10 CFR 71.95 REPORT EVALUATION FORM

Docket No.: 71-9341

Package Model No.: BRR

Report Submitted By: John P. Foster, MIT Nuclear Reactor Laboratory

Report Date: August 26, 2015.

Report ADAMS Accession No.: ML15243A035

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 Monday August 17, 2015, during loading operations of the BRR package, MIT's Reactor staff (MIT or the user) performed a visual inspection of the sealing surfaces on the Model No. BRR closure lid and the mating surfaces of the package body. The MIT staff discovered a gouge/dent on the mating surface where the outer O-ring seal (the test seal) rests. The surface of this annular region should be as shown in Drawing No. 1910-01-01-SAR, Revision 4, in order to ensure that gaskets (seals) provide a proper sealing surface for the closure lid. The MIT staff notified AREVA Federal Services LLC (AFS or the certificate holder) of the damaged surface. The decision was made to suspend the shipment, repair the package on-site, and leak test the package prior to use. "These repairs entail adding appropriate filler material to the damaged surface by welding/grinding/polishing the affected area." There were no safety consequences of this event.

4. Corrective actions taken by the licensee:

Per letter dated August 26, 2015, and e-mail dated March 1, 2017, the package user and the certificate holder took the following actions:

- The user contacted the certificate holder and informed it about the damage. The user and the certificate holder agreed to take the package out of service and to repair the package on-site.

10 CFR 71.95 REPORT EVALUATION FORM

Docket No.: 71-9341

Package Model No.: BRR

Report Submitted By: John P. Foster, MIT Nuclear Reactor Laboratory

Report Date: August 26, 2015.

Report ADAMS Accession No.: ML15243A035

4. Corrective actions taken by the licensee:

(Continue)

- The certificate holder sent its contractor to repair the package under AFS Purchase Order (P.O.) No. 15C3013389. The contractor performed the repair on September 1, 2015. The user provided a copy of the repair report. The report includes information related to the repair including qualifications of the contractor and the person who performed the repair. On September 1, 2015, an AFS Quality Engineer inspected the repair.

- On September 2, 2015, a DOE-certified leak test examiner performed a leak test to the empty package and the package passed the test. The user provided a copy of the post repair leak test procedure for the repair of the Model No. BRR (ADAMS Accession No. ML17065A031).

- Per the U.S. DOE's recommendation, since the time of the incident, DOE tasked a contractor to develop a procedure (ADAMS Accession No. ML17065A033) for an independent inspection of the BRR cask of all sealing surfaces upon arrival and after loading.

5. Staff comments:

The staff contacted MIT, including by e-mail, to gather additional information related to its report submitted on August 25, 2015 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15243A035). MIT submitted the additional information requested by the staff by e-mail dated March 1, 2017, (ADAMS Accession No. ML17065A025). Per this e-mail, MIT (the user) pointed out that it was determined that the package's non-compliance did not occur at MIT's facility. The staff used the information provided by MIT to complete the evaluation of the report submitted by MIT on August 26, 2015. The staff's evaluation does not constitute approval of the procedures submitted as supplemental information for this evaluation.

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.

__ There is a need to take additional action. Provide a summary of the bases and recommended actions:

10 CFR 71.95 REPORT EVALUATION FORM

Docket No.: 71-9341
Package Model No.: BRR
Report Submitted By: John P. Foster, MIT Nuclear reactor Laboratory
Report Date: August 26, 2015.
Report ADAMS Accession No.: ML15243A035

4. Corrective actions taken by the licensee:

(Continue)

- The certificate holder sent its contractor to repair the package under AFS Purchase Order (P.O.) No. 15C3013389. The contractor performed the repair on September 1, 2015. The user provided a copy of the repair report. The report includes information related to the repair including qualifications of the contractor and the person who performed the repair. On September 1, 2015, an AFS Quality Engineer inspected the repair.

- On September 2, 2015, a DOE-certified leak test examiner performed a leak test to the empty package and the package passed the test. The user provided a copy of the post repair leak test procedure for the repair of the Model No. BRR (ADAMS Accession No. ML17065A031).

- Per the U.S. DOE's recommendation, since the time of the incident, DOE tasked a contractor to develop a procedure (ADAMS Accession No. ML17065A033) for an independent inspection of the BRR cask of all sealing surfaces upon arrival and after loading.

5. Staff comments:

The staff contacted MIT, including by e-mail, to gather additional information related to its report submitted on August 25, 2015 (ADAMS Accession No. ML15243A035). MIT submitted the additional information requested by the staff by e-mail dated March 1, 2017, (ADAMS Accession No. ML17065A025). Per this e-mail, MIT (the user) pointed out that it was determined that the package's non-compliance did not occur at MIT's facility. The staff used the information provided by MIT to complete the evaluation of the report submitted by MIT on August 26, 2015. The staff's evaluation does not constitute approval of the procedures submitted as supplemental information for this evaluation.

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.

__ There is a need to take additional action. Provide a summary of the bases and recommended actions:

DISTRIBUTION:
SFST 71.95 Report File
R. Powell, RI S. Walker, RII M. Kunowski, RIII J. Whitten, RIV D. Marcano
R. Boyle and M. Conroy, Department of Transportation
R. Sun and A. McIntosh, MSTR NMED Project Manager
G:\SFST\Part 71\71.95 reports\71.95 Report Evaluations\71-9341_8-26-15.doc
ADAMS Package No.: ML17107A164

OFFICE	DSFM	DSFM	DSFM
NAME	NGarcia Santos	SFigueroa by email	JMcKirgan
DATE	3/22/2017	3/29/17	4/14/17

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY