July 21, 2005

Dr. Melinda Krahenbuhl
Director of CENTER
122 S. Central Campus Drive, Room 104
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT NO. 50-407/2005-201

Dear Dr. Krahenbuhl:

This letter refers to the inspection conducted on July 5-7, 2005, at your TRIGA Mark-I Research Reactor Facility. The inspection included a review of activities authorized for your facility. The enclosed report presents the results of that inspection.

Areas examined during the inspection are identified in the report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations of activities in progress. Based on the results of this inspection, no safety concerns or noncompliances of NRC requirements were identified. No response to this letter is required.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at (the Public Electronic Reading Room) http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.

Should you have any questions concerning this inspection, please contact Craig Bassett at 404-562-4712.

Sincerely,

/RA Alexander Adams for/

Patrick M. Madden, Section Chief
Research and Test Reactors Section
New, Research and Test Reactors Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-407
License No. R-126

Enclosure: NRC Inspection Report No. 50-407/2005-201
cc w/encl.: Please see next page

cc:

William Sinclair, Director
Division of Radiation Control
Department of Environmental Quality
168 North 1950 West
P.O. Box 144850
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4850

Mayor of Salt Lake City
451 South State
Room 306
Salt Lake City, UT 84111

Director
Division of Radiation Control
1460 West 288 North
P.O. Box 144850
Salt Lake City, UT 84114-4850

Dr. Richard Koehn
Office of the Vice President for
Research
210 Park Building
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dr. Dong-Ok Choe
Reactor Supervisor
122 S. Central Campus Drive
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Ms. Karen Langley
Director, University of Utah Radiological Health
100 OSH, University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Dr. Ronald J. Pugmire
Associate Vice President for Research
210 Park, University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

Test, Research, and Training
Reactor Newsletter
Universities of Florida
202 Nuclear Sciences Center
Gainesville, FL 32611

July 21, 2005

Dr. Melinda Krahenbuhl
Director of CENTER
122 S. Central Campus Drive, Room 104
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, UT 84112

SUBJECT: NRC INSPECTION REPORT NO. 50-407/2005-201

Dear Dr. Krahenbuhl:

This letter refers to the inspection conducted on July 5-7, 2005, at your TRIGA Mark-I Research Reactor Facility. The inspection included a review of activities authorized for your facility. The enclosed report presents the results of that inspection.

Areas examined during the inspection are identified in the report. Within these areas, the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations of activities in progress. Based on the results of this inspection, no safety concerns or noncompliances of NRC requirements were identified. No response to this letter is required.

In accordance with 10 CFR 2.390 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) component of NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at (the Public Electronic Reading Room) http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html.

Should you have any questions concerning this inspection, please contact Craig Bassett at 404-562-4712.

Sincerely,
/RA Alexander Adams for/
Patrick M. Madden, Section Chief
Research and Test Reactors Section
New, Research and Test Reactors Program
Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-407
License No. R-126
Enclosure: NRC Inspection Report No. 50-407/2005-201
cc w/encl.: Please see next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RNRP/R&TR r/f	AAdams	CBassett
WBeckner	PDoyle	TDragoun	WEresian
FGillespie	DHughes	EHylton	PIsaac
PMadden	MMendonca	CNagel	KWitt
PYoung	DBarss (MS O6-H2)		BDavis (Ltr only O5-A4)

NRR enforcement coordinator (Only for IRs with NOVs, O10-H14)

ACCESSION NO.: ML051940326 **TEMPLATE #: NRR-106**

OFFICE	RNRP:RI		RNRP:LA		RNRP:SC	
NAME	CBassett		EHylton		PMadden (AI Adams for)	
DATE	7/19/2005		7/18/2005		7/20/2005	

C = COVER **E = COVER & ENCLOSURE** **N = NO COPY**
OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

U. S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

Docket No:	50-407
License No:	R-126
Report No:	50-407/2005-201
Licensee:	University of Utah
Facility:	Center for Excellence in Nuclear Technology, Energy, and Research (CENTER)
Location:	Merrill Engineering Building Salt Lake City, UT
Dates:	July 5-7, 2005
Inspector:	Craig Bassett
Accompanied by:	Somjait Sudprasert Nuclear Safety Inspector Bureau of Nuclear Safety Regulation Office of Atoms for Peace Bangkok, Thailand
Approved by:	Patrick M. Madden, Section Chief Research and Test Reactors Section New, Research and Test Reactors Program Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

University of Utah
Report No.: 50-407/2005-201

The primary focus of this routine, announced inspection included onsite review of selected aspects of the licensee's Class II research and test reactor safety programs including: organizational structure and staffing, review and audit and design control functions, reactor operations, operator requalification, facility procedures, fuel handling, maintenance and surveillance, experiments, and emergency preparedness since the last NRC inspection of these areas. The licensee's programs were acceptably directed toward the protection of public health and safety and were in compliance with NRC requirements. No safety concerns or violations of regulatory requirements were identified.

Organizational Structure and Staffing

- The organizational structure and staffing at the facility met the requirements specified in Technical Specifications Sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3.

Review and Audit and Design Control Functions

- Review and oversight functions required by Technical Specifications Section 6.5 were acceptably completed by the Reactor Safety Committee.

- Changes made at the facility had been reviewed and approved in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59.

Operations

- Reactor operations and logs were acceptable and in accordance with procedural and Technical Specification requirements.

Operator Requalification Program

- The requalification/training program was being acceptably maintained and was up-to-date.

- Medical examinations were being completed biennially as required.

Procedures

- Facility procedures and document reviews satisfied Technical Specifications Section 6.8 requirements.

- Procedural compliance was acceptable.

Fuel Handling

- Reactor fuel movements and inspections were made and documented in accordance with procedure.

- Fuel elements were being inspected on a biennial basis as specified by Technical Specifications Section 4.4.

Maintenance and Surveillance

- Maintenance was being completed as required.

- The program for completing surveillance checks and Limiting Conditions of Operation confirmations was being implemented in accordance with Technical Specifications requirements.

Experiments

- The program for the control of experiments satisfied regulatory requirements and license commitments.

Emergency Preparedness

- The Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures were being reviewed and updated biennially as required and were acceptable.

- Emergency response facilities and equipment were being maintained as required and responders were knowledgeable of proper actions to take in case of an emergency.

- Off-site support was acceptable and communications capabilities were adequate.

- Annual drills were being conducted and critiques were being held as required by the Emergency Plan.

- Emergency preparedness training for staff and off-site personnel was being completed as required.

REPORT DETAILS

Summary of Plant Status

The licensee's one hundred kilowatt (100 kW) TRIGA Mark I Research and Test Reactor continued normal, routine operations. A review of the applicable records indicated that the reactor was typically operated in support of sample irradiations, reactor system testing and surveillances, and operator training. During this inspection, the reactor was operated for demonstration purposes.

1. Organization Structure and Staffing

a. Inspection Scope (Inspection Procedure [IP] 69001)

The inspector reviewed the following to verity that the staffing requirements, personnel responsibilities, and organizational structure specified in Sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3 of the licensee's Technical Specifications (TS), Amendment No. 7, dated June 23, 1999, were being met and maintained:

- organization and staffing for the facility
- TRIGA Operations Log Number (No.) 35
- administrative controls and management responsibilities
- Description of Operations Procedure Manual, Section I, "Organization and Responsibilities"

b. Observations and Findings

Through discussions with licensee representatives, the inspector determined that management responsibilities and the organization at the University of Utah TRIGA Mark I Reactor Facility had not changed since the previous NRC inspection in July 2004 (see Inspection Report No. 50-407/2004-201). The Reactor Supervisor retained direct control and overall responsibility for safe operation and maintenance of the facility as specified in the TS. The Reactor Supervisor reported to the President of the University of Utah through the Reactor Administrator/Director, Nuclear Engineering Laboratory.

The licensee's current operational organization consisted of the Reactor Administrator and the Reactor Supervisor. These individuals were also qualified Senior Reactor Operators (SROs). In addition, there were two students in training to become Reactor Operators (ROs) or SROs. Two other students were being considered for the training program. The Reactor Administrator and the Reactor Supervisor positions were full-time positions while all the others were part-time.

The organizational structure was as required by TS and was consistent with that specified in the ANSI Standard ANS 15.1, "Development of Technical Specifications for Research Reactors." Qualifications of the staff met TS requirements and were consistent with those specified in the ANSI Standard ANS 15.4, "Selection and Training of Personnel for Research Reactors."

c. Conclusions

The organizational structure and staffing at the facility met the minimum requirements specified in TS Sections 6.1, 6.2, and 6.3.

