



CONVERSATION RECORD

8-10-16

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU See below.		DATE OF CONTACT 08/02/2016	TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> E-MAIL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING
E-MAIL ADDRESS		TELEPHONE NUMBER (888) 447-9153	

ORGANIZATION Virginia Electric Power Company (Dominion) and AREVA	DOCKET NUMBER(S) 72-16
--	---------------------------

LICENSE NUMBER(S) SNM-2507	CONTROL NUMBER(S)
-------------------------------	-------------------

SUBJECT
Second RAI Teleconference

SUMMARY
 NRC participants: Chris Allen, Zhian Li, Eli Goldfeiz, Meraj Rahimi, Bernard White and Jason Piotter
 Dominion participants: Tom Szymanski, Tom Brookmire, Rich Ridder, David Tomlinson and Brian Vitiello
 AREVA participants: Don McGee, Philippe Pham, Tom Edwards, Venkata Venigalla, Phil Lozmack and Gary Clark

Prior to the call commencing at 3 P.M., the attached request for additional information (RAI) was provided to Dominion. Staff asked if there were any questions about the RAI, and Dominion inquired about the breadth of the scope of the RAI. Staff responded that the initial scope in addressing the RAI would be to determine if the neutron shield temperature, in the radial direction, remained below the design basis temperature identified in the amendment request. If a revised thermal evaluation determined that the radial neutron shield design basis temperature was exceeded, the applicant needed both to identify the associated degradation and to propose mitigating actions. AREVA then stated previously provided shielding calculations indicated that, after being in service for a long period of time at temperatures below the design basis temperature, the dose rate increased only by 10%. Although staff expressed appreciation for this insight, staff stated that using information associated with normal degradation did not clearly resolve the issue. Next, AREVA asserted that changing the thermal modeling assumptions identified in the RAI would actually lower the predicted radial neutron shield temperature. They also emphasized that the thermal calculations reported average bulk temperatures because

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY)

Continue on Page 3

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION
Chris Allen

SIGNATURE
William C. Allen

CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)

SUMMARY: (Continued from page 1)

the design basis neutron shield temperature was an average bulk temperature. Subsequently, staff asked AREVA to identify the peak radial neutron shield temperature if possible. AREVA provided the requested information, and they identified the temperature gradient between the inner radial neutron shield surface and the outer radial neutron shield surface. In addition, AREVA indicated that a similar temperature gradient was generated by thermal calculations submitted to support approval of the TN-68 Part 72 certificate of compliance. Since the peak radial neutron shield temperature provided by AREVA in response to staff's question exceeded the neutron shield bulk design basis temperature, staff indicated that RAI would be revised especially since insufficient information had been provided thus far for the materials reviewer to determine how the neutron shield would behave locally at temperatures above the bulk design basis temperature. The call concluded at approximately 3:45 P.M.