

MEMORANDUM FOR: Steve R. Ruffin, SGTB, NMSS

FROM: Henry W. Lee, SGTB, NMSS

SUBJECT: REVIEW OF AMERSHAM CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE MODEL 934 SHIPPING PACKAGE

I have reviewed the response dated February 19, 1992, supplemented March 9, 1992, by Amersham Corporation to our request for additional information dated November 29, 1991, for the Model 934 shipping package.

In order to complete my review, the applicant should provide the information listed below:

1. Revision C of Drawing Number 93400D, Sheet 1 through 7. These drawings were missing from the February submittal and the March supplement mistakenly submitted copies of revision B of the drawings.
2. Specify on the drawing the standards, codes, and procedures used for fabrication, welding, inspection, and the acceptance criteria.
3. On Drawing No. 93400D, Sheet 1, the 1/8" fillet weld at the outshell flange should be deleted and the weld at the lower shield collar appears to be more than just 1/8" fillet weld. Revise the drawing or provide justification.
4. Provide a narrative description of how the actuator unit is secured in place. What are the clamping forces on the Viton rubber seals?
5. The applicant performed 30-foot drop and 40-inch puncture on a Model 650 and Model 660 to demonstrate the effect of -20°F on the uranium shield. The application failed to show the similarity of Model 650 and 660 with respect to Model 934. Also, it is not clear that the drop orientations were the most damaging to the uranium shield. Provide justification.
6. The application did not show that a 30-foot corner drop onto the padlock and closure head cap crews would not result in the source being moved or released. The analysis should consider the effects of a subsequent puncture test in the most damaging orientation.

Original Signed by

Henry W. Lee  
SGTB, NMSS

Distributions:

NRC FC  
NMSS r/f  
SGTB r/f  
BHWhite  
HWLee

9807270217 980720  
PDR FOIA  
PIPER98-174 PDR

*HWL*  
110

**NRC FILE CENTER COPY**

MEMORANDUM FOR: Steve R. Ruffin, SGTB, NMSS  
FROM: Henry W. Lee, SGTB, NMSS  
SUBJECT: REVIEW OF AMERSHAM CORPORATION'S RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR  
ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR THE MODEL 934 SHIPPING PACKAGE

I have reviewed the response dated February 19, 1992, supplemented March 9, 1992, by Amersham Corporation to our request for additional information dated November 29, 1991, for the Model 934 shipping package.

In order to complete my review, the applicant should provide the information listed below:

1. Revision C of Drawing Number 93400D, Sheet 1 through 7. These drawings were missing from the February submittal and the March supplement mistakenly submitted copies of revision B of the drawings.
2. Specify on the drawing the standards, codes, and procedures used for fabrication, welding, inspection, and the acceptance criteria.
3. On Drawing No. 93400D, Sheet 1, the 1/8" fillet weld at the outshell flange should be deleted and the weld at the lower shield collar appears to be more than just 1/8" fillet weld. Revise the drawing or provide justification.
4. Provide a narrative description of how the actuator unit is secured in place. What are the clamping forces on the Viton rubber seals?
5. The applicant performed 30-foot drop and 40-inch puncture on a Model 650 and Model 660 to demonstrate the effect of -20°F on the uranium shield. The application failed to show the similarity of Model 650 and 660 with respect to Model 934. Also, it is not clear that the drop orientations were the most damaging to the uranium shield. Provide justification.
6. The application did not show that a 30-foot corner drop onto the padlock and closure head cap crews would not result in the source being moved or released. The analysis should consider the effects of a subsequent puncture test in the most damaging orientation.

Original Signed by

Henry W. Lee  
SGTB, NMSS

Distribution:

NRC FC  
NMSS r/f  
SGTB r/f  
BHWhite  
HWLee

9807270217 980720  
PDR FOIA  
PIPER98-174 PDR

*HWL*  
110  
**NRC FILE CENTER COPY**