



CONVERSATION RECORD

7/12/2017

NAME OF PERSON(S) CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU

Chad E. Thompson, et al.

DATE OF CONTACT

07/06/2017

TYPE OF CONVERSATION

☐

E-MAIL

☒

TELEPHONE

☐

INCOMING

☒

OUTGOING

E-MAIL ADDRESS

Chad.Thompson@nnsa.doe.gov

TELEPHONE NUMBER

(505) 845-4114

ORGANIZATION

National Nuclear Security Administration

DOCKET NUMBER(S)

07109370

LICENSE NUMBER(S)

NA

CONTROL NUMBER(S)

NA

SUBJECT

7/6/2014, 11:30AM CONFERENCE CALL TO DISCUSS CLARIFICATION QUESTION TO REQUESTS FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE MATERIALS EVALUATION REGARDING MODEL NUMBER 380-B (CAC NO. L25109)

SUMMARY

Attendees:

NRC

Darrell Dunn

Norma Garcia Santos

NNSA

Chad Thompson

Temeka Taplin

Bill Stewart

AREVA

Phil Noss

Tom Criddle

Gannon Johnson

PNNL

Harold E. Adkins

LANL

Mark Wald-Hopkins

Cristy Lynn Abeyta

David McCollum

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY)

See Summary.

Continue on Page 3

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION

Norma Garcia Santos, Darrell Dunn, and Chad Thompson

SIGNATURE

CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)

SUMMARY: (Continued from page 1)

On July 6, 2017, NRC, NNSA, LANL, PNNL, and AREVA Federal Services LLC participated on a phone call to discuss questions related to the first round of requests for additional information (RAIs) No. RAI M-4, RAI M-5, RAI M-6, RAI M-13, and RAI M-16 submitted in June 2017. The following items summarize the discussion during the July 6 telephone call:

RAI M-4

The applicant added a paragraph in Section 1.2.2 of the application indicating that the contents placed in the package will be dry with exception of the moisture present in the wood used as dunnage. The staff asked the applicant to revise Section 7 of the application to ensure that contents loaded to the package are dry (as assumed in Section 1 of the application). The applicant agreed to revise Section 7 of the application by adding a requirement to verify that the sources (payload) as well as the packaging cavity are dry prior to loading. The staff asked the applicant to provide revisions to the application to supplement this response.

RAI M-5

The applicant removed the term "forging" from the description of items in the drawings. The staff asked the applicant to revise the application to ensure that the term "forging" (as applicable to the components described in the drawings) is removed from the application, as applicable. For graphics related to code runs including the word "forging," the applicant can add a clarification note to ensure that terms are used consistently through the application or can re-run the code, if appropriate. Examples in which the term "forging" that refers to either the upper or base forging or "forgings" that refers to both the upper and base forgings appear in Revision 1 of the application are the following:

1. Section 2.7.1.2, page 2.7-8
2. Section 2.12.4.4.7, page 2.12.4-12
3. Figure 2.12.4-40, page 2.12.4-42
4. Figure 2.12.4-44, page 2.12.4-44
5. Figure 2.12.4-44a, page 2.12.4-45
6. Figure 2.12.4-44b, page 2.12.4-45
7. Figure 2.12.4-66, page 2.12.4-57
8. Table 5.3-1, page 5.3-3

The staff asked the applicant to provide revisions to the application to supplement this response.

RAI M-6

The staff noted that the material specifications for ASTM A479 and ASTM A276 are probably close, but the staff does not have the authority to accept substituting the properties of a material that appears in the American Society of Mechanical Engineers ASME Boiler and Pressure Vessel (B&PV) Code for another that does not appear on the ASME B&PV Code. The staff asked the applicant to provide the proper justification for the material properties at elevated temperatures of the material that does not appear in the ASME Code (i.e., ASTM A276). Instead of referencing the ASME B&PV code for ASTM A276, the staff mentioned that the applicant may use reference not related to the ASME B&PV Code to justify and compare the mechanical properties of ASTM A276. The staff asked the applicant to provide justification of mechanical properties at elevated temperatures for ASTM A276 and revisions to the application to supplement this response.

RAI M-13

The staff asked the applicant to provide a complete response to the application including explaining the changes in the application to address this question.

RAI M-16

Since the applicant changed its approach and will use gamma scanning to assess the adequacy of the lead shielding, the staff asked the applicant to provide the information identified in NUREG\CR-3854, Section 3.2.1, "Acceptance Testing for the Gamma Shield." The applicant indicated that they do not know the type of equipment they will be using or some of the information mentioned in the NUREG's criteria. The staff asked the applicant to follow the criteria in Section 3.2.1 of the NUREG and provide the information to supplement this response. The staff pointed out that it is asking for this information due to the change in approach to assess the adequacy of the gamma shield, the applicant should respond in the best of its ability and the staff will review the information submitted by the applicant. The staff also asked the applicant to revise the application in order to incorporate this response into the acceptance tests section of the application. The response to this RAI and revisions to the application would be considered a supplement to this RAI response.