

## 10 CFR 71.95 REPORT EVALUATION FORM

**Docket No.:** 71-9036 and 71-9056

**Package Model No.:** SPEC 2-T and SPEC C-1

**Report Submitted By:** Source Production and Equipment Company (SPEC)

**Report Date:** July 22, 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:

The Model Nos. SPEC 2-T and SPEC C-1 Certificates of Compliance (CoCs) requires the use of a 12 gallon drum overpack made of 20-22 gauge steel. From April 16, 2003, to May 25, 2005, 12 gallon drum overpacks made of 24 gauge steel were inadvertently used.

On April 16, 2003, SPEC received an order of 24 gauge steel drums that were not in accordance with the purchase order. None of the documents accompanying the order showed the drums to be 24 gauge steel rather than 20-22 gauge steel. It was only during a recent reorder of the drums was the discrepancy noted.

### 4. Corrective actions taken by the licensee:

The 24 gauge drums are being returned to SPEC and replaced with the correct 20-22 gauge steel drums within 45 days of July 22, 2005. A new QA procedure has been implemented that requires QA Inspectors to notify the QA Manager when purchase specifications cannot be verified by established means. The QA Manager shall obtain conformance certificates from the vendor, specify alternate inspection techniques, or other wise specify the means to verify conformance.

# 10 CFR 71.95 REPORT EVALUATION FORM

**Docket No.:** 71-9036 and 71-9056

**Package Model No.:** SPEC 2-T and SPEC C-1

**Report Submitted By:** Source Production and Equipment Company (SPEC)

**Report Date:** July 22, 2005

**5. Staff comments:** None

**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:**

SFPO 71.95 Report File      Greg Morrel (IMNS Regional Coordinator)      J. Peralta (TSSI SC)      S. Baggett  
M. Burgess (NMED Project Manager)      R. Bellamy, I      D. Collins, II      J. Madera, III      B. Spitzberg, IV  
N. Osgood      M. Rahimi      J. Umana      J. Caverly      J. Cuadrado

G:\SFPO\71.95 reports\71.95 Report Evaluations\5805

<b>OFC</b>	SFPO	N	SFPO		SFPO		SFPO			
<b>NAME</b>	S. Williams		M. Debose		R. Lewis					
<b>DATE</b>	9/23/05		9/26/05		9/29/05					

C = COVER E = COVER & ENCLOSURE N = NO COPY

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY