

**Safety Evaluation Report for  
9975 Gram Based Content Envelopes,  
C.10 and C.11; Safety Analysis Report for Packaging;  
Model 9975; Addendum; S-SARA-G-00007, Revision 1  
August 2009**

**Addendum to  
Safety Analysis Report for Packaging, Model 9975,  
B(M)F-96; S-SARP-G-00003, Revision 0, January 2008, as  
supplemented**

**Docket No. 09-30-9975  
September 2009**

Prepared by: James M. Shuler  
James M. Shuler  
Manager, DOE Packaging Certification Program  
Office of Packaging and Transportation  
Office of Environmental Management

Date: 9/17/09

Approved by: Frank Marcinowski  
Frank Marcinowski  
Headquarters Certifying Official  
Deputy Assistant Secretary for Regulatory Compliance  
Office of Environmental Management

Date: 9/18/09

## OVERVIEW

The Department of Energy (DOE) requested approval from the DOE Headquarters Certifying Official (HCO) to ship Model 9975-85 and Model 9975-96 Packages loaded with Pu/U metal and Pu/U oxide materials as identified in proposed new Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11. The new Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 consist of radioisotopes and impurities that are similar to the existing C.3 (Pu/U metal) and C.4 (Pu/U oxide) Content Envelopes, but list the radioisotopes as gram values in lieu of the existing weight percent of radioactive material mass values listed for the C.3 and C.4 Content Envelopes.

Authorization for shipment requires acceptance of this report by the DOE Packaging Certification Program (PCP) and approval by the HCO as an Addendum to WSRC-SA-2002-00008, Revision 0; S-SARA-G-00001, Addendum 1, Revision 0; and S-SARA-G-00002 Addendum 2, Revision 1, of the Model 9975-85 Package Safety Analysis Report for Packaging (SARP). This Addendum also applies to S-SARP-G-00003, Revision 0, of the Model 9975-96 Package SARP. These documents are collectively referred to as the existing Model 9975 Package SARP. The safety basis described addresses specific supplements to the currently approved safety basis. Justification is made for shipping the new Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 under this Addendum.

This Addendum is accepted by the DOE PCP and HCO, and the DOE Certificates of Compliance (CoCs) USA/9975/B(M)F-85(DOE), Revision 22; and USA/9975/B(M)F-96(DOE), Revision 2 will be issued to add Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 for the Model 9975-85 Package and Model 9975-96 Package. The new Content Envelopes will be incorporated into the next revision to the Model 9975-85 and Model 9975-96 Package SARPs.

## Chapter 1: General Information

This Safety Evaluation Report (SER) documents the DOE PCP staff's review of *Justification for 9975 Gram Based Content Envelopes, C.10 and C.11, Safety Analysis Report for Packaging, Model 9975, Addendum*,<sup>[1]</sup>— the Submittal — prepared for the DOE by Savannah River Packaging Technology, Savannah River National Laboratory, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, to support shipment of special nuclear materials in the Model 9975-85 Package and Model 9975-96 Package. This section of the SER covers the review of the General Information provided in Chapter 1 of the Submittal.

The Submittal is an Addendum to WSRC-SA-2002-00008, Revision 0,<sup>[2]</sup> S-SARA-G-00001, Addendum 1, Revision 0,<sup>[3]</sup> and S-SARA-G-00002, Addendum 2, Revision 1,<sup>[4]</sup> of the Model 9975-85 Package SARP. This Addendum also applies to S-SARP-G-00003, Revision 0, of the Model 9975-96 Package SARP.<sup>[5]</sup> These documents are collectively referred to as the existing Model 9975 Package SARP in the Submittal. The safety basis described in the Submittal addresses specific supplements to the currently approved SARP. Justification is made for shipping the new Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 under this Addendum. The Model 9975-85 Package is currently certified by the DOE under Revision 21 to the CoC,<sup>[6]</sup> while the Model 9975-96 Package is certified by the DOE under Revision 1 to the CoC.<sup>[7]</sup>

The new Content Envelopes, C.10 and C.11, will assist with de-inventory of the Super Block at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL) and other facilities in the DOE Complex. This CoC amendment would permit shipment of radioactive materials characterized by a weight percent exceeding values presented in Table 1.2 in the Model 9975-85 Package SARP and in the Model 9975-96 Package SARP using a Content Envelope specified in grams.

