27
10-25-78
2-2-1979

3151

MASTER

SAND78-0724 (Revised)
Unlimited Release

Plutonium Accident Resistant Container Project

John A. Andersen

Sandia Laboratories

SAND78-0724 (Revised)
Unlimited Release
Printed May 1978
Revised September 1978

PLUTONIUM ACCIDENT RESISTANT CONTAINER PROJECT^{*}

John A. Andersen
Transportation Safety Technology Division 5433
Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87185

NOTICE

This report was prepared as an account of work sponsored by the United States Government. Neither the United States nor the United States Department of Energy, nor any of their employees, nor any of their contractors, subcontractors, or their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights.

ABSTRACT

The PARC (plutonium accident resistant container) project resulted in the design, development, and certification testing of a crashworthy air-transportable plutonium package (shipping container) for certification by the USNRC (Nuclear Regulatory Commission). This PAT-1 (plutonium air transportable) package survives a very severe sequential test program of impact, crush, puncture, slash, burn, and water immersion. There is also an individual hydrostatic pressure test. The package has a payload mass capacity of 2 kg of PuO_2 and a thermal capacity of 25 watts. The design rationale for very high energy absorption (impact, crush, puncture, and slash protection) with residual high-level fire protection, resulted in a reasonably small air-transportable package, advancing the packaging state-of-art. Optimization design iterations were utilized in the areas of impact energy absorption and stress and thermal analysis. Package test results are presented in relation to radioactive materials containment acceptance criteria, shielding and criticality standards.

^{*}Project funded by the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author is indebted to a number of people who, directly or indirectly, have been instrumental in this work. Among many expert and dedicated people, the contributions of Brian J. Joseph were outstanding. Also, William Lahs, Jerry Wallace, Ken Cole, Walt Von Riesenmann, Ron Pope, Bob Jefferson, Bill Snyder, Mike Stone, Bill Hartman, Will Schmidt, Jim Stark, Steve Sutherland, Lloyd Nelson, Nick DeLollis, Charlie Maak, Tom Duffey, Steve Dupree, Bob Nilson, Van Luhrs, Hank Guttmann, Phil Owens, and Rick Matchette made significant independent contributions.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction and General	7
Air Qualified Overpack (AQ-1)	10
Containment Vessel (TB-1)	14
Product Can (PC-1)	17
Thermal Analysis	18
Test Program	18
Other	21
Conclusion	23
APPENDIX A -- Crush-Energy Absorption and Char Properties of Materials	25
APPENDIX B -- Analysis of Package Impact	31
References	33

TABLES

<u>Table</u>		
I	Qualification Criteria	8
II	Acceptance Criteria	9
III	Summary of Qualification Tests, PAT-1 Package	20
IV	Examples of Allowable Mass Release Rates -- IAEA "A2," Safety Series No. 6 and NUREG-0360	20
V	Shielding and Criticality	21
VI	Results of 10 CFR 71 Qualification Tests, PAT-1 Package	22
VII	Containment Vessel Integrity	23

ILLUSTRATIONS

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	PAT-1 Package Exterior	9
2	PAT-1 Plutonium Air Transportable Package, Cutaway	10
3	AQ-1 Closure	11
4	Accident Resistant Container Materials Evaluation	11
5	Char Performance	12
6	Average Crush Stress for Redwood as a Function of Temperature	13
7	Impact Energy Balance	13
8	Impact Energy Balance	14
9	PAT-1 Package Interior	15
10	TB-1 Containment Vessel with PC-1 Product Can	16
11	Containment Vessel Seal	16
12	Containment Vessel Finite Element Stress Analysis	17
13	Finite Difference Internal Heat Model	18
14	Finite Difference External Heat Model	19
A-1	Energy Absorbed per Unit Mass of Material	25
A-2	Energy Absorbed per Unit Volume of Material	26
A-3	Comparison of Char Depths (Distance of Exposure Surface to 550°F Point) versus Time for an 1850°F Blackbody Radiation Source	27
A-4	Typical Load-Deflection Curves for Redwood	28
A-5	Average Crushing Stress vs. Temperature for Redwood	28
A-6	Specific Energy vs. Temperature for Redwood	29
B-1	Regions Used in Energy Balance Calculations	31

