CoC Condition/TS Identifier: A-	1.1
---------------------------------	-----

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less conservative direction"?

Requirement			Appendix A Section 1.1: Definitions
CoC Body	Section I. Technology		No
Certified Design	Section II. Design Features		No
Appendix A - Inspe	ections, Tests, and		No
Evaluations			
	Section 1 Definitions, Use and Application		Yes
	Section 2 Approved	A1	No
	Contents (Selection		No
	Criteria)	A3	No
Appendix B.	Section 3 Limiting	L1	No
Technical	Conditions for	L2	No
Specifications	Operation (LCOs)*	L3	No
	and Surveillance		
	Requirements (SRs)		
	(Selection Criteria)		
	Section 4 Administrat	ive	No
	Controls		
	A significant increase in the probability or consequences of an		N <u>o</u> ∕A
	accident previously		
Risk Insight**:	evaluated in the cask		
Will removing	FSAR?		
this The possibility of a new or			N <u>o</u> /A
requirement	different kind of accid		
from the CoC/TS	being created compared		
result in	to those previously		
	evaluated in the FSAR?		
	A Significant reduction in		N <u>o</u> /A
	the margin of safety for		
	ISFSI or cask operation	n?	
Evaluation Summa	ary		Move to Appendix B Section 1 as it meets the
			criterion for inclusion in the new TS format (Use and
			Application).

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

CoC Condition/TS	Identifier:	A-1.2

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less conservative direction"?

Requirement	Requirement		Appendix A Section 1.2: Logical Connectors: The purpose of this section is to explain the meaning of
			logical connectors.
CoC Body	Section I. Technology		No
Certified Design	Section II. Design Feat	tures	No
Appendix A - Inspe	ections, Tests, and		No
Evaluations			
	Section 1 Definitions,	Use	Yes
	and Application		
	Section 2 Approved	A1	No
	Contents (Selection	A2	No
	Criteria)	A3	No
Appendix B.	Section 3 Limiting	L1	No
Technical	Conditions for	L2	No
Specifications	Operation (LCOs)*	L3	No
	and Surveillance		
	Requirements (SRs)		
	(Selection Criteria)		
	Section 4 Administrative		No
Controls		_	(-
	A significant increase in		N <u>o</u> /A
the probability or consequences of an			
	accident previously evaluated in the cask FSAR? The possibility of a new or different kind of accident		
Dick Inciah+**			
Risk Insight**: Will removing			
this			No /A
requirement			Noj A
from the CoC/TS	being created compar		
result in			
	evaluated in the FSAR?		
	A Significant reduction in		No/A
	the margin of safety f		
	ISFSI or cask operation?		
Evaluation Summa	ary		Move to Appendix B Section 1 as it meets the
			criterion for inclusion in the new TS format (Use and
			Application).

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

CoC Condition/TS	Identifier:	A-1.3

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less conservative direction"?

Requirement			Appendix A Section 1.3: Completion Times: The
			purpose of this section is to establish the Completion
			Time convention and to provide guidance for its use.
CoC Body	Section I. Technology		No
Certified Design	Section II. Design Fea	tures	No
Appendix A - Insp	ections, Tests, and		No
Evaluations			
	Section 1 Definitions, Use		Yes
	and Application		
	Section 2 Approved	A1	No
	Contents (Selection	A2	No
	Criteria)	A3	No
Appendix B.	Section 3 Limiting	L1	No
Technical	Conditions for	L2	No
Specifications	Operation (LCOs)*	L3	No
	and Surveillance		
	Requirements (SRs)		
	(Selection Criteria)		
Section 4 Administrative Controls		ive	No
	A significant increase	in	N <u>o</u> /A
	the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the cask FSAR? The possibility of a new or		
Risk Insight**:			
Will removing			
this			N <u>o</u> /A
requirement	different kind of accid		
from the CoC/TS	being created compa	red	
result in	to those previously		
	evaluated in the FSAF		No./A
	A Significant reduction in the margin of safety for		N <u>o</u> ∕A
Evaluation Comme	ISFSI or cask operatio	1115	Mayo to Appondix P Soction 1 as it mosts the
Evaluation Summary			Move to Appendix B Section 1 as it meets the
			criterion for inclusion in the new TS format (Use and
			Application).

