide a basis for staff to make their safety determination.