PLUTONIUM ACCIDENT RESISTANT CONTAINER PROJECT

Introduction and General

A recent United States Public Law (94-79; August 9, 1975) restricts the air shipment of plutonium. This law reads, in part, that no plutonium (except for very small quantities of material in medical devices) may be air transported until the NRC (U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission) "...has certified that a safe container has been developed and tested which will not rupture under crash and blast testing equivalent to the crash and explosion of a high-flying aircraft. . . ." Although there were problems of translating the general language of the law to technically meaningful definitions, very severe accident-modeling criteria were developed by the NRC, which also engaged Sandia Laboratories in the development of a transportation package that would acceptably survive the new criteria. The initial tasks were to promulgate criteria and then to design a package to satisfy those criteria. Both the new criteria and the new package have been presented for approval to the Advisory Committee for Reactor Safeguards and the National Academy of Engineering's Ad-hoc Committee on the Air Transport of Plutonium. Results are being, or have been, presented to the U.S. Congress, as originally mandated.

The NRC criteria became a document defining those measures necessary to qualify and certify a package for the air transport of plutonium; hereafter, this will be referred to as the Qualification Criteria. The Qualification Criteria essentially consists of a test program with supporting rationale and stringent acceptance standards. The rationale embodies a maximum credible accident approach, with very severe single-event accident elements applied sequentially to the same package. Also, certain individual tests are included as well as a requirement to conform to existing regulations.

That portion of the program performed at Sandia bears the acronym "PARC" for Plutonium Accident Resistant Container. The PARC project resulted in the development of the PAT-1 (Plutonium Air Transportable) Package. The package was designed concurrently with and in response to the Qualification Criteria and survives the sequential and individual tests of both the new and old criteria and meets the applicable acceptance standards in each case.

The Qualification Criteria are summarized in the next two tables; Table 1 defines the test program of new sequential and individual tests, and also summarizes the tests of the existing regulations, 10 CFR 71.

TABLE II
Acceptance Criteria

Containment of Plutonium

- Release must be < IAEA A2 weekly quantity following test sequence of new criteria
- "No release" from double containment following 10 CFR 71 normal or accident conditions measured as a leak rate -- ANSI N 14.5: 10^{-7} cm³/s -- or as actual loss of surrogate: less than 10^{-8} g, by fluorimetry

Shielding

- Normal transport - 49 CFR 173 requires that external radiation be limited to: 10 mrem/hr at 1 m (3 ft), and 200 mrem/hr at surface
- Postaccident - 10 CFR 71 requires that external radiation, following the more severe tests of the new criteria, be limited to: 1000 mrem/hr at 1 m (3 ft)

Criticality

- Undamaged single packages and large arrays must be subcritical per 10 CFR 71
- Arrays of damaged packages must be subcritical per 10 CFR 71, following the more severe tests of the new criteria

Figure 1. PAT-1 Package Exterior

Figure 2. PAT-1 Plutonium Air Transportable Package, Cutaway

Air Qualified Overpack (AQ-1)

The AQ-1 configuration consists of an outside drum, with at least two layers and in some cases five layers of 16 gauge, 304 stainless steel; an outer and inner grain-oriented redwood assembly with an interstitial load spreader assembly; and a heat conductor element.

The outside drum-ends, both top and bottom, are secured in a unique manner, shown in Figure 3, to permit relatively simple access to the container and yet retain the removable parts in a violent crash.

One factor leading to the selection of redwood as the shock mitigator/thermal barrier is its high specific energy absorption capability parallel with the grain, as indicated in Figure 4; redwood outranks most shock mitigators such as elastomeric and rigid foams, aluminum and stainless steel honeycombs, foam-filled honeycombs, and other natural products. This capability was examined relative to density so as to constrain the final package size and weight while maintaining utility as an industrial air transportable package with a practical (although small) internal payload.

Figure 3. AQ-1 Closure

Figure 4. Accident Resistant Container Materials Evaluation

Thermal barrier or char performance was the other principal characteristic leading to the choice of redwood. As indicated in Figure 5, redwood char performance compares favorably with other high energy absorbers, even outperforming some fire-retardant-treated materials which were not as efficient. Although balsa and some rigid foams slightly outperformed redwood in this regard, the former was too bulky for air transportable design and the latter were not as efficient in energy absorption.

