
Event Details for Item No: 000557

EVENT DATE

10-APR-00

DISCOVER DATE

10-APR-00

REPORT DATE

11-MAY-00

LICENSEE INFORMATION**Name:** U.S. ENRICHMENT CORP.**License Number:** USEC-K**City:** PADUCAH**State:** KY**Region:** 3**Agreement State Status:** NO **Reportable Event:** Y **Abnormal Occurrence:** N

ABSTRACT: The licensee reported that the conditions of approval in Certificate of Compliance (CoC) #6553, revision 15, were not observed in making shipments of UF6 cylinders in Paducah Tiger Overpacks (PTOs). The CoC requires that the cylinders be inspected, tested, maintained, assembled, and used in accordance with ANSI N14-1-1990. The cylinders must be designed and fabricated in accordance with ANSI N14.1-1990 or an earlier version in effect at the time of fabrication. On 4/10/2000, the licensee became aware that a group of cylinders manufactured by W.H. Stewart Company (model 48X and 48Y) were not in compliance with the letter of the standard in effect at the time of fabrication. Specifically, the cylinders were fabricated with a steelhead thickness of "nominal" 0.625 inches instead of the "minimum" 0.625 inches required by ANSI N14.1-1982. This occurred because W. H. Stewart Company fabricated a number of cylinders in accordance with the 1971 edition of the ANSI standard after the 1982 edition was approved. The Department of Transportation had granted an exemption for this deviation stating that the exemption would no longer be required when the cylinders were re-certified. The minimum wall thickness for used cylinders at re-certification is 0.5 inches; these cylinders meet the minimum thickness for re-certification. The licensee suspended shipment of all cylinders fabricated by W.H. Stewart Company and revised their procedure to require checking the cylinder's date of fabrication prior to loading.

EVENT CLASSIFICATION**Event Type:** FCP **Cause:** MANUFACTURER'S ERROR (WRONG MARKING, SPEC)**Reporting Requirements:** 71.95(c) - THE 30 DAY REPORT OF ANY INSTANCES IN WHICH THE CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL IN THE CERTIFICATE OF COMPLIANCE WERE NOT OBSERVED IN MAKING A SHIPMENT.**KEY WORD INFORMATION****Key Word:** CYLINDER, UF6 PRODUCT**EQUIPMENT INFORMATION****System Level****System ID:** CYLINDER, UF6 PRODUCT**Manufacturer:** W.H. STEWART CO.**Model Number:** 48X**Serial Number:** NR**Manufacture Date:** NR**Consequences:** FIELD NOT USED**System Level****System ID:** CYLINDER, UF6 PRODUCT**Manufacturer:** W.H. STEWART CO.**Model Number:** 48Y**Serial Number:** NR**Manufacture Date:** NR**Consequences:** FIELD NOT USED**REFERENCE DOCUMENTS****Report ID
Number****Type of Report**

003730316

LICENSEE REPORT

Glenn
Chris
tescon
per in notes

10 CFR 71.95 EVALUATION FORM

Review the incoming report to identify any issues that warrant additional Commission or staff action. The review should consider, (a) whether the report identifies a generic concern with a particular package design or package type, (b) if the report merits additional action, and (c) the safety significance of the issue. Attach a copy of the 71.95 report to this evaluation form. NOTE: high safety significance represents a potential for significant radiation exposure, medium safety significance represents a potential for some moderate radiation exposure, and low safety significance represents little or no potential for radiation exposure.

Report submitted by: Steven Baggett

Date: 8/14/00

1. The staff has concluded that;

The report does NOT identify generic design or license/certificate issues that warrant additional Commission or staff action.

There is a need to take additional action. Provide the brief summary of the bases.

Revision 17 to CoC No. 6553 was made to allow for the continued use of casks fabricated under an older but accepted ANSI standard.

2. What is the safety significance of the issues (high, medium, low)?

3. With regard to the staff assessment of the safety significance and need for follow-up;

Based on the safety significance of the issues, the staff recommends NO specific action be taken with regard to this report.

Based on the significance of the issues, the staff believes that additional follow-up is warranted. Provide a brief description of the recommended actions.

4. Based on the considerations discussed above, the staff considers this 71.95 Report;

CLOSED. No further SFPO action is anticipated.

OPEN. The recommended actions are identified in item 3 above.

Reviewed by: *[Signature]*

Date: 8/14/00

Approved by: *[Signature]*

Date: 8/15/00

Evaluation Form Accession # _____

Distribution of this form and attachment (add additional people as appropriate):

Region III
EZiegler
71-6553 Docket File/Central File
PUBLIC

SSoong (GAP Coordinator)