2. Review, Audit, and Design Change Functions

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

In order to verify that the licensee had established and conducted reviews and audits as required and to determine whether modifications to the facility were consistent with 10 CFR 50.59 and TS Section 6.5, the inspector reviewed:

- Audit and Review Plan for the University of Utah TRIGA Reactor
- Reactor Safety Committee meeting minutes for the past two years
- Reactor Safety Committee Charter, dated June 11, 1997 and reviewed June 3, 1999
- Completed audits and reviews as noted on Form CENTER-035, Revision (Rev) 1, "Audit and Review Program Checklist," Reactor Safety Committee (RSC) approval dated June 9, 1993 - checklists for audits conducted January 2002 - December 2003 and January 2004 - December 2005
- Description of Operations Procedure Manual, Section I, "Organization and Responsibilities"
- 10 CFR 50.59 Review, "Safety Evaluation of the Pneumatic Irradiator," dated April 14, 2004
- 10 CFR 50.59 Review, "Safety Evaluation of the New Crane Hoist Installation," dated April 7, 2005

b. Observations and Findings

(1) Reviews and Audits

The inspector reviewed the Reactor Safety Committee's (RSC's) meeting minutes from December 2003 to the present. These meeting minutes showed that the RSC had met at the required frequency and had considered the types of topics outlined by the TS. Review of the committee meeting minutes also indicated that the RSC provided guidance and direction for safe reactor operations, and ensured suitable use and oversight of the reactor.

The inspector noted that the RSC, or an individual specifically designated by the committee, completed audits of the facility operations, programs, and procedures. Since the last NRC inspection, audits had been completed in those areas outlined in the TS. The audits were structured so that the various aspects of the licensee's operations and safety programs were reviewed semiannually. Major facility documents and plans, including the facility procedures, were reviewed biennially. The inspector noted that the audits and the resulting findings were detailed and that the licensee responded and took corrective actions as needed.

(2) Design Change Functions

The inspector reviewed recent changes made at the facility. Records of the change made in 2004 and observations of the steps taken to implement the change showed that the design control program at the facility was being followed. Two SROs evaluated the proposed modification and made a recommendation to proceed. Subsequently, the Reactor Supervisor reviewed the proposed modification and determined that no safety or TS concern existed. The change resulted in the installation of a pneumatic irradiator used in conjunction with the reactor. The inspector noted that the 2005 change also had been acceptably documented in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59 and applicable licensee requirements. That change resulted in the installation of a new hoist system for the reactor.

Neither of the changes constituted a safety question, was deemed to increase the possibility of an accident or malfunction not previously evaluated, or required a change to the facility Technical Specifications. Due to the nature of the changes, they were not required to be reviewed and approved by the RSC. However, courtesy copies of the Safety Evaluations for these two projects were given to the RSC for review.

c. Conclusions

Review and oversight functions required by TS Section 6.5 were acceptably completed by the RSC. Changes made at the facility had been reviewed and approved in accordance with facility procedures and the guidance of 10 CFR 50.59.

3. Operations

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

The inspector reviewed selected aspects of the following to verify operation of the reactor in accordance with TS Sections 2, 3, 4, and 6:

- TRIGA Operations Log No. 35
- organization and staffing for the facility
- administrative controls and management responsibilities
- Startup and Termination Procedures Log
- Maintenance Procedures and Maintenance Log
- selected surveillance data sheets, records, and tests
- Form CENTER-001, Rev 10, “TRIGA Pre-start Checklist, TRIGA Start-up Checklist, and TRIGA Termination Checklist,” RSC approval dated April 2, 2004
- Description of Operations Procedure Manual, Section II, “Reactor Operations”

b. Observations and Findings

The inspector reviewed the operations log from December 2003 through the present. The inspector also reviewed TRIGA Pre-start, Start-up and Termination Checklists

and Monthly Checklists. Additionally, the inspector observed a reactor startup, steady state operation, and termination on July 6, 2005. Reactor operations were carried out in accordance with written procedures as required by TS Section 6.8.

Information on the operational status of the facility was recorded accurately in the log book or on the required checklists as stipulated by Section 6.9 of the facility TS. The inspector verified that, according to the data recorded, TS operational limits had not been exceeded as stipulated in TS Sections 2, 3, and 4. Scrams were identified in the logs, were reported as required, and were resolved before the resumption of operations. Through interviews with operators, the inspector confirmed that shift staffing met the minimum requirements for duty and on-call personnel as required by TS Section 6.3.

c. Conclusions

Based on the procedures and records reviewed, and observations made during the inspection, the inspector determined that reactor operations and logs were acceptable and in accordance with procedural and TS requirements.

4. Operator Licenses, Requalification, and Medical Activities

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

To determine that operator requalification activities and training were conducted as required by the "University of Utah Center for Excellence in Nuclear Technology, Engineering, and Research Reactor Operator Requalification Plan," Rev 3, dated February 1996, and that medical requirements were met, the inspector reviewed:

- TRIGA Operations Log No. 35
- medical examination records
- status of licenses of those operators who routinely operated the reactor
- Form CENTER-001, Rev 10, "TRIGA Pre-start Checklist, TRIGA Start-up Checklist, and TRIGA Termination Checklist," RSC approval dated April 2, 2004
- operator requalification status documented on Form CENTER-025, "University of Utah Center for Excellence in Nuclear Technology, Engineering, and Research Reactor Requalification Program Progress Checklist," (no RSC approval date listed) which included reactivity manipulations, written examinations, training and lectures, and SRO duty

b. Observations and Findings

As noted previously, there were two qualified SROs at the facility. Both of the operators' licenses were found to be current. A review of facility logs and records showed that training had been conducted in accordance with the licensee's requalification and training program. Lectures had been given as stipulated and training reviews and examinations had been completed and documented. Records of quarterly reactor operations, reactivity manipulations, and other operations and supervisory activities were maintained and the required activities completed by each

operator. Records indicating the completion of the annual operations tests and supervisory evaluations were also maintained. Biennial written examinations had been completed by the operators as required as well.

The inspector also noted that the operators were also receiving the required biennial medical examinations as specified by the program.

c. Conclusions

The requalification/training program was being acceptably maintained and was up-to-date. Medical examinations were being completed biennially as required.

5. Procedures and Procedural Compliance

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

To verify that facility procedures were being reviewed, revised, and implemented as required by TS Section 6.8, the inspector reviewed selected aspects of:

- selected forms and checklists
- selected operating and administrative procedures and logs
- procedural reviews and updates documented in the RSC meeting minutes for the past two years
- Description of Operations Procedure Manual, Section I, “Organization and Responsibilities”

b. Observations and Findings

The licensee’s procedures were found to be acceptable for the current facility status and staffing level. The inspector noted that the procedures specified the responsibilities of the various members of the staff as well as the RSC. The procedures were being audited/reviewed biennially, as noted earlier, and were updated as needed. It was also noted that substantive revisions to checklists and forms were routinely presented to the RSC for review and approval as required by TS. The inspector verified that the latest revisions to various procedures and forms had been through this review and approval process as required.

The inspector observed the completion of the Pre-start, Start-up, and Termination Checklists for operation on July 6, 2005. It was noted that the required checks and verifications were completed in accordance with the applicable procedure.

c. Conclusions

Facility procedures and document reviews satisfied TS Section 6.8 requirements. Procedural compliance was acceptable.

6. Fuel Movement and Handling

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

The inspector reviewed selected aspects of the following in order to verify adherence to fuel handling and inspection requirements specified in TS Section 4.4 and the applicable procedures:

- Core Procedures and Log
- TRIGA Operations Log No. 35
- Heavy Water Element Inspection Forms
- Criticality calculations for various storage locations
- University of Utah TRIGA Reactor Core (element location sheet), Core Configuration 24B, dated November 17, 2004
- Fuel Procedures and Log for Stainless Steel and Aluminum clad fuel elements
- Form CENTER-004, Rev 1, “Biennial Fuel Rod Inspection,” RSC approval dated December 17, 1997
- Form CENTER-005, Rev 4, “Core Change and Critical Fuel Loading,” RSC approval dated March 29, 2000
- Form CENTER-018, “Fuel Element Inventory Sheet,” RSC approval dated May 25, 1988
- Description of Operations Procedure Manual, Section II, “Reactor Operations”

b. Observations and Findings

The inspector determined that the licensee was maintaining the required records of the various fuel movements that had been completed and verified that the movements were conducted and recorded in compliance with procedure. The latest core reconfiguration was completed in September 2003 and the resulting University of Utah TRIGA core and fuel positioning was designated as Core Configuration 24B.

Core loading procedures provided a prescribed method to move and handle fuel consistent with the requirements and provisions of the TS Section 4.4 and the licensee safety analyses. Fuel movement and fuel examination records showed that the fuel of the current core was moved in accordance with procedures and examined biennially as required. It was also noted that fuel handling tools were controlled and secured when not in use. The procedures and the controls specified for these operations were acceptable.

c. Conclusions

Reactor fuel movements and inspections were completed and documented in accordance with applicable procedures and the fuel was being inspected as specified by TS Section 4.4.

