

November 27, 2001

Dr. William G. Vernetson
Director of Nuclear Facilities
University of Florida
202 Nuclear Sciences Center
P.O. Box 118300
Gainesville, FL 32611-8300

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
RE: FUEL SURVEILLANCE AMENDMENT (TAC NO. MB3358)

Dear Dr. Vernetson:

We are continuing our review of your amendment request for Amended Facility Operating License No. R-56 for the University of Florida Training Reactor which you submitted on November 8, 2001. During our review of your amendment request, questions have arisen for which we require additional information and clarification. Please provide responses to the enclosed request for additional information within 30 days of the date of this letter. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.30(b), your response must be executed in a signed original under oath or affirmation. Following receipt of the additional information, we will continue our evaluation of your amendment request.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-1127.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Alexander Adams, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Operational Experience and
Non-Power Reactors Branch
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-83

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure:
Please see next page

University of Florida

Docket No. 50-83

cc:

Mr. James S. Tulenko, Chairman
Nuclear Engineering Sciences
Department
University of Florida
202 Nuclear Sciences Center
Gainesville, FL 32611

Administrator
Department of Environmental Regulation
Power Plant Siting Section
State of Florida
2600 Blair Stone Road
Tallahassee, FL 32301

State Planning and Development
Clearinghouse
Office of Planning and Budgeting
Executive Office of the Governor
The Capitol Building
Tallahassee, FL 32301

Mary E. Clark, Chief
Office of Radiation Control
Department of Health
and Rehabilitative Services
1317 Winewood Boulevard
Tallahassee, FL 32999

November 27, 2001

Dr. William G. Vernetson
Director of Nuclear Facilities
University of Florida
202 Nuclear Sciences Center
P.O. Box 118300
Gainesville, FL 32611-8300

SUBJECT: UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA - REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
RE: FUEL SURVEILLANCE AMENDMENT (TAC NO. MB3358)

Dear Dr. Vernetson:

We are continuing our review of your amendment request for Amended Facility Operating License No. R-56 for the University of Florida Training Reactor which you submitted on November 8, 2001. During our review of your amendment request, questions have arisen for which we require additional information and clarification. Please provide responses to the enclosed request for additional information within 30 days of the date of this letter. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.30(b), your response must be executed in a signed original under oath or affirmation. Following receipt of the additional information, we will continue our evaluation of your amendment request.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-1127.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Alexander Adams, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Operational Experience and
Non-Power Reactors Branch
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-83

Enclosure: As stated

cc w/enclosure:
Please see next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	REXB r/f	TDragoun	MMendonca
AAdams	Elmbro	OGC	EHylton
FGillespie	SHolmes	CBassett	DMatthews
WEresian	Plsaac	PDoyle	GHill (2)(T5-C3)

ADAMS ACCESSION NO: ML013200221

TEMPLATE #: NRR-056

OFFICE	REXB:LA	REXB:PM	REXB:SC	REXB:ABC
NAME	EHylton:rd	AAdams	PMadden	Elmbro
DATE	11/ 16 /2001	11/ 16 /2001	11/ 16 /2001	11/ 26 /2001

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION
UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA TRAINING REACTOR
DOCKET NO. 50-83

1. Your proposed change to Technical Specification (TS) 4.2.7 (1) also impacts TS 4.2.2 (4). Changing the fuel inspection requirement in TS 4.2.7 (1) from biennially to every five years in effect eliminates the inspection of the mechanical integrity of the control blades and drive system in TS 4.2.2 (4) that occurred during fuel inspections under the two year fuel inspection interval. The control blades and drive system will continue to be subject to the requirement in TS 4.2.2 (4) to be fully checked at least once every five years. Please describe the difference between conducting an inspection and a full check of the control blades and drive system. Please give a justification for dropping the inspection requirement and only needing to perform a full check every five years on the system.
2. Your proposed change to TS 4.2.7 (1) contains a surveillance frequency of every five years at intervals not to exceed six years. One of the advantages of your proposed TS change was the ability to perform a full check of the control blades and drive system required by TS 4.2.2 (4) at the same time as the fuel inspection. Please consider changing the wording on the interval of surveillance for TS 4.2.2 (4) to match that proposed for TS 4.2.7 (1) by adding "at intervals not to exceed six years" to TS 4.2.2 (4).