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

CoC Condition/TS	Identifier:	A-1.4

^{**} In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less conservative direction"?

Requirement	quirement		Appendix A Section 1.4: Frequency: The purpose of this section is to define the proper use and
			application of Frequency requirements.
CoC Body	Section I. Technology		No
Certified Design	Section II. Design Feat	ures	No
Appendix A - Inspe	ections, Tests, and		No
Evaluations			
	Section 1 Definitions,	Use	Yes
	and Application		
	Section 2 Approved	A1	No
	Contents (Selection	A2	No
	Criteria)	A3	No
Appendix B.	Section 3 Limiting	L1	No
Technical	Conditions for	L2	No
Specifications	Operation (LCOs)*	L3	No
	and Surveillance		
	Requirements (SRs)		
	(Selection Criteria)		
Section 4 Administrative Controls		ive	No
	A significant increase	in	N <u>o</u> ∕A
	the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated in the cask FSAR? The possibility of a new or different kind of accident		
5.11.144			
Risk Insight**:			
Will removing			No /A
this			N <u>o</u> ∕A
requirement from the CoC/TS	being created compar		
result in	to those previously	eu	
result III	evaluated in the FSAR	2	
			No/A
	A Significant reduction in the margin of safety for		\ <u>\</u>
ISFSI or cask operation?			
Evaluation Summa			Move to Appendix B Section 1 as it meets the
	1		criterion for inclusion in the new TS format (Use and
			Application).

^{*} All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

*	All LCOs also require a	n Annlicability	(Canditian(c)	Poguired Action(c)	Completion Time(c)	
	All ECOS also reduite a	ın Abbilcabilin	z, conuniones,	. Neuulieu Aciionisi.	Completion inners).	

A-5.8

CoC Condition/TS Identifier:

* All LCOs also require an Applicability, Condition(s), Required Action(s), Completion Time(s), Surveillance Requirement(s), and Frequency(ies). Refer to NUREG-1745 for additional guidance.

** In performing the risk insight evaluation above, the evaluator should think about subsequent changes to a relocated CoC requirement. Specifically, ask the question "what is the likelihood and worst possible consequences of a future change to this requirement in the less conservative direction"?

Requirement		Appendix A Section 5.8: Fabrication Helium Leak Test
		At completion of welding the MPC shell to baseplate, an MPC confinement weld helium leak test shall be performed using a helium mass spectrometer. This test shall include the base metals of the MPC shell and baseplate. A helium leak test shall also be performed on the base metal of the fabricated MPC lid. The confinement boundary leakage rate tests shall be performed in accordance with ANSI N14.5 to "leaktight" criteria. If a leakage rate exceeding the acceptance criteria is detected, then the area of leakage shall be determined and the area repaired per ASME Code Section III, Subsection NB requirements. Re-testing shall be performed until the leakage rate acceptance criterion is met. Casks initially loaded to Amendments No. 2 through 7 must meet the following: Casks fabricated on or after July 1, 2009 a fabrication helium leak test at completion of the welding of the MPC shell to baseplate must be performed in accordance with the above requirements. Casks loaded before July 1, 2009 must meet the fabrication helium leak test requirements of the lid base metal of the amendment to which they were originally loaded. Casks loaded before July 1, 2009 do not meet the above fabrication helium leak test requirements
CoC Dody		after MPC shell to baseplate welding. These casks
		may be upgraded to Amendment 15.
CoC Body Certified Design	Section I. Technology	No No
	Section II. Design Features	No VacNo
Evaluations	ections, Tests, and	<u>Yes</u> No
	Section 1 Definitions, Use and Application	<u>No</u> Yes