

September 06, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Joseph G. Giitter, Chief
Special Projects Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards

THRU: Brian W. Smith, Chief
Gas Centrifuge Facility Licensing Section
Special Projects Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Stan Echols
Project Manager
Gas Centrifuge Facility Licensing Section **/RA/**
Special Projects Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: AUGUST 29, 2006, TELEPHONE CONFERENCE SUMMARY:
CLARIFYING INFORMATION ON USEC's FACTUAL
ACCURACY REVIEW OF DRAFT SAFETY EVALUATION
REPORT

On August 29, 2006, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff participated in a telephone conference with staff from USEC Inc. (USEC) to discuss clarifying information on USEC's factual accuracy review of the draft Safety Evaluation Report related to USEC's application for a gas centrifuge uranium enrichment facility proposed to be constructed and operated in Piketon, Ohio. I am attaching the telephone conference summary for your use.

Enclosure:

1. NRC/USEC Telephone Conference Summary - Clarifying Information on USEC's Factual Accuracy Review of draft Safety Evaluation Report

Docket: 70-7004

September 06, 2006

MEMORANDUM TO: Joseph G. Giitter, Chief
Special Projects Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards

THRU: Brian W. Smith, Chief
Gas Centrifuge Facility Licensing Section
Special Projects Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards

FROM: Stan Echols
Project Manager
Gas Centrifuge Facility Licensing Section /RA/
Special Projects Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle Safety
and Safeguards

SUBJECT: AUGUST 29, 2006, TELEPHONE CONFERENCE SUMMARY:
CLARIFYING INFORMATION ON USEC's FACTUAL ACCURACY REVIEW OF
DRAFT SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT

On August 29, 2006, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff participated in a telephone conference with staff from USEC Inc. (USEC) to discuss clarifying information on USEC's factual accuracy review of the draft Safety Evaluation Report related to USEC's application for a gas centrifuge uranium enrichment facility proposed to be constructed and operated in Piketon, Ohio. I am attaching the telephone conference summary for your use.

Enclosures:

1. NRC/USEC Telephone Conference Summary - Clarifying Information on USEC Factual Accuracy Review of draft Safety Evaluation Report

Docket: 70-7004

cc: (Cover Memo and Enclosure 1)

William Szymanski/DOE	Michael Marriotte/NIRS	Dan Minter/SODI
Carol O'Claire/Ohio EMA	James Curtiss/W&S	Randall DeVault/DOE
Lindsay Lovejoy/NIRS	Karl Gross/LES	Peter Miner/USEC Inc.
Rocky Brown/Mayor of Beaver	Jim Brushart/Pike Co. Comm.	Geoffrey Sea
David Bowe/SPFPA/USEC	Teddy West/Scioto Twp. Trust.	Robert Owen/Ohio DoH
Billy Spencer/Mayor of Piketon	Vina Colley/PRESS	Donald Silverman/Morgan Lewis
Harry Rioer/Pike Co. Comm	Larry Scaggs/Seal Twp.Trust.	Carrie Mytinger/Cong. Ney
Robert Huff/Portsmouth CoC	Ted Wheeler/Pike County Aud.	Marvin Jones/Chillicothe CoC
Kara Willis/Gov. Taft's Reg. 7	Ewan Todd/PRESS	Dwight Massie/Pike CoC
Joyce Weeth/Pike Co. Rec	Blaine Beekman/Pike CoC	MarJean Kennedy/Gov. Taft

DISTRIBUTION:

FCSS R/F	SPB R/F	JStrosnider/NMSS	MFederline/NMSS
RPierson/FCSS	JGiitter/FCSS	WTroskoski/SPB	LTrocine/OE
JHenson/RII	RVirgilio/OSP	NGarcia/SPB	LRakovan/EDO
RTrojanowski/RII	JDavis/DWM	DAyres/RII	MGalloway/TSG
WBrach/SFPO	DMcIntyre/OPA	DMorey/TSG	DHartland/RII
BThomas/SFPO	TCombs/OCA	TJohnson/SPB	JYerokun/RES
RWescott/SPB	BMoran/NSIR	ISpivack/SPB	LSilvious/NSIR
RHannah/RII	MBurrell/OE	RShaffer/RES	MBlevins/DWM
SEchols/SPB	Hearing File	File Center	

USEC Website: Cover Memo and Enclosure 1

ML062440247

****see previous concurrence**

OFC	GCFLS	GCFLS	TSS	OGC	GCFLS
NAME	ISpivack	SEchols**	RWray**	MBupp	BSmith
DATE	09/1/06	09/1/06	09/ 06 /06	09/1/06	09/1/06

**Official Record Copy
USEC/NRC Telephone Conference Summary
Clarifying Information on USEC Factual Accuracy Review of
draft Safety Evaluation Report**

Date: August 29, 2006

Call Participants:	NRC:	USEC:	WSMS:
	I. Spivack	D. Couser	G. Pyzik
	S. Echols	M. Smith	
	W. Troskoski	D. Scott	
	C. Tripp	K. Coriell	
	R. Wescott	J. Thompson	
	B. Smith	J. Bolling	
	Y. Faraz	G. Corzine	
	T. Johnson		
	N. Garcia-Santos		

On August 29, 2006, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff participated in a teleconference call with USEC Inc. (USEC) staff to discuss clarifying information on USEC's factual accuracy review of NRC's draft Safety Evaluation Report (SER). This information was submitted to NRC in document AET 06-0095.

NRC staff discussed USEC's comments on Chapters 3 and 7 and Appendices A and D and stated that comment #47 was accepted as recommended. NRC staff advised USEC to submit another comment and License Application (LA) changes if they wished to further clarify the exception to NFPA-13 in Section 1.4.6 of the LA. Comment #91 was accepted as recommended except that the second sentence was deleted. Comment #97 was accepted as recommended with the use of the words "depends on fire type." NRC staff agree with the rest of the comments in these Chapters and Appendices.

NRC staff discussed USEC's comments on Chapter 6 and stated that Comment #43 had a typographical error which was explained by the applicant during the teleconference. The applicant's recommended approach was accepted by removing the sentence referring to the UF₆ leak detector. Comments #44 and #45 were accepted as recommended with exception of a typographical error. Comment #46 was modified to add that the "see and flee" procedure is based on the Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant "see and flee" procedure.

NRC staff discussed USEC's comments on Chapter 5 and Appendix C and stated that Comments #37 and #40 will have some proposed word changes. Comment #81 will need some further review and Comment #83 will need to be further reviewed due to possible changes between USEC's Quality Assurance Program Description Revision 0 and Revision 3. Comment #76 was discussed. Possible new accident sequences resulting from feeding enriched material into the cascade are likely bounded. NRC staff will review. Comments #36, #38, #39, #41, #42, #82, #84, #85, #86, and #87 were accepted as recommended.

NRC staff discussed USEC's comments on Chapters 1, 2, and 10 and stated that Comment #61 and #62 will have some proposed word changes. Comment #22 was accepted as recommended after USEC stated that it will conform to the latest code and standard as of

Enclosure 1

January 1st, 2005. Any changes in the future to standards will be done under 10 CFR 70.72. Comment #60 was discussed because NRC requested that USEC coordinate with the Department of Energy regarding their decommissioning funding cost analysis prior to submission of updated cost estimates. USEC stated that it is concerned about possibly not receiving a timely response from DOE and that it will have to be discussed further.

The phone call ended with NRC and USEC stating that they will address the remaining open issues in the next telephone call.