



CONVERSATION RECORD

NAME OF PERSON(S)/TITLE CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU		DATE OF CONTACT	TYPE OF CONVERSATION	
Dan Tallman		06/04/2019	<input type="checkbox"/> E-MAIL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING	
E-MAIL ADDRESS		TELEPHONE NUMBER		
Dan.Tallman@smud.org				
ORGANIZATION		DOCKET NUMBER(S)		
Sacramento Municipal Utility District (SMUD)		72-11		
LICENSE NAME AND NUMBER(S)		MAIL CONTROL NUMBER(S)		
SNM-2510				
SUBJECT				
Rancho Seco ISFSI License Renewal Application: clarifications to RAI response				
SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY) SMUD/Orano attendees: Dan Tallman (SMUD), Don Shaw (Orano), Tom Edwards (Orano), Doug Yates (Orano), Oley Nelson (Orano), Phillipe Pham (Orano), Girish Patel (Orano), Rushabh Shah (Orano), Brian Gutherman (Gutherman Technical Services) NRC attendees: Darrell Dunn, Wendy Reed, Meraj Rahimi, Chris Allen, Yiming Pan (contractor), Xihua He (contractor) A teleconference was held between the NRC and SMUD representatives. The purpose of the call, requested by the NRC, was to discuss RAI responses provided by the licensee to the NRC. The following RAI responses were discussed: RAI 2-1: The NRC staff informed the licensee of some inconsistencies in the information provided in the cross reference table RAI 2-1-3 provided in the RAI response. The licensee agreed to provide the NRC with drawings referenced in the updated license renewal application (LRA) and correct errata in the LRA and RAI response. RAI 2-2: The NRC noted that some of the descriptions in Appendix B of the LRA were inconsistent. For example, the terms "aging management" and "aging management review" are used interchangeably. NRC noted errata such as typos in the Appendix.				
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION				
Wendy Reed				
SIGNATURE			DATE OF SIGNATURE	
			6/14/2019	

CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)

LICENSE NAME AND NUMBER(S)

SNM-2510

MAIL CONTROL NUMBER(S)

SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY) (Continued)

RAI 2-8: Discussion included proprietary information.

RAI 3-2: The NRC and licensee discussed the basis of a dose conversion factor that was included in the response to the RAI.

RAI 3-5: The NRC staff noted the clarification that should be made as to the inclusion of "microbiological chemical attack" in the "loss of material" list documented in LRA section 3.6.5.

RAI B-2(1): The NRC staff noted that it was not clear which version of the ACI 349.3R the licensee was referring to with regard to inspection intervals. The staff asked the licensee to make this clear and provide a justification of the proposed inspection interval provided in the RAI response.

RAI B-4: The NRC staff noted the that sections in Chapter 2 and 3 of the LRA may not have been revised in the LRA as a result of the RAI response and asked the licensee to clarify this.

RAI B-5(1): The NRC staff asked the licensee to clarify the use of Part 71 terminology in the RAI response. The discussion focused on the possible uses of the MP-187 transfer cask, which resolved the NRC's clarification question.

During the call, the licensee asked the NRC to submit any requests for clarification that remained, including the identified errata in a formal letter. The NRC agreed. No time period for submission of the information by the licensee was discussed on the call.

1/27/2018