

71-9006

FCTC:RHO
71-9006

JAN 27 1986

RETURN TO
J. Machlin
396-SS

Tech/Ops RPD, Inc.
ATTN: Mr. John J. Munro, III
40 North Avenue
Burlington, MA 01803

Gentlemen:

This refers to your application dated August 12, 1985, requesting an amendment to the Model No. AI 500 SU package.

In connection with our review, we need the information identified in the enclosure to this letter.

Please advise us within 30 days from the date of this letter when this information will be provided. The additional information requested by this letter should be submitted in the form of revised pages. If you have any questions regarding this matter, we would be pleased to meet with you and your staff.

Sincerely,

Original Signed by
CHARLES E. MACDONALD
Charles E. MacDonald, Chief
Transportation Certification Branch
Division of Fuel Cycle and
Material Safety, NMSS

Enclosure: As stated

Distribution: w/encl
RHodegaarden (2)
DTHuang
CEWilliams
Docket File
NRC PDR
IE HQ
Region I
NMSS R/F
FCTC R/F

B602050025 B60127
PDR ADOCK 07109006
C PDR

OFFICE	FCTC	FCTC	FCTC	FCTC		
SURNAME	RHodegaarden:alm	DTHuang	CEWilliams	CEMacDonald		
DATE	01/24/86	01/24/86	01/24/86	01/24/86		

Tech/Ops RPD, Inc.
Model No. AI 500 SU Package
Docket No. 71-9006

Encl to ltr dtd: JAN 27 1986

DRAWINGS

- DRAWINGS
1. Sheets 1 and 3 of Drawing No. AI500SU90 do not reflect a modification to the design of the source hold-down arrangement. Furthermore, the space plate shown on Sheets 1 and 3 do not appear to be in agreement with each other.
 2. Some of the information presented on Sheets 1 through 5 of Drawing No. AI500SU90 are not legible.
 3. It is not clear that the drawings are in agreement with the description of the lock mechanism. The drawings should be revised to clearly show the various components of the lock mechanism in both the locked and unlocked position (including dimensions of the lock box, materials, weld specifications, etc.).

STRUCTURAL

STRUCTURAL

The modified lock box appears to be larger than the original lock box. Since the dimensions of the modified lock box are not specified, it is not clear what clearance exists between the cover and the modified lock box. Also, neither the orientation nor the impact surface was specified for the 30-foot drop test and the puncture test in the original safety analysis for Model No. AI 500 SU package. Therefore, the HRC staff cannot evaluate the effects of the 30-foot drop test followed by a puncture test on the package. Previous tests on padlocks have resulted in failure of the lock. The effect of the puncture test on the lock box should not assume the protection of the cover plate.

OPERATING PROCEDURES

The page numbering in Section 7.0, Operating Procedures, should be corrected. There appears to be three different numbering systems used.

[illegible]