

10 CFR 71.95 REPORT EVALUATION FORM

Docket No.: 71-9218

Page 1 of 3

Package Model No.: TRUPACT-II

Report Submitted By: P.C. Gregory

Report Date: June 17, 2005

Review the incoming report to determine if additional Commission or staff action is warranted. The review should consider whether the report identifies a generic defect or problem with the package design and the safety significance of the issue. Note that a 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.

1. The report identifies:

- ☒ Significant reduction in the effectiveness of a package during use;
- ☒ Defect with a safety significance;
- ☐ Shipment in which conditions of the approval were not observed.

2. What is the safety significance? ☒ High ☒ Medium ☐ Low

3. Summary of the report:

On May 21, 2005, shipment No. RL4007 was arrived at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP) from the Hanford Site. The TRUPACT-II unit 140 included in the shipment contained a 12-inch Pipe Overpack Container (POC 31414) assembly. The applicable Payload Container Transportation Certification Document (PCTCD) and Payload Assembly Transportation Certification Document (PATCD) indicated two billet cans with a total of 58 Pu-239 fissile gram equivalent (FGE) in the POC 31414. The POC was emplaced at WIPP on May 22, 2004. On April 20, 2005, Hanford personnel discovered that the verified data for POC 31414 reflected the contents as three billet cans for a total of 144 FGE. Therefore, more FGE than what was indicated in PCTCD and PATCD was shipped and emplaced at WIPP. However, the TRUPACT-II Certificate of Compliance limit of 200 FGE for a POC was never exceeded.

4. Corrective actions taken by the licensee:

- Applicable Waste Certification procedures are being assessed for adequacy and will be revised as necessary
- The certification officials have received additional training

10 CFR 71.95 REPORT EVALUATION FORM

Docket No.: 71-9218

Page 2 of 3

Package Model No.: TRUPACT-II

Report Submitted By: P.C. Gregory

Report Date: June 17, 2005

5. Staff comments:

There were no safety consequences as a result of the event.

6. Staff conclusion:

- : The report does NOT identify generic design or license/certificate issues that warrant additional Commission or staff action. This report is considered closed.
- 9 There is a need to take additional action. Provide a summary of the bases and recommended actions:

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC SFPO 71.95 Report File R. Torres (NMSS GAP Coordinator) J. Peralta (TSSI SC)
R. Bellamy, I D. Collins, II J. Madera, III B. Spitzberg, IV
E:\Filenet\ML052440585.wpd ML052440585

OFC	SFPO		SFPO		SFPO					
NAME	MRahimi		MDeBose		RLewis					
DATE	08/29 /05		08/29/05		08/31/05					

C = COVER

E = COVER & ENCLOSURE

N = NO COPY

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY