



CONVERSATION RECORD

08/25/2016

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU Dennis Williford		DATE OF CONTACT 08/18/2016	TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> E-MAIL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING
E-MAIL ADDRESS Dennis.Williford@areva.com		TELEPHONE NUMBER (704) 805-2223	

ORGANIZATION AREVA Inc.	DOCKET NUMBER(S) 72-1004
----------------------------	-----------------------------

LICENSE NUMBER(S)	CONTROL NUMBER(S)
-------------------	-------------------

SUBJECT  
Clarification Call regarding Re-issuing RAI-2 for AREVA CoC 1004 renewal application

SUMMARY

Participants:

- Don Shaw (AREVA)
- Miguel Manrique (AREVA)
- Raheel Haroon (AREVA)
- Philippe Pham (AREVA)
- Karan Mauskar (AREVA)
- Dennis Williford (AREVA)
- Venkata Venigalla (AREVA)
- Prakash Narayanan (AREVA)
- Rick Migliore (AREVA)
- Christian Jacobs (NRC)
- Joseph Borowsky (NRC)
- Darrell Dunn (NRC)
- Ricardo Torres (NRC)
- John McKirgan (NRC)

**Continue on Page 2**

ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY)

NRC staff will re-issue RAI-2 regarding two issues identified during NRC staff's review of AREVA RAI-2 responses provided June 2016.

**Continue on Page 3**

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION  
Christian Jacobs

SIGNATURE  
*Christian Jacobs*

**CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)**

SUMMARY: (Continued from page 1)

A clarification call requested by NRC staff was held on August 18, 2016, with AREVA Inc. regarding two issues identified during NRC staff's review of HSM and THERM/CONFINE RAI-2. NRC staff clarified that some AREVA responses to RAI-2 were unresponsive. Issue #1 - AREVA has not provided adequate justification for the use surrogate inspections of HSMs, in lieu of actual inspections. NRC Staff indicated that, absent a compelling justification, the use of surrogates would not be a viable approach. Staff also indicated the goal of making a timely regulatory decision on this licensing action and additional rounds of RAIs were unlikely to achieve an acceptable outcome. Issue #2 - The applicant provided more material than needed by the staff to make a safety decision and that staff had issues with the excess information provided. Staff explained the concerns with the excess information provided and clarified the alternatives to address the staff's concerns. One alternative was to resubmit the response omitting the unnecessary information or the other alternative is to issue another set of RAIs. The call ended with both parties (NRC and AREVA) indicating that no further clarification was needed, and that NRC will re-issue RAI-2 in regards to Issue #1 and Issue #2.