

From: Samantha Mason [mailto:samantha.mason@theratronics.ca]
Sent: Wednesday, June 07, 2017 1:48 PM
To: Vera, John <John.Vera@nrc.gov>
Subject: [External_Sender] RE: Potential changes to CofC 9290

Good morning Mr Vera,

The revised application will take some time. We do have the safety analysis as required for the CNSC licence, however it was done over 10 years ago and needs an internal review. And it would be for the added Ci limits and higher weight. I think we will put this on hold until there is stronger demand.

As for the consolidated SAR, please find the missing drawing attached. It was included in the submission, but perhaps the scanners missed it (it was a large document!) Do you have an estimate on the time to completion of the review? We have a site looking at an internal relocation in July/August so I was going to see if they would like a letter to confirm the package is still allowed for use past expiry if you think it will take more time.

Samantha Mason

Radiation Safety Officer

Best Theratronics

samantha.mason@theratronics.ca

phone 613-591-2100 ext: 2029

fax 613-591-5680

From: Vera, John [mailto:John.Vera@nrc.gov]
Sent: May-09-17 3:37 PM
To: Samantha Mason
Subject: RE: Potential changes to CofC 9290

Hi Samantha,

I looked through what you sent, the current CoC, and drawings, and as far as I can see, what you have approved right now is the GC-40 configuration for 2000 Ci of CS-137. Which of the other two configurations (GC1000/GC3000 or IBL 437) are you seeking approval for? It seems that both of the other configurations have higher Ci limits than currently allowed, which means you would need to demonstrate radiation safety compliance with the higher Curie content. The IBL 437 model is also heavier than the currently approved configuration, we would also need to know the max weights of the proposed contents for any instance. If the weights are higher than currently approved, you would need to provide additional demonstration of performance for normal condition of transport and hypothetical accident conditions for these additional contents, since the testing prototype for you licensing basis, as detailed in the SAR, is a GC-40.

Also, it looks like your consolidated SAR for the renewal does not include sheet 3 of drawing F643001-001, which is necessary as it is incorporated in the CoC. I am still reviewing it so I will provide more feedback later.

Regards,
John A. Vera, Ph.D.

Project Manager
NMSS/DSFM/SFLB
Email (Best way to contact): john.vera@nrc.gov
301-415-5790

From: Samantha Mason [<mailto:samantha.mason@theratronics.ca>]
Sent: Monday, May 08, 2017 12:44 PM
To: Vera, John <John.Vera@nrc.gov>
Subject: [External_Sender] Potential changes to CofC 9290

Good morning John,

Here is the Canadian certificate with the additional drawings for what we would like to add to the certificate. It is under the US DOT as USA/0674/B(U) if the attachments do not go through. As you can see, the outer shielding remains the same, however as the inner components holding the sources are different the safety analysis for each unit is different.

I was mistaken when I typed the 9310 in the original request. This is the one that the is currently under review for a consolidated SAR. We do not want to hold up the current certificate review, so if this will take time from that we can delay the amendment until later in the year.

Sam

Samantha Mason

Radiation Safety Officer

Best Theratronics

samantha.mason@theratronics.ca

phone 613-591-2100 ext: 2029

fax 613-591-5680