The C.10 and C.11 Content Envelope changes do not affect either the Model 9975 packaging configurations or packaging components. The radioisotope gram weight limits in Addendum Table 1.1, *C.10 and C.11 Content Envelopes*, were derived to limit the quantities to be within existing elements (structural, thermal, containment) of the safety basis for the Packages as supported by the supplemental shielding and criticality analyses. For example, the gram quantities of <sup>238</sup>Pu and <sup>241</sup>Am in Addendum Table 1.1 are limited by the 19-Watt (W) limit for the Model 9975 Package. Also, for Content Envelope C.10, gram quantities each of <sup>240</sup>Pu ( $m^{240}\text{Pu}$ ) and <sup>242</sup>Pu ( $m^{242}\text{Pu}$ ) are controlled by the following algorithm to keep the surface dose rate within the regulatory limit of 200 mrem/h:

$$m^{242}\text{Pu} + 0.596m^{240}\text{Pu} \leq 1290 \text{ g}$$

The existing operational controls and configuration requirements for the Content Envelope C.3 and Content Envelope C.4 materials also apply to the C.10 and C.11 Content Envelopes, as well, as can be seen in Addendum Table 1.2, *Summary of Requirements by Content and Configuration*. The same packaging configurations are used in the Addendum as used in Table 1.3, *Summary of Requirements by Content and Configuration*, for the Model 9975-85 Package and Model 9975-96 Package. For example, 3013 containers, food-pack cans, and hex-can configurations are used for both the Addendum and the Model 9975 Package. The C.10 and C.11 Content Envelope limits for Impurities and Total Mass are the same values as the existing Content Envelope C.3 and Content Envelope C.4 limits. The Addendum Table 1.1, *Table Notes*,

were revised to reflect the gram weight values (in lieu of existing SARP Table 1.2 weight percent of total radioactive material values) and to omit notes not applicable to the C.10 and C.11 Envelopes. A supplemental shielding analysis<sup>181</sup> and a supplemental criticality safety evaluation<sup>191</sup> were performed to support the Content Envelope C.10 and Content Envelope C.11 gram weight limits. These will be discussed in Chapter 5 and in Chapter 6 of this SER.

### **Findings**

Based on the review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff has concluded that the packaging design has been adequately described to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 71.<sup>1101</sup>

### **Conditions of Approval**

The DOE PCP has concluded that the following conditions of approval will be added to the existing CoCs<sup>16,71</sup> for this request:

- Addendum Table 1.1, *C.10 and C.11 Content Envelopes*, and Addendum Table 1.1, *Table Notes*, and
- Addendum Table 1.2, *Summary of Requirements by Content and Configuration*.

## **Chapter 2: Structural Evaluation**

This section of the SER covers the review of the Structural Evaluation information provided in Chapter 2 of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are noted above in Chapter 1. The results of the structural review are discussed below.

The C.10 and C.11 Content Envelope additions do not modify or exceed the total payload mass certified for shipment in the Model 9975 package. The maximum content weight and packaging configuration authorized is the same as evaluated in the Model 9975 SARP. The package structural performance documented in the existing Model 9975 SARP is valid for the C.10 and C.11 Content Envelope additions.

### **Findings**

Based on the review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff has concluded that the packaging design has been adequately described to meet the structural requirements of 10 CFR Part 71.

### **Conditions of Approval**

The DOE PCP has concluded that no additional structurally-related conditions of approval need to be added to the existing CoCs for this request.

### **Chapter 3: Thermal Evaluation**

This section of the SER covers the review of the Thermal Evaluation information provided in Chapter 3 of the Submittal and Appendices of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are noted above in Chapter 1. The results of the thermal review are discussed below.

The C.10 and C.11 Content Envelope additions maintain the existing 19-W decay heat limit, and the packaging configuration and requirements are the same as that evaluated for the existing C.3 Pu/U metal and C.4 Pu/U oxide Content Envelopes, so there is no adverse affect on the thermodynamic performance of the package.

#### **Findings**

Based on the review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff has concluded that the packaging design has been adequately described to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 71.

#### **Conditions of Approval**

The DOE PCP has concluded that no additional thermally-related conditions of approval need to be added to the existing CoCs for this request.

### **Chapter 4: Containment**

This section of the SER covers the review of the Containment information provided in Chapter 4 of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are noted above in Chapter 1. The results of the containment review are discussed below.

The C.10 and C.11 envelope additions do not increase the loading within the containment vessels, and do not increase the evaluated maximum temperature that must be sustained or the pressure that must be contained. Therefore, package containment *leaktight* performance (in accordance with ANSI Standard N-14.5<sup>[11]</sup>) as documented in the existing Model 9975 SARP is valid for the C.10 and C.11 Content Envelope additions.

#### **Findings**

Based on the review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff has concluded that the packaging design has been adequately described to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 71.

#### **Conditions of Approval**

The DOE PCP has concluded that no additional containment-related conditions of approval need to be added to the existing CoCs for this request.

## Chapter 5: Shielding Evaluation

This section of the SER covers the review of the Shielding Evaluation information provided in Chapter 5 of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are noted above in Chapter 1. The results of the shielding review are discussed below.

The Model 9975 Package has a lead shield that provides gamma shielding. It does not have any neutron shielding features incorporated into the design and instead relies on the distance from source to external points of interest to attenuate the neutron dose rate. Other features, such as the Primary Containment Vessel (PCV) and Secondary Containment Vessel (SCV) walls, the lead shield, the Celotex<sup>®</sup>, and the drum walls, provide some additional attenuation for both neutrons and gammas. The material containers inside the PCV do not contribute much to attenuate the radiation and have not been included in the shielding analysis by the applicant. For the Hypothetical Accident Conditions (HAC) cases, only the PCV and SCV were assumed to be present, and the 1-meter dose rates were estimated from the outer surface of the SCV.

The approach taken by the applicant was to estimate the neutron and gamma source terms, based on 1 gram (g) of each isotope that could be part of the payload as presented in Table 5.2, *Content Envelope Composition*, of the Addendum.<sup>11</sup> Source terms for the neutrons and the gammas were calculated based on 1 g of the isotope without any impurities for both the metallic contents (Content Envelope C.10) and for the oxide form (Content Envelope C.11). Where appropriate, the isotopes were decayed to produce a bounding source term. Since subcritical multiplication was not included in the neutron source term, the neutron dose-rate calculations included 4,400 g of <sup>239</sup>Pu in metallic form for C.10 and oxide form for C.11 as a conservative way of accounting for these additional neutrons and their progeny. The gamma dose-rate calculations also included the 4,400 g of <sup>239</sup>Pu. Therefore, the self-shielding by the <sup>239</sup>Pu mass was accounted for, especially in the gamma dose-rate calculations. This is a reasonable assumption because contents of this mass can typically be present in the PCV.

The neutron, neutron-induced gamma, and gamma dose rates on a per gram basis were calculated for all the isotopes listed in Table 5.2, *Content Envelope Composition*, of the Addendum. The 3-sigma upper bound of the individual dose rates was determined and added up to give the total dose rate at the various measurement points. The applicant ranked these on a per gram basis by isotope.<sup>181</sup> Following this, starting with the highest contributing isotope, the contribution per gram was multiplied by the total mass of that isotope until a total mass of 4,400 g was reached for that Content Envelope. For Content Envelope C.10, the combination of <sup>240</sup>Pu and <sup>242</sup>Pu at 2,200 g each gave rise to dose rates exceeding the regulatory limits. As a result, the mass limits for <sup>240</sup>Pu and <sup>242</sup>Pu were reduced to 1,450 g and 400 g, respectively, for Content Envelope C.10. To maintain dose rates within regulatory limits, the masses of these two isotopes will be required to comply with the following criterion:

$$m^{242}\text{Pu} + 0.596m^{240}\text{Pu} \leq 1290 \text{ g}$$

The mass limit of 188.9 g of <sup>241</sup>Pu / <sup>241</sup>Am, used by the applicant, was based on the assumption that the maximum mass of <sup>241</sup>Am would be limited to 168 g to comply with the 19-W decay heat limit of the package. To achieve this mass, which would occur at approximately 73 years from

the decay of  $^{241}\text{Pu}$ , the initial mass of  $^{241}\text{Pu}$  would have to be 188.9 g (i.e., peak  $^{241}\text{Am} = 0.89^{241}\text{Pu}$ .) The DOE PCP staff notes that the actual decay heat per gram of  $^{241}\text{Am}$  is approximately 0.114 W, so the mass equivalent to 19 W would be 166.7 g of this isotope. However, the inclusion of 188.9 g of  $^{241}\text{Pu} / ^{241}\text{Am}$ , though not possible from the decay heat limitation of the package, has been confirmed by the DOE PCP staff to be compliant with external dose-rate levels when included in the payload. This finding will be discussed in more detail later in this Chapter of the SER.

For the case with impurities, the applicant included 500 g of Be as a bounding impurity and determined that the dose rates with 34 g of  $^{238}\text{Pu}$  or with 188.9 g of  $^{241}\text{Am}$  would far exceed regulatory limits. The applicant concluded that, in case of impurities being present, acceptability for shipment must be demonstrated by measurements on a case-by-case basis as described in the Model 9975 Package SARP.<sup>1,2,3,4,5</sup>

The tables presented by the applicant in the Addendum<sup>11</sup> and in Reference 5.1 to the Addendum<sup>18</sup> show different mass limits for Normal Conditions of Transport (NCT) and for HAC cases for the same contents. This seeming inconsistency is caused by using the ranking procedure that the applicant applied to achieve a bounding set of isotopes with a total mass of 4,400 g for both NCT and HAC.

The DOE PCP staff performed selected calculations on a per gram basis to confirm the applicant's results and found them to be correct. Furthermore, the DOE PCP staff combined the mass limits, presented in Table 5.2 of the Addendum<sup>11</sup> with the per gram dose rates of each isotope, to demonstrate that the regulatory external dose-rate limits for non-exclusive shipment can still be met. Table 5.1 of this SER lists the dose rates at the package surface (regulatory limit of 200 mrem/h) and at 1 m from the package surface for NCT (regulatory limit of 10 mrem/h) and the dose rate at 1 m from the SCV surface for HAC (regulatory limit of 1000 mrem/h) as calculated by the DOE PCP staff. Table 5.1 indicates that surface dose rates at NCT are close to the regulatory limits for these very conservative estimates. However, the conditions of mass limit for actinides of 4,400 g, combined with the 19-W decay heat limit, would produce much lower values of dose rates. The DOE PCP staff, based on this bounding analysis, concludes that a combination of all the isotopes at their mass limits would still meet the regulatory requirements.

**Table 5.1. Dose Rates for Non-Exclusive Shipments based on Total Limits for Isotopes**

Isotope	Mass in grams		NCT dose rate at surface in mrem/h		NCT dose rate at 1 m in mrem/h		HAC dose rate at 1 m in mrem/h	
	C.10	C.11	C.10	C.11	C.10	C.11	C.10	C.11
<sup>238</sup> Pu	34	34	7.14E+00	1.41E+01	2.03E-01	4.73E-01	2.92E-01	6.83E-01
<sup>239</sup> Pu	4400	4400	2.35E-01	4.80E+00	6.86E-03	1.61E-01	1.24E-01	5.02E-01
<sup>240</sup> Pu	1450	2200	1.18E+02	5.90E+01	3.39E+00	1.98E+00	4.70E+00	2.86E+00
<sup>242</sup> Pu	400	2200	5.48E+01	8.54E+01	1.56E+00	2.88E+00	2.16E+00	4.16E+00
<sup>241</sup> Pu/ <sup>241</sup> Am	188.9	188.9	5.57E-01	1.41E+01	1.63E-02	4.74E-01	1.68E-01	1.21E+00
<sup>243</sup> Am	1	1	6.76E-04	4.20E-03	1.94E-05	1.42E-04	2.76E-03	4.12E-03
<sup>244</sup> Cm	0.0044	0.0044	3.78E+00	1.09E+00	1.08E-01	3.66E-02	1.49E-01	5.24E-02
<sup>237</sup> Np	220	220	1.83E-01	3.56E-01	6.91E-03	1.08E-02	2.75E-01	6.71E-01
<sup>232</sup> U	0.00044	0.00044	1.22E+01	1.96E+01	3.69E-01	6.95E-01	9.50E-01	1.94E+00
<sup>233</sup> U	427	427	2.93E-03	5.64E-02	1.08E-04	1.89E-03	6.11E-03	1.73E-02
<sup>234</sup> U	4400	4400	2.67E-03	3.31E-01	7.74E-05	1.12E-02	2.40E-03	2.17E-02
<sup>235</sup> U	4400	4400	1.28E-03	1.21E-03	2.73E-05	3.72E-05	3.31E-03	8.01E-03
<sup>236</sup> U	2640	2640	2.30E-03	3.75E-03	6.57E-05	1.28E-04	5.10E-05	1.05E-04
<sup>238</sup> U	4400	4400	4.75E-03	1.35E-03	1.35E-04	4.49E-05	1.87E-04	6.56E-05
<sup>232</sup> Th	4400	4400	4.22E-08	2.49E-06	1.21E-09	8.36E-08	4.80E-08	2.25E-07
<b>Total</b>	<b>27360.90</b>	<b>29910.90</b>	<b>1.97E+02</b>	<b>1.99E+02</b>	<b>5.66E+00</b>	<b>6.73E+00</b>	<b>8.83E+00</b>	<b>1.21E+01</b>

Note: Maximum actinide mass is limited to 4,400 g and the decay heat is limited to 19 W.

### Findings

The DOE PCP staff has confirmed that the Model 9975 Package with the gram-based limits presented in Table 1.1 of the Addendum for the metallic contents and the oxide contents without any impurities will comply with the external radiation dose-rate limits set forth in 10 CFR Part 71. Any contents with impurities will require measurements on a case-by-case basis to ensure compliance with 10 CFR Part 71.

### Conditions of Approval

The revised CoCs will contain a restriction that the contents be bounded by Table 1.1 of the Addendum.

For Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 with impurities, measurements must be made as described in Appendix 5.1 to the Model 9975-85 SARP<sup>[2]</sup> and to the Model 9975-96 SARP<sup>[5]</sup> on a case-by-case basis to ensure compliance with regulatory limits on external radiation.

## Chapter 6: Criticality Evaluation

This section of the SER covers the review of the Criticality Evaluation information provided in Chapter 6 of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are listed above in Chapter 1. The results of the criticality review are discussed below.

### Criticality Evaluation

Two new Content Envelopes, C.10 and C.11, were evaluated as a part of this Model 9975 Package SARP *Justification for Gram Based Content* Addendum. The Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 are very similar to previously analyzed Content Envelopes C.3 and C.4, respectively. The isotopic contents for C.3 and C.4 were specified as weight percent of total radioactive materials mass. On the other hand, the isotopic contents for C.10 and C.11 were specified as the gram amount of material in the Content Envelope, as shown below in Table 6.1 of this SER.

**Table 6.1. Comparison of Isotopic Content Specifications for C.3/C.4 and C.10/C.11**

	C.3/C.4 (Pu/U Metal or Pu/U Oxide), wt%	C.3/C.4, grams	C.10/C.11 (Pu/U Metal or Pu/U Oxide), grams
<b><i>Fissile</i></b>			
<sup>239</sup> Pu	100	4,400	4,400
<sup>241</sup> Pu	15	660	188.9
<sup>235</sup> U	100	4,400	4,400
<sup>233</sup> U	0.5	22	427
<b><i>Fissionable</i></b>			
<sup>238</sup> Pu	2	88	34
<sup>240</sup> Pu	50	2,200	1,450 (2,200 for C.11)
<sup>242</sup> Pu	5	220	400 (2,200 for C.11)
<sup>243</sup> Am	$1 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-3}$	1
<sup>244</sup> Cm	$1 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-3}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-3}$
<sup>237</sup> Np	5	220	220
<sup>232</sup> U	$1 \times 10^{-5}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-4}$	$4.4 \times 10^{-4}$
<sup>234</sup> U	100	4,400	4,400
<sup>236</sup> U	40	1,760	2,640
<sup>238</sup> U	100	4,400	4,400
<sup>232</sup> Th	23	1012	4,400

