



CONVERSATION RECORD

05/18/2020

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

See attendee list below

DATE OF CONTACT

05/12/2020

TYPE OF CONVERSATION

☐

E-MAIL

☒

TELEPHONE

☐

INCOMING

☐

OUTGOING

E-MAIL ADDRESS

TELEPHONE NUMBER

ORGANIZATION

Holtec International (Holtec)

DOCKET NUMBER(S)

07201014

LICENSE NUMBER(S)

CoC 72-1014, HI-STORM 100, Amd 15

CONTROL NUMBER(S)

SUBJECT

PURPOSE: Discuss Holtec's approach on RAI 3-1, 3-6, and 4-9. Clarify NRC's questions on some RAI responses.

SUMMARY

Holtec attendees: Stefan Anton, Jeff Brown, Chuck Bullard, Vadym Makodym, Kimberly Manzione, Abrar Mohammad, Evan Rosenbaum, Hunter Smith, Peter Stefanovic, Joyce Tomlinson, and Nikhil Varma.

NRC attendees: Yen-Ju Chen, Meraj Rahimi, Ricardo Rodriguez, Jorge Solis, David Tang, and Veronica Wilson.

Holtec discussed its approach for responding to RAI 4-9, which addresses the temperature change with wind speed. The staff acknowledged the approach and will wait to see the final results.

The staff also discussed the response to RAI 4-3 regarding sheltered configuration. Holtec indicated its response demonstrates how to perform site-specific evaluation if the licensee chooses to use sheltered configuration. The staff noted that the cask is for general licensees, and the method or approach needs to demonstrate it can meet regulatory requirements. Action: Holtec will provide supplemental information and be ready to discuss it during the followup clarification call.

Continue on Page 2

ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY)

Continue on Page 3

NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION

Yen-Ju Chen

SIGNATURE

CONVERSATION RECORD (continued)

SUMMARY: (Continued from page 1)

Holtec presented the approach for responding to RAI 3-1. The staff questioned whether evaluations were done for two different orientations for MPC-32M, and also noted that the discussions of various MPCs in FSAR is confusing. Action: Holtec recognized the confusion, and will ensure the RAI 3-1 response is clear in referring to different MPCs.

Holtec planned to respond to RAI 3-6 (related Proposed Change #9) by providing a definition of "non-credible" event and justifying the tipover event is a "non-credible" event, so it would not need to perform additional dose analysis for tipover event. The evaluation will be both quantitative and qualitative. The staff reminded that the evaluation should include address both external and operational events. Further discussions may be needed in the followup call.

For the response to RAI 8-1, the staff had questions about the material properties and specifications. Action: Holtec agreed to provide supplemental information.

Holtec and the staff discussed the response to some shielding and radiation protection RAIs. Several responses referenced report HI-2188253, Revision 2. However, the report was not provided in the RAI response. Action: Holtec will provide the report.

The staff emphasized that Holtec needs to justify that the system meets the dose limits in 10 CFR 72.104 and 72.106 for the maximum calculated dose rate. Holtec and the staff also discussed using technical specification dose rate limit, similar to the limit for transfer cask in HI-STORM FW Amendment No. 5. The staff noted that the top and side dose rates should still be considered. With respect to tolerance for modeling, the staff indicated that the tolerance should be sufficiently low to demonstrate the modeled system is a representative of the actual system. Action: Holtec will provide supplemental information on maximum dose rates and justification for meeting regulatory requirements.