7. Maintenance and Surveillance

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

To determine that Limiting Conditions of Operation and surveillance activities were being completed as stipulated by TS Sections 3 and 4, and that maintenance was being conducted as required, the inspector reviewed:

- TRIGA Operations Log No. 35
- calibration procedures and records
- Startup and Termination Procedures Log
- selected Surveillance Procedures and Logs
- Maintenance Procedures and Maintenance Log
- selected surveillance data sheets, records, and tests
- Form CENTER-001, Rev 10, "TRIGA Pre-start Checklist, TRIGA Start-up Checklist, and TRIGA Termination Checklist," RSC approval dated April 2, 2004
- Form CENTER-002, Rev 2, "Biennial Control Rod Inspection/Control Rod Movement or Repair," RSC approval dated September 30, 1997
- Form CENTER-003, Rev 6, "Semi-Annual Control Rod Calibrations," RSC approval dated March 29, 2000
- Form CENTER-008, Rev 4, "Procedure for Adding Water to the Reactor Tank," RSC approval dated December 17, 1997
- Form CENTER-011, Rev 2, "Calibration of Temperature Monitoring Channels," RSC approval dated March 12, 1997
- Form CENTER-012, Rev 3, "Semi-Annual Thermal Power Calibration," RSC approval dated March 18, 1998
- Form CENTER-015, Rev 3, "Emergency Kit Check," RSC approval dated September 17, 2003
- Form CENTER-020, Rev 12, "Monthly Inspection Checklist," RSC approval dated April 2, 2004
- Form CENTER-022, Rev 2, "Maintenance Log," RSC approval dated September 21, 1994
- Form CENTER-023, Rev 4, "Annual Maintenance and Calibration of the Area Radiation Monitors (ARMs) and Continuous Air Monitor (CAM)," RSC approval dated December 17, 1997
- Description of Operations Procedure Manual, Section III, "Reactor Operations"

b. Observations and Findings

(1) Surveillance

The inspector determined that selected daily, monthly, semiannual, annual, and biennial checks, tests, and verifications for TS-required Limiting Conditions of Operation (LCOs) and surveillances were completed as stipulated. Surveillance and LCO verifications reviewed were being completed on schedule and in accordance with licensee procedures. All the recorded results reviewed by the inspector were within the TS and procedurally prescribed parameters. Several of the surveillances were being completed more frequently than required by the TS.

The records and logs reviewed were complete and were being maintained as required.

(2) Maintenance

A review of the reactor console and maintenance log forms showed that they were being maintained as required and problems, if any, were being documented. This review also demonstrated that maintenance was being conducted consistent with the TS and applicable procedures. Maintenance activities ensured that equipment remained consistent with the Safety Analysis Report and TS requirements.

c. Conclusions

The program for completing surveillance checks and LCO verifications was being carried out in accordance with TS requirements. Maintenance was being completed as required.

8. Experiments

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

The inspector reviewed selected aspects of the following in order to verify that experiments were being conducted within approved guidelines:

- control of irradiated items
- TRIGA Operations Log No. 35
- potential hazards identification
- Experimental Procedures and Log
- selected Routine and Modified Routine Experiments
- selected Irradiation Request and Performance Forms
- selected authorized experiments documented on University of Utah TRIGA Reactor Experiment Authorization Form, RSC approval dated February 20, 1981, including Authorization Number 4-15-04, Authorization Number 3-4-05, and Authorization Number 4-21-05
- Form CENTER-027, Rev 4, “TRIGA Reactor Irradiation Request and Performance,” RSC approval dated March 26, 1996
- Description of Operations Procedure Manual, Section IV, “Experiment Methods”

b. Observations and Findings

The licensee classified experiments as “new,” “routine,” or “modified routine.” (It was noted that, in the past, routine experiments were classified as Class I and new experiments were classified as Class II.) New experiments were required by the TS and the applicable procedural guidance to be reviewed and approved by the RSC. Routine and modified routine experiments were required to be reviewed and approved by the Reactor Supervisor.

The inspector noted that no new experiments had been initiated, reviewed, or approved since the last inspection. However, licensee representatives stated that the RSC review and approval process for new experiments had been, and would continue to be followed.

The experiments currently being conducted at the facility were those classified as routine or modified routine. Those experiments in use at the facility had been reviewed and approved by the Reactor Supervisor as required and were conducted under the cognizance of the Reactor Supervisor as well. The results of the experiments were documented in the TRIGA Operations Log book and on the irradiation request forms. The inspector noted that experiments were conducted in accordance within procedural and Authorization guidelines and that materials produced were controlled as required by the radiation protection program.

c. Conclusions

The license's program for conducting experiments and controlling products satisfied regulatory