

NOTE TO: FILE

DOCKET NO.: 71-9291

SUBJECT: MAY 14, 2014, 1:00 PM - CONFERENCE CALL TO DISCUSS COLUMBIANA HI TECH'S PROPOSED RESPONSES TO THE SECOND REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION REGARDING THE REVISION OF MODEL NUMBER LIQUI-RAD, REVISION 8 (TAC NO. L24783) – CONTAINMENT EVALUATION, STRUCTURAL EVALUATION, AND OPERATING PROCEDURES

ATTENDEES¹: NRC
Norma Garcia Santos, Project Manager
Steven Everard, P.E.
Haile Lindsay, Ph.D.

Columbiana Hi Tech, LLC
Robert E. Hypes, Vice President - Special Projects
Rod Felts

AREVA INC.
Glenn Mathues, Licensing Manager, Transportation
Scott Edwards
Jason Heineman
Olivier Gandou
Abhijit Honrao

DISCUSSION:

On March 14, 2014, NRC, Columbiana Hi Tech, LLC², and AREVA Inc. participated on a telephone call to discuss the second request for additional information (RAI) related to the containment review, structural review, and operating procedures for the Model Liqui-Rad package; as part of the revision request of this package. The second RAI was issued on April 15, 2014 (ADAMS Accession Number: ML14105A289).

The discussion was focused on the proposed response to RAI 5.1; regarding to possible changes to unloading and re-loading procedures. The applicant mentioned that the RAI response would include changes to the safety analysis report of the Liquid-Rad package. The following were some of the changes to this safety analysis report:

- 1) **Figure 4-1** – Revise to clearly identify the containment vessel from the containment boundary.
- 2) **Section 7.2** - Include a provision for checking the package for damage, and changing the “containment boundary” to “containment vessel.” The applicant stated that failure of the drawpipe only occurred below the bottom weld in the heat affected area of the pipe. The upper and lower welds have remained intact, so the integrity of the primary lid was never breached.

¹ NRC means U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

² Columbiana Hi Tech, LLC, was “the applicant.” AREVA Inc. provided technical support to Columbiana Hi Tech, LLC.

- 3) **Section 8.2** – Add a new step for performing annual inspections of the draw pipe-to-primary lid weld for cracks, damage, etc.

The applicant mentioned that loading procedures would not change, but there may be changes to unloading procedures. In this regard, the applicant would rely on the user's unloading procedures, since the same rationale is proposed for loading procedures. The applicant had used a pipeline with a smaller diameter to withdraw the contents of the package; if there was damage to the port or draw pipe. After some discussion, the applicant agreed to add language about the use of a smaller diameter pipeline, in case of damage to the port or draw pipe.