Figure 5. Char Performance

New redwood strength data, Figure 6, were generated to support design analysis across an appropriate broad temperature range. An impact energy balance analysis, Figure 7, was iterated to optimize the design application of the inner and outer regions of redwood and the interstitial aluminum load spreaders. Appendix A gives more complete information on the redwood data generated for this program; Appendix B summarizes the energy balance impact analysis method.

Aluminum was chosen for the load-spreader assembly because of its favorable mass, strength, modulus, thermal conductivity, cost and availability. Load spreaders were found to be essential to distribute dynamic inertial compressive loading from the relatively small area loading of the containment vessel within the package, to a larger area of the shock-absorbing material. In a side or lateral impact, the tube is the principal load spreader; in an end or longitudinal impact, the discs are the principal load spreaders. Referring to Figure 2, the extended region of the tube, beyond the discs, deforms inward in a severe corner impact, constricting possible passage of the discs and containment vessel in an outward direction.

Figure 6. Average Crush Stress for Redwood as a Function of Temperature

Figure 7. Impact Energy Balance

This deformation/constriction action also occurs in side and end impacts. Additionally, as shown in Figure 8, load spreader deformational energy is also accounted for in the impact energy balance, again for design optimization to restrict package weight and size while retaining great toughness.

Figure 8. Impact Energy Balance

A photograph, Figure 9, of the resulting package cross-section shows the double-walled outside drum, the radial grain orientation of the outer and inner annuli of redwood, the load spreader tube, and the containment vessel. The non-removable elements of this assembly are permanently bonded together with a polyester-flexibilized epoxy adhesive which has resilience over a wide temperature range. When impact forces cause deformations, this bond acts in unison with the wooden elements and their adjacent metal elements.

Containment Vessel (TB-1)

The containment vessel, TB-1, Figure 10, consists of a body, a lid secured by bolts, a copper gasket, and an O-ring. The vessel body and lid are fabricated from PH13-8Mo precipitation hardened stainless steel. The H1075 temper enhances ductility while preserving high strength from low to high temperatures. The TB body and lid are designed with approximately hemispherical end shapes and cylindrical side wall shapes to resist deformation from either external or internal loads or pressures. The lid is hermetically sealed to the body by the use of a ductile copper gasket in conjunction with knife edge sealing beads on both the body and lid, and a pattern of bolts, as shown in Figure 11. The sealing surfaces are arranged to afford handling

protection to the knife edge sealing beads. The lid has a pilot diameter region of great structural shear strength which fits closely into the mating internal diameter of the body. This closely limits any possible radial motion between these parts, especially motion that would be induced from deformations resulting from accidental crash, crush, or puncture loads. This pilot diameter is also equipped with an O-ring in a groove, as a secondary seal to supplement the upper copper gasket and double knife edges, for containment of contents within the TB-1 containment vessel.

Figure 9. PAT-1 Package Interior

The twelve TB-1 closure bolts, 1/2-in. in diameter, shown in Fig. 10, are forged from A-286 stainless steel, with over 30,000 lb ultimate tensile strength per bolt. This material resists corrosion in conjunction with the stainless steel TB-1 body and lid, and provides high temperature strength to maintain the TB-1 seal at elevated temperatures. The bolts are silver plated to prevent galling of the stainless steel bolt in the stainless steel vessel.

A shock mitigation spacer within the TB-1 containment vessel is fabricated from aluminum honeycomb (see Fig. 10) with axial cell orientation. This honeycomb spacer prevents the flat end of the PC-1 product from entering into the hollow hemispheric lid in the case of severe impact loads in the axial directions. This spacer also serves as a thermal conductor for heat generated by certain PuO_2 contents.

Figure 10. TB-1 Containment Vessel with PC-1 Product Can

Figure 11. Containment Vessel Seal

Finite element stress analysis (Fig. 12) was used to define the containment vessel design, leading to optimization of vessel mass, itself a threat to the surrounding shock mitigation material. The vessel was designed to directly accept impact and puncture threat, including armor piercing ballistic attack.

Figure 12. Containment Vessel Finite Element Stress Analysis

The TB-1 inner container is highly resistant to sea water corrosion and will withstand the hydrostatic pressures specified in the NRC Qualification Criteria.

Product Can (PC-1)

The PC-1 product can, right side of Figure 10, is fabricated from stainless steel. It is closed by crimping in a canning machine and is also sealed with an epoxy material. The close fit of the TB-1 containment vessel limits product-can deflection or permanent change of shape under severe impact loads. The product can provides double containment under the normal and accident conditions of transport performance tests as specified by 19 CFR 71.42. This product can may be loaded to a maximum weight of 2 kg PuO_2 contents, not to exceed a maximum of 25 W thermal activity, of PuO_2 of various isotopic composition.

Thermal Analysis

Thermal analyses of the PAT-1 package included finite difference modeling for internal heat load capacity (Fig. 13), leading to the 25-W limitation on thermally active radioisotopic contents; the limiting consideration here was long-term protection of the redwood for preservation of known performance factors. Finite difference thermal modeling was also used in the case of externally applied heat such as the standard hot day conditions (Fig. 14), and to predict package performance in the 1010°C (1850°F) large JP-4 jet fuel fire environment.

- 1 COPPER CYLINDER: $k_c = 220$ (0.91) δ = THICKNESS INCHES (cm)
 $\delta^c = 0.25$ (0.63) k = CONDUCTIVITY $\frac{\text{Btu}}{\text{hr. ft.}^2 \text{ } ^\circ\text{F}} \left(\frac{\text{cal}}{\text{cm. s.}^{\circ}\text{C}} \right)$
- 2 ALUMINUM PLATE: $k_A = 90$ (0.37)
 $\delta = 1''$ (2.54)
- 3 ALUMINUM TUBE: $k_A = 90$ (0.37)
 $\delta = 0.5''$ (1.27)
- 4 REDWOOD LINER: $k_w = 0.31$ @ 200°F (0.0013)
- 5 STAINLESS WALL: $k_s = 10$ (0.04)

Figure 13. Finite Difference Internal Heat Model

Test Program

Test activities are best shown by a motion picture, "Plutonium Air Transportable Project," Sandia Laboratories, March 1978. Table III summarizes these tests and also indicates results. This table indicates that five PAT-1 packages were subjected to a similar sequential test series, with the initial impact test oriented so as to encompass the five different principle threat orientations of top, top corner, side, bottom corner, and bottom. The crush, puncture, slash, fire,

and immersion tests that follow are essentially identical for all packages, with the application point of each test being chosen to produce the most damaging cumulative effect on each package.

Figure 14. Finite Difference External Heat Model

Table III includes the individual hydrostatic test required by the Qualification Criteria, and high and low temperature engineering development impact tests, applied as the first test in a sequential series.

Before the tests, each package was loaded with a finely divided surrogate ^{235}U powder and helium gas. The results show that no uranium oxide escaped as indicated by a fluorimetric test with a detection capability of 10^{-8} g. Also, only very small helium leak rates were induced through the containment vessel seals.

TABLE III
Summary of Qualification Tests, PAT-1 Package

Impact Orientation	Impact Vel. 1 to Unyielding Target (fps)	Crush 70,000 (lb)	Puncture 5000 (ft-lb)	Slash 15,000 (ft-lb)	Fire 2200°F 60 Minutes	Immersion	Uranium Detection $\geq 10^{-6}$ g	Post-Test Air Leakage (cm ³ /s)
Top 0°	442	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	none	$< 4.6 \times 10^{-6}$
Top Corner 30°	451	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	none	$< 4.5 \times 10^{-5}$ probably $\sim 1.7 \times 10^{-7}$
Side 90°	445	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	none	1.4×10^{-6}
Bottom Corner 150°	443	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	none	$< 5.5 \times 10^{-6}$
End 180°	456	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	none	1.9×10^{-6}

Individual Test: 600 psig hydrostatic; 8 hours - No detectable water leakage; $< 10^{-10}$ cm³/s

Other Requirements: Impact at -40°F -- 2.4×10^{-6} cm³/s result;
Impact at 200°F -- 7×10^{-6} cm³/s result

Experimental work with actual PuO₂ was conducted under NRC sponsorship at another laboratory (Ref. 10), to correlate the observed helium leak rates with conservative bounding estimates of worst-case possible plutonium loss (again, no surrogate powder escaped). These conservative bounding assessments of plutonium loss were compared to IAEA "A2" quantities, Table IV, by the NRC staff. These assessments demonstrated successful performance of the PAT-1 package, satisfying the criteria for plutonium containment.

TABLE IV
Examples of Allowable Mass Release Rates -- IAEA "A2,"
Safety Series No. 6 and NUREG-0360

Isotope	Normal Conditions of Transport (μg/hr)	Accident Conditions of Transport ^a (μg/wk)
Pu ²³⁸	0.000176	0.176
Pu ²³⁹	0.032	32.2
Pu ²⁴⁰	0.0087	8.7
Pu ²⁴¹	0.0009	0.9
Pu ²⁴²	0.77	770
Typical Mixture	0.00255	2.55

^a These values are IAEA B(11) quantities; NUREG-0360 and IAEA B(M) allowed release is 10³ larger.

Other

Other analyses conducted to determine package conformance to the Qualification Criteria and to 10 CFR 71 and 49 CFR 173 involve calculations for shielding and criticality. These results are summarized in Table V.

TABLE V
Shielding and Criticality

<u>Shielding</u>	
<u>Normal Transport</u>	<p>-- PAT-1 Package Provides Sufficient Shielding (49 CFR 173)</p> <p>Required -- < 10 mrem/hr 3 ft from surface</p> <p>Calculated -- 4 mrem/hr 3 ft from AQ-1 -- horizontally 1 mrem/hr 3 ft from AQ-1 -- vertically</p> <p>Required -- < 200 mrem/hr at surface</p> <p>Calculated -- 30 mrem/hr at surface of AQ-1 -- horizontally 15 mrem/hr at surface of AQ-1 -- vertically</p>
<u>Postaccident</u>	<p>-- Containment Vessel (TB-1) Provides</p> <p>Sufficient Shielding (10 CFR 71) -- This permits AQ-1 overpack to be discounted</p> <p>Required -- < 1000 mrem/hr 3 ft from surface</p> <p>Calculated -- 8 mrem/hr 3 ft from surface of TB-1 -- horizontal -- vertical</p>
<u>Criticality</u>	
<u>Normal Transport</u>	-- Undamaged Infinite Array $K_{eff} \sim 0.22$
<u>Postaccident</u>	<p>-- Damaged Infinite Array (full consequence of Qualification Criteria) $K_{eff} \sim 0.34$</p> <p>Single Water-Flooded and Reflected TB-1 $K_{eff} \sim 0.62$</p> <p>(K_{eff} = effective neutron multiplication factor)</p>

^aUsing most radioactive recycled plutonium as conservative source model.

Table VI summarizes the results from testing the PAT-1 package to the requirements of the present regulations, 10 CFR 71.

The integrity of the inner containment vessel, determined by both analysis and test, is summarized in Table VII.

TABLE VI

Results of 10 CFR 71 Qualification Tests, PAT-1 Package

Normal Conditions of Transport: Heat, cold, internal pressure, vibration,
water spray, drop (4 ft), penetration,
compression

- No Effect on Shielding
- No Effect on Criticality
- No Release: Leaktight (leakrate $< 10^{-10}$ cm³/s) Containment Vessel
No Release ($< 10^{-8}$ g) of UO₂ Surrogate from Product Can
- Double Containment (product can and containment vessel both meet requirements)

Accident Conditions of Transport: Drop (30 ft), puncture, fire, immersion

- No Effect on Shielding
- No Effect on Criticality
- No Release: Leaktight (leakrate $< 10^{-10}$ cm³/s) Containment Vessel
No Release ($< 10^{-8}$ g) of UO₂ Surrogate from Product Can
- Double Containment (product can and containment vessel both meet requirements)

TABLE VII
Containment Vessel Integrity

Internal Pressure

- Maximum Credible Accident Environment -- 1080°F, 1253 psi (Bounding Assessment)
 - Tested to: 1000°F, 3330 psi, 18 hrs
 - Many tests at ~1080°F, ~1253 psi
 - Analysis 18,300 psi stress
 - 93,000 psi strength
 - At 1080°F and 1253 psi, Margin of Safety ≈ 4
- Maximum Normal Operating Pressure -- 215°F, 34.3 psi
 - Analysis 455 psi stress
 - 140,000 psi strength
 - At 215°F and 34.3 psi, Margin of Safety ≈ 306

External Pressure

- Hydrostatic Requirement -- 600 psi
 - Tested to: 5,000 psi: No leak
 - Analysis 5,000 psi load produces ~43,000 psi stress
 - 150,000 psi strength gives Margin of Safety ≈ 2.5
 - Margin of Safety ≈ 20 at 600 psi

Conclusion

The PAT-1 package, developed in the PARC program, survives the severe accident-modeling test threats of the Qualification Criteria, meets the acceptance criteria for containment, shielding, and criticality, and provides a safe means for air transport of plutonium.