The important differences are noted for isotopes  $^{233}\text{U}$ ,  $^{242}\text{Pu}$ ,  $^{243}\text{Am}$ ,  $^{236}\text{U}$ , and  $^{232}\text{Th}$ , where the mass of the isotopes increased. Only one out of these five isotopes is fissile ( $^{233}\text{U}$ ); the rest are fissionable. The four fissionable isotopes ( $^{242}\text{Pu}$ ,  $^{243}\text{Am}$ ,  $^{236}\text{U}$ , and  $^{232}\text{Th}$ ) have subcritical mass limits in the tens of kilograms, or more.<sup>[12,13]</sup> The subcritical mass limit of  $^{233}\text{U}$  is larger than that of  $^{239}\text{Pu}$ . For example, the subcritical mass limit for an aqueous solution of  $^{233}\text{U}$  is 500 g versus 450 g for  $^{239}\text{Pu}$ .<sup>[12]</sup> The subcritical mass limit for  $^{233}\text{U}$  metal is 6,000 g versus 5,000 g for  $^{239}\text{Pu}$ .<sup>[12]</sup> Therefore,  $^{233}\text{U}$  is bounded by  $^{239}\text{Pu}$ . It may be noted that 100 wt% of  $^{239}\text{Pu}$  (4,400 g) was used as the bounding value for criticality analyses in the Model 9975 Package SARP. This was justified, provided that the amount of  $^{240}\text{Pu}$  is greater than the amount of  $^{241}\text{Pu}$ . This condition remains unchanged for the new contents. Therefore, any increase in mass value for  $^{242}\text{Pu}$ ,  $^{243}\text{Am}$ ,  $^{236}\text{U}$ , and  $^{232}\text{Th}$  will, in fact, reduce the system reactivity so long as the total radioactive material mass remains at 4,400 g for each Model 9975 Package.

Therefore, it is concluded that the new Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 for the Model 9975 Package SARP are bounded by the original criticality evaluations for Content Envelopes C.3 and C.4, respectively. The Model 9975 Package SARP with the new Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 can be used with a Criticality Safety Index (CSI) of 2.0 without any detailed, explicit criticality analyses.

### **Findings**

Based on the review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff has concluded that the packaging design has been adequately described to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 71.

### **Conditions of Approval**

The new Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 for the Model 9975 Package can be shipped with a CSI of 2.0. The DOE PCP has concluded that no additional criticality-related conditions of approval need to be added to the existing CoCs for approval of the Submittal.

## **Chapter 7: Operating Procedures**

This section of the SER covers the review of the Operating Procedures information provided in Chapter 7 of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are noted above in Chapter 1. The results of the operating procedures review are discussed below.

The existing Model 9975 SARP provides the required procedural steps for operating the Model 9975 package. The procedural steps found in Chapter 7 of the Model 9975 SARP must be complied with as if the C.10 metal content were the same as the existing C.3 metal content and the C.11 oxide content were the same as the existing C.4 oxide content. Content verifications will comply with the Addendum Table 1.1, *C.10 and C.11 Content Envelopes*, and Addendum Table 1.1, *Table Notes*, as identified in Chapter 1 of this document. Content Envelopes C.10 and C.11 will comply with the configuration and spacer materials of Addendum Table 1.2, *Summary of Requirements by Content and Configuration*, and requirements as identified in Chapter 1 of the Submittal.

## **Findings**

Based on the review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff has concluded that the packaging design has been adequately described to meet the requirements of 10 CFR Part 71.

## **Conditions of Approval**

Because the requirements specified in the Operating Procedures Chapter of the SARP are normally incorporated in their entirety as Conditions of Approval in the CoCs, the DOE PCP has concluded that the new procedural steps specified in Chapter 7 of the Submittal must be included in the CoC. Specifically, Addendum Tables 1.1 and 1.2 must be complied with for content verifications and configuration, and spacer materials, and will be included as new Conditions of Approval in the CoCs for this request.

## **Chapter 8: Acceptance Tests and Maintenance Program**

This section of the SER covers the review of the Acceptance Tests and Maintenance Program information provided in Chapter 8 of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are noted above in Chapter 1. The results of the acceptance tests and maintenance review are discussed below.

The addition of the C.10 and C.11 Content Envelopes does not affect the maintenance of the packaging and does not affect acceptance testing. Therefore, the package acceptance testing and maintenance program documented in the existing Model 9975 Package SARP remains valid.

## **Findings**

Based on the review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff has concluded that the packaging design has been adequately described to meet the operational requirements specified in 10 CFR Part 71.

## **Conditions of Approval**

The DOE PCP has concluded that no additional conditions of approval need to be added to the existing CoCs for this request.

## **Chapter 9: Quality Assurance**

This section of the SER covers the review of the Quality Assurance (QA) program description and packaging-specific QA requirements provided in Chapter 9 of the Submittal.

Details of the items reviewed are noted above in Chapter 1. The results of the quality assurance review are discussed below.

The Submittal describes that the QA Program for the Model 9975 Packaging is described in *SARPs for the Model 9975 Packaging*.<sup>[2,5]</sup> The staff concurs that the addition of contents C.10 and C.11 do not affect the QA program as stated in Chapter 9 of the existing SARPs, and that those Chapter 9s contain reasonably up-to-date descriptions of the applicant's QA program and packaging-specific QA requirements.

## Findings

Based on review of the statements and representations in the Submittal, the DOE PCP staff concludes that the QA program has been adequately described and meets the QA requirements of 10 CFR Part 71, Subpart H. Packaging-specific requirements are adequate to assure that the packaging is designed, fabricated, assembled, tested, used, maintained, modified, and repaired in a manner consistent with its evaluation.

## Conditions of Approval

The DOE PCP has concluded that no additional QA-related conditions of approval need to be added to the existing CoCs for this request.

## References

- 
- [1] *Justification for 9975 Gram Based Content Envelopes, C.10 and C.11, Safety Analysis Report for Packaging, Model 9975, Addendum*, S-SARA-G-00007, Revision 1, Savannah River Packaging Technology, Savannah River National Laboratory, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC (August 2009).
  - [2] *Safety Analysis Report for Packaging, Model 9975*, WSRC-SA-2002-00008, Revision 0, Radioactive Materials Packaging Technology, Savannah River Technology Center, Westinghouse Savannah River Company, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC (December 2003).
  - [3] *Safety Analysis Report for Packaging, Model 9975, Addendum 1, Justification for Modified Contents Parameters*, S-SARA-G-00001, Revision 0 (April 2005).
  - [4] *Safety Analysis Report for Packaging, Model 9975, Addendum 2, Justification for U233 Content Envelope*, S-SARA-G-00002, Revision 1, Savannah River Packaging Technology, Savannah River National Laboratory, Washington Savannah River Company, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC (May 2008).
  - [5] *Safety Analysis Report for Packaging, Model 9975*, S-SARP-G-00003, Revision 0, Savannah River Packaging Technology, Savannah River National Laboratory, Washington Savannah River Company, Savannah River Site, Aiken, SC (January 2008).
  - [6] USA/9975/B(M)F-85 (DOE), *United States Department of Energy Certificate of Compliance for Radioactive Materials Packages, Model 9975*, Revision 21, United States Department of Energy, Washington, DC, expires March 31, 2011.
  - [7] USA/9975/B(M)F-96 (DOE), *United States Department of Energy Certificate of Compliance for Radioactive Materials Packages, Model 9975*, Revision 1, United States Department of Energy, Washington, DC, expires June 30, 2013.
  - [8] *Shielding Analysis of LLNL Contents for Addendum to 9975 Shipping Package SARP*, N-CLC-G-00133, Revision 1, A.H. Bridges and S.J. Nathan, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, August 2009.
  - [9] *Nuclear Criticality Safety Evaluation 9975 Shipping Package for LLNL Contents Addendum*, N-NCS-G-00129, S.J. Nathan and J.A. Schlessler, Savannah River Nuclear Solutions, March 19, 2009.
  - [10] Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 10 CFR Part 71, *Compatibility with IAEA Transportation Standards (TS-R-1) and Other Transportation Safety Amendments*; Final Rule, 69 F.R. 3698, pp. 3698–3814, January 26, 2004, as amended.

- [11] American National Standards Institute, *American National Standard for Radioactive Materials-Leakage Tests on Packages for Shipment*, ANSI N14.5-1997, New York, New York, 10036.
- [12] ANSI/ANS-8.1-1998, *Nuclear Criticality Safety in Operations with Fissionable Materials Outside Reactors*, American Nuclear Society, La Grange Park, Illinois (1998).
- [13] ANSI/ANS-8.15-1981, *Nuclear Criticality Control of Special Actinide Elements*, American Nuclear Society, La Grange Park, Illinois (1981).