



CONVERSATION RECORD

NAME OF PERSON(S)/TITLE CONTACTED OR IN CONTACT WITH YOU Brad Gacke, Brian Gutherman and David Schwarzbart	DATE OF CONTACT 02/09/2022	TYPE OF CONVERSATION <input type="checkbox"/> E-MAIL <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> TELEPHONE <input type="checkbox"/> INCOMING <input type="checkbox"/> OUTGOING						
E-MAIL ADDRESS	TELEPHONE NUMBER (301) 576-2978							
ORGANIZATION Sacramento Municipal Utility District	DOCKET NUMBER(S) 72-11							
LICENSE NAME AND NUMBER(S) SNM-2510	MAIL CONTROL NUMBER(S)							
SUBJECT Aging Management Inspection Discussion								
SUMMARY AND ACTION REQUIRED (IF ANY) NRC Participants: Chris Allen, Marlone Davis, Darrell Dunn and Patrick Koch The call began at approximately 1:00 P.M. Eastern Standard Time. During the call, it was explained that most of the canister surfaces that Rancho Seco planned to inspect could be examined remotely by sending a robotic camera into the Horizontal Storage Module through the bottom vent. However, the canister bottom, where the grapple ring was located, could only be examined by removing either an axial retainer bolted to the Horizontal Storage Module door, or by removing the door itself. Since canister components that Rancho Seco had identified as being within the scope of aging management in their License Renewal Application were located at the bottom of the canister, Rancho Seco wanted to clarify if the safety evaluation report issued with the renewed license authorized removal of the axial retainer or if it simply confirmed that Rancho Seco had accurately identified components within the aging management scope. The NRC stated that the components within the scope of the aging management program were included in the license renewal application. However, because the license renewal application did not include inspection procedures or request NRC approval for removing the axial retainer, the NRC did not make a finding on the procedures to inspect either the canister bottom or the grapple ring. Rancho Seco stated that they would attempt to find an analysis evaluating the safety impacts associated with removing the axial retainer, or if they were unsuccessful, they would consider performing their own independent analysis. Rancho Seco also stated that they would perform a 72.48 evaluation to determine if removing the axial retainer would require a license amendment. The call concluded at approximately 1:45 P.M. Eastern Standard Time.								
NAME OF PERSON DOCUMENTING CONVERSATION Chris Allen								
SIGNATURE <i>William C. Allen</i>	DATE OF SIGNATURE 02/24/2022							