APPENDIX A

Crush-Energy Absorption and Char Properties of Materials

Crush-Energy Absorption

Results of an extensive set of both static and dynamic crush tests, run on a wide variety of materials, are reported in Reference 11. As both weight and volume are important parameters to be minimized for a practical air shipment package, the energy absorption capability on both a weight and volume basis is considered. The energy absorbed (as measured by the area under the force-deflection curve of the material) per unit mass and per unit volume of the material is indicated in Figures A-1 and A-2 for a representative set of materials taken from the 45 materials tested. ¹¹ It is clear that woods such as redwood, balsa, and poplar (load applied parallel to the grain) are quite promising when compared to such materials as metal and plastic honeycomb or foamed materials.

Figure A-1. Energy Absorbed per Unit Mass of Material

Figure A-2. Energy Absorbed per Unit Volume of Material

Char Properties of Materials

Data on the char depth as a function of time were obtained on a number of different materials, including 23 lb/ft³ (368 kg/m³) redwood.⁸

The experimental setup consisted of a hollow, cylindrical sample subjected on its outer surface to a 1850°F (1010°C) temperature, which simulates a 1850°F (1010°C) blackbody fuel fire. Thermocouples were placed at various radial locations inside and at inner and outer surfaces of the cylindrical sample; temperature, as a function of time, was recorded. The average char velocity was determined as the distance into the material at which a temperature of 550°F (288°C) was recorded (the thermocouple location) divided by the time at which this temperature was observed. As discussed in Reference 8, 550°F (288°C) is representative of cellulose charring temperature.

The char velocity data were graphically integrated (Figure A-3). The clear superiority of redwood over balsa wood in fire resistance capability is readily apparent. Based upon the combination of energy absorption and charring capabilities, redwood was chosen for use in the PAT-1 package.

Figure A-3. Comparison of Char Depths (Distance of Exposure Surface to 550°F Point) versus Time for an 1850°F Blackbody Radiation Source

Additional Redwood Crush Data

Additional new data on the mechanical properties of redwood were found to be necessary in order to develop a package design to meet the severe demands of the qualification criteria. Experimental determination⁹ of the static load-deflection (and consequent energy absorption capability) behavior of redwood compressed parallel to the grain was obtained by driving a cylindrical plunger with a cross sectional area of one square inch (645 mm^2) into restrained three-inch (76-mm) redwood cubes. The variation of redwood crush load with temperature for all tests performed is indicated in Figure A-4.⁹ Although considerable scatter is present, a trend of decreasing strength with increased temperature is clearly evident. It was also found that crush load is reasonably constant with deflection until "bottoming out" of the material occurs. Figure A-5 presents the average crushing stress across the temperature range of interest.

The specific energy absorbed by the redwood specimens over the temperature range of interest is presented in Figure A-6.⁹ Figure A-6 also shows static and dynamic data points taken from other work performed at Sandia Laboratories.¹¹ Reasonable agreement between static and dynamic test results lends justification to the use of static data for dynamic crushing capability design estimates.

Figure A-4. Typical Load-Deflection Curves for Redwood

Figure A-5. Average Crushing Stress vs. Temperature for Redwood

APPENDIX B
Analysis of Package Impact

Figure B-1 is a view of the PAT package showing all components. The basic approach used in the design of the package was to absorb the impact energy by material crushing and plastic work, the aim being to isolate the inner container from excessive shock, while retaining crushed-up material as a thermal barrier for the subsequent intense fire.

Figure B-1. Regions Used in Energy Balance Calculations

The inner container can be envisioned as a rigid, massive, but fairly small object whose motion must be stopped primarily by redwood crushing. A load spreader assembly is incorporated around the inner container to distribute the inertial loading over a larger area of the redwood than would be caused by the projected area of the inner container alone.

The ability of the PAT-1 package to survive a 422 fps (129 m/s) perpendicular impact on an unyielding target was analyzed for both side-on and end-on configurations by means of an elementary energy balance approach.

The end-on impact process is assumed to be one-dimensional. Such an assumption is deemed especially appropriate for redwood compressed in a direction parallel to the grain, based upon the observed response of redwood so compressed during the material property tests.¹¹

The column of material isolating the inner container consists of regions 1, 2, 3, 4, and 5 (Figure 13-1) as well as the two disc end load spreaders. It is assumed that at the time of impact this column has a rigid body kinetic energy corresponding to the 422 fps (129 m/s) impact velocity and the total mass of all materials in the column.

For a successful design, the kinetic energy attributed to the total rigid body motion must be absorbed by permanent deformational energy of the redwood material. It is assumed that the kinetic energy of the entire column is fully absorbed by redwood regions 1 and 4 only. Such an assumption neglects the absorption capability of regions 2, 3, 5 and deformation of the two load spreaders, and is therefore conservative.

When the initial rigid body kinetic energy before impact is compared with the total energy which can be absorbed by redwood in regions 1 and 4 (crushing to the point of lockup), a positive margin of safety for end-on container impact is present which indicates the adequacy of the design.

A similar energy balance approach was taken for side-on impact, that is, initial rigid body kinetic energy was equated with energy absorbed by crushing of redwood material.

Early in the design phase of the package, many energy balance calculations were performed in an attempt to arrive at a practical optimization of mass, strength, and numbers (e.g., one or more interstitial shells) of load spreaders, and also to judge the affordable mass (and hence strength) of the inside vessel. Computer-generated design iterations were judged from the viewpoint of available economic materials and fabrication costs of grain-oriented redwood annular shells and plugs embedded in metal tubes and plates.

A more complete treatment of the energy-balance impact analysis is presented in Reference 7.

References

1. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Qualification Criteria to Certify a Package for Air Transport of Plutonium, (NUREG-0360), NRC draft, January 1978.
2. Leakage Tests on Packages for Shipment of Radioactive Materials, ANSI Standard N14.15, 1974, American National Standards Institute, 1430 Broadway, New York, NY.
3. Regulations for the Safe Transport of Radioactive Materials, International Atomic Energy Agency, Safety Series 6, 1973 Revised Edition; UNIPUB, Inc., PO Box 443, New York, NY.
4. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Appropriation Authorization, Public Law 94-79, 94-1 Congress, Washington, DC, August 9, 1975.
5. Packaging of Radioactive Material for Transport and Transportation of Radioactive Material Under Certain Conditions, Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 71, revised August 19, 1975.
6. Transportation, Title 49, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 173, January 1, 1975.
7. J. A. Andersen, et al., PARC (Plutonium Accident Resistant Container) Research, Design, and Development, SAND76-0587, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, July 1978.
8. R. E. Berry, et al., Accident-Resistant Container: Materials and Structures Evaluation, SAND74-0010, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, August 1975.
9. W. A. Von Riesemann and T. R. Guess, The Effects of Temperature on the Energy-Absorbing Characteristics of Redwood, SAND77-1589, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, 1978.
10. L. C. Schwendiman, et al., Quarterly Progress Report, October 1, 1977-December 31, 1977, Study of Plutonium Oxide Leak Rates from Shipping Containers, BNWL-2260-5/NRC-12, Battelle Pacific Northwest Laboratories, Richland, WA, January 1978.
11. T. K. Hill and W. W. Joseph, Energy-Absorbing Characteristics of Materials, SLA74-0159, Sandia Laboratories, Albuquerque, NM, May 1974.

DISTRIBUTION:

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (50)
Washington, DC 20555

Attn: W. Lahs (25)

Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research
C. E. Macdonald (25)
Office of Nuclear Matl. Safety and
Safeguards Transportation Br.

1223 H. E. Guttman
1414 A. V. Luhrs
1760A J. A. Andersen (25)
1760A W. F. Hariman
2433 P. R. Owens
3151 J. G. Wallace
4231 S. A. Dupree
4430 R. M. Jefferson (10)
4431 W. A. Von Riesenmann
4431 C. M. Stone
4433 R. B. Pope (50)
4433 B. J. Joseph
4433 S. H. Sutherland
4533 L. S. Nelson
5513 R. H. Nilson
5631 J. A. Stark
5636 J. K. Cole
5813 N. J. Delcollis
5832 C. H. Maak
8266 E. A. Aas
3141 T. L. Werner (5)
3151 W. L. Garner (3)
For DOE/TIC (Unlimited Release)
DOE/TIC (25)
(R. P. Campbell, 3172-3)