



CONVERSATION RECORD

02/07/2017

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 AREVA Inc. (AREVA)	DOCKET NUMBER(S) 71-9372
---	-----------------------------

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

SUBJECT
Conference Call with AREVA to Discuss Request for Supplemental Information (RSI) and Observations on the Model No. TN-B1 Transportation Package

SUMMARY
AREVA Attendees: Larry Tupper, James Davis, Kevin Elliot, Kevin Mon, Calvin Manning, Scott Edwards, and Iaon Arimescu
NRC Attendees: Huda Akhavannik and Joseph Borowsky
On January 30, 2017, staff and AREVA had a teleconference to discuss the NRC acceptance review RSI and observations sent in a letter dated January 27, 2017 (ML17030A006).
The applicant and staff primarily discussed the thermal observation which requested the applicant demonstrate that the integrity of the cladding's containment boundary of the proposed content is bounded by the previous hypothetical accident condition drop tests and the subsequent hypothetical accident fire test.

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 discussed that the cladding has some deformation after the drop testing and the fuel pressure provided after hypothetical accident testing is close to the rupture pressure cited in the application. Staff indicated that there needs to be discussion in the application that provides reasonable assurance that the effects of the drop testing on the content (the containment boundary) has been considered as an initial condition to the thermal hypothetical accident fire test.

The applicant stated that the methodology used to evaluate the fuel has not changed from the previously approved content and that this question would potentially be questioning the licensing basis for the other already approved content in the certificate of compliance. Staff indicated that the 11x11 fuel assembly is in-scope to this amendment and is the primary focus of the question. Staff does not expect to question the basis of the other already approved content.

The applicant indicated that the fuel pressures provided in the application are not the actual pressures and have been purposefully increased to add greater conservatism. The applicant indicated that they would provide the actual fuel pressures and also describe the other conservatisms that are part of the thermal analysis.

Staff indicated that although they do not expect the full thermal analysis to be redone, this information should be put together to complete a story that would provide staff with the information needed to write a safety analysis report and would need to be more than simple qualitative statements.

The applicant indicated that they would provide the information in a few days for review prior to submitting it as the official response.