



CONVERSATION RECORD

05/11/2015

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU

See below.

DATE OF CONTACT

5/07/2015

TYPE OF CONVERSATION

- E-MAIL
- TELEPHONE
- INCOMING
- OUTGOING

E-MAIL ADDRESS

TELEPHONE NUMBER

(888) 447-9153

ORGANIZATION

Robatel

DOCKET NUMBER(S)

71-9365

LICENSE NUMBER(S)

CONTROL NUMBER(S)

SUBJECT

Request for Additional Information Teleconference

SUMMARY

NRC - Chris Allen, Joe Borowsky, Eli Goldfeiz and Antonio Rigato
Robatel - Christopher Dane, Jared Bower, Andy Langston and Philip Sewell

The call commenced at approximately 2:30 P.M. eastern standard time. Robatel provided draft responses to a letter, issued on April 24, 2015, requesting additional information (ML15114A375) prior to the call commencing. NRC staff considered the response to the structural question satisfactory, and consequently, there was no discussion of the response. Of the three shielding questions, only the response to question 5-3 required discussion. NRC staff asked if the maximum dose response function was used to calculate the maximum allowable content, and if it was, was the maximum dose response function used in the loading table provided in Chapter 7. Robatel responded that the maximum dose response function was used in the Chapter 7 loading table, and Robatel committed to provide the file title which used the maximum dose response function. In discussing containment question 4-1, NRC noted that the RAI response lacked a direct connection to industry standards for the qualification of leak testing personnel. Such qualification would help to ensure that appropriate personnel would perform leak testing. Robatel explained that cask user personnel will be certified per Nuclear Quality Assurance-1, and because Nuclear Quality Assurance-1 does not reference any testing code, they did

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY)

Robatel will provide title of post-processing spreadsheet used in shielding evaluation.

Continue on Page 3

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION

Chris Allen

SIGNATURE

William C. Allen

CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)

SUMMARY: (Continued from page 1)

not want to impose unnecessary restrictions on the cask user. NRC staff informed Robatel that a second information request might occur once the response was reviewed further. In discussing question 4-2, Robatel explained they changed the temperature used to determine the test duration because the lid temperature varies less than the ambient temperature. Robatel then provided examples where the ambient temperature was both higher and lower than the cask lid temperature. When asked the amount of time by which the test duration changed using the cask lid temperature versus the ambient temperature, Robtel stated the difference was seconds. Robatel also pointed out that, because absolute temperature was used to calculate the test duration, using the cask lid temperature versus the ambient temperature resulted in a small temperature difference. While discussing the response to question 4-3, it was mentioned that the test volume is an important parameter in determining test duration. Consequently, any interspace volumes incorporated into Chapter 8 of the Safety Analysis Report needed to be both accurate and bounding values to insure an accurate and conservative test duration. NRC staff reviewed the response to question 4-4 and had no comments. For question 4-5, NRC staff queried Robatel if information in Table 4.4.3-6 was also in Chapter 7. Robatel's response pointed to a similar table in Chapter 7, and Robatel also stated that if shoring beyond the volumes listed in the Chapter 7 table, the hydrogen gas generation equation in Chapter 7 must be utilized. NRC staff had no comments on both question 4-6 and 4-7. For question 4-8, Robatel said that, in addition to the Chapter 7 revision proposed in the response to the additional information request, Chapter 4 would also be revised to include the second sentence of the proposed response. After discussion of the proposed response to the additional information request was completed, Robatel explained that their response would be delayed until approximately May 20, and the call was concluded at approximately 3:15 P.M. eastern standard time.