UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

November 30, 2016

MEMORANDUM TO: Anthony Hsia, Deputy Director
Division of Spent Fuel Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Christian Jacobs, Sr. Project Manager **/RA/**
Spent Fuel Licensing Branch
Division of Spent Fuel Management
Office of Nuclear Material Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: SUMMARY OF NOVEMBER 9, 2016, MEETING WITH XCEL ENERGY TO DISCUSS XCEL ENERGY'S DRAFT PROJECT PLAN FOR THE REMAINING DRY STORAGE NUHOMS® CANISTERS, NUMBERS 11-15, AT THE MONTICELLO NUCLEAR GENERATING PLANT

On November 9, 2016, staff from the Division of Spent Fuel Management (DSFM) held a public meeting with representatives from Xcel Energy (XE), at the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Headquarters in Rockville, MD. The purpose of the meeting was to discuss XE's draft Project Plan for the remaining dry storage NUHOMS® canisters, Numbers 11 to 15, at the Monticello Nuclear Generating Plant (MNGP). There was no proprietary information discussed during the meeting. No regulatory decisions were made nor requested at this meeting.

The main points of discussion followed the general progression of XE's PowerPoint presentation. During the Q&A session, some members of the public also asked questions and provided comments. A summary of the discussion follows.

NRC staff questioned how Dry Shielded Canister (DSC) exemptions for the five remaining DSCs could be justified based solely on results from DSC 16 and the pending DSC 11 examination. XE acknowledged the challenge and stated that the justifications would be built into the project plan and the exemption request. XE explained the approach to "bookend" the six canisters with data from the first cask (DSC 11) and DSC 16, and the understanding that the exemption request will have to justify the exemption whether DSC 11 results are "representative" or not.

NRC staff questioned whether two years would be adequate recovery time if the first exemption is not approved until late in 2019, and asked when XE intended to next engage NRC. XE intends to engage again as early as January 2017, and as needed over the next 5 years. NRC staff asked if XE could be completed by the deadline of 2021 if the DSC 11 results are far different than expected, possibly requiring XE to increase their sample size. XE replied that results would be managed as they occurred, and would be openly communicated with NRC. XE

said that the 2018 inspection provides three years of recovery time for reasonably-foreseeable events.

NRC staff asked for more information on the schedule regarding an “open question” concerning resolution on future movement of DSCs 11-15. In particular, NRC staff asked if XE would prompt this resolution through a letter to NRC. XE is considering having a January 2017 meeting to discuss their approach.

Comments from the public included: complaints about not hearing some of the discussion due to the quality of the audio, suggestion that the canister should have been put back in the spent fuel pool after finding a problem, and questioning if any of the fuel was high burnup fuel. NRC staff stated that several assemblies were slightly over 45 gigawatt days per metric ton uranium, which is a lower threshold for the characterization as high burnup spent fuel. Other public comments included: questions and concerns in regard to the proposed phased array ultrasonic testing (PAUT), a statement that the technicians were not doing their jobs right, and questions about the willful violation. NRC staff explained that XE was cited with a violation, and the contractors involved were suspended from working in the domestic U.S. nuclear industry.

In conclusion, XE communicated the proposed XE plan to NRC and are still seeking resolution to the “open question” on moving an inoperable DSC. NRC staff communicated their expectations, particularly as they relate to providing a thorough justification for performing anything less than PAUT on all six DSCs. The next steps will include development and agreement on an appropriate approach to the “open question” for DSC movement. The next steps may begin in January 2017, but not until after the licensee submits its proposed project plan by December 12, 2016.

The attendance list (Enclosure 1) and Xcel Energy’s PowerPoint presentation (Enclosure 2) are attached to this memorandum.

Docket No.: 72-58

Enclosures:
1. Attendance List
2. Presentation

said that the 2018 inspection provides three years of recovery time for reasonably-foreseeable events.

NRC staff asked for more information on the schedule regarding an “open question” concerning resolution on future movement of DSCs 11-15. In particular, NRC staff asked if XE would prompt this resolution through a letter to NRC. XE is considering having a January 2017 meeting to discuss their approach.

Comments from the public included: complaints about not hearing some of the discussion due to the quality of the audio, suggestion that the canister should have been put back in the spent fuel pool after finding a problem, and questioning if any of the fuel was high burnup fuel. NRC staff stated that several assemblies were slightly over 45 gigawatt days per metric ton uranium, which is a lower threshold for the characterization as high burnup spent fuel. Other public comments included: questions and concerns in regard to the proposed phased array ultrasonic testing (PAUT), a statement that the technicians were not doing their jobs right, and questions about the willful violation. NRC staff explained that XE was cited with a violation, and the contractors involved were suspended from working in the domestic U.S. nuclear industry.

In conclusion, XE communicated the proposed XE plan to NRC and are still seeking resolution to the “open question” on moving an inoperable DSC. NRC staff communicated their expectations, particularly as they relate to providing a thorough justification for performing anything less than PAUT on all six DSCs. The next steps will include development and agreement on an appropriate approach to the “open question” for DSC movement. The next steps may begin in January 2017, but not until after the licensee submits its proposed project plan by December 12, 2016.

The attendance list (Enclosure 1) and Xcel Energy’s PowerPoint presentation (Enclosure 2) are attached to this memorandum.

Docket No.: 72-58

Enclosures:
1. Attendance List
2. Presentation

DISTRIBUTION:
NRC attendees
G:/SFST/Jacobs/Monticello Exemption DSCs 11-15/Pre-app Meeting/
Meeting Summary/Meeting Summary 11-9-16.docx

ADAMS Package No. ML16336A025 Memo: ML16336A028 Slides: ML16312A507

OFC:	DSFM		DSFM		DSFM	
NAME:	CJacobs		WWheatley (via email)		JMcKirgan	
DATE:	11/28/16		11/28/16		11/30/16	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

November 9, 2016
ATTENDANCE LIST

Name	Affiliation
Christian Jacobs	NRC/DSFM
Norma Garcia-Santos	NRC/DSFM
Meraj Rahimi	NRC/DSFM
John McKirgan	NRC/DSFM
Anthony Hsia	NRC/DSFM
Darrell Dunn	NRC/DSFM
David Tang	NRC/DSFM
Joe Borowsky	NRC/DSFM
Antonio Rigato	NRC/DSFM
Bob Tripathi	NRC/DSFM
Marlone Davis	NRC/DSFM
Lisa London	NRC/OGC
Matthew Learn	NRC/RIII
Glenn Adams	XE
Scott Marty	XE
Patrick Burke	XE
Michael Baumann	XE
Martin Murphy	XE
Kent Scott	XE
Jeffrey Place	XE

(Participating by phone)

Donna Gilmore
Marvin Lewis
Ace Hoffman

ENCLOSURE 2: Xcel Energy Presentation Slides

"Project Plan for Restoring Dry Shielded Canister (DSC) 11 – 16 Compliance to 10 CFR Part 72"

November 9, 2016