



CONVERSATION RECORD

1/31/17

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU See Summary below		DATE OF CONTACT 01/30/2017	TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> E-MAIL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING
E-MAIL ADDRESS huda.akhavannik@nrc.gov		TELEPHONE NUMBER (301) 415-5253	

ORGANIZATION NRC/NMSS/DSFM Global Nuclear Fuel - Americas, LLC (GNF)	DOCKET NUMBER(S) 71-9309
--	-----------------------------

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

SUBJECT
Conference Call with GNF, to Discuss their Amendment Submittal on the Model No. RAJ-II Transportation Packages

SUMMARY
GNF Attendees: Lisa Schichlein, Cindy Fung Poon, and Brad Boyette
NRC Attendees: Huda Akhavannik, Yong Kim, and Joseph Borowsky

Staff and GNF discussed clarification questions staff had on changes made to Section 8.2.5, "Miscellaneous Tests," made as part of their amendment request. Staff noticed that text was added to this section and requested clarification on this text. One change made was that text was updated to specify that lids of both the outer and inner containers do not need to provide an air tight seal. Staff noted that as the containment boundary is the fuel itself, this change does not pose a safety concern but were not sure if this was a new change or only being highlighted as part of the amendment. GNF confirmed that the inner and outer containers were never air tight and that the change was being made to highlight this fact. Next staff discussed the change in text for the foam cushioning materials where the criteria of limiting the amount of volume removed was limited to 2% but is now specified as following "approved procedures."

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY)

Continue on Page 3

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION
Huda Akhavannik

SIGNATURE

CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)

SUMMARY: (Continued from page 1)

Staff noted that they would like to know if and how different these procedures are from the previous 2% criteria. The applicant noted that they would look into the approved procedures as they were not sure offhand what exactly the procedure stated. On a similar note, staff also had a question on a change for the damage allowed to the honeycomb material. Previously, there was an allowable limit of 2% damage to the honeycomb where the individual pieces of honeycomb could be rounded to approximately a radius of 3 inches. The applicant has requested in the SAR to allow for 10% damage to the honeycomb. Staff asked the applicant how different allowing 10% damage would be than allowing for 2% damage with the 3 inch radius criteria. The applicant indicated that they would consult their documents and in the next two weeks provide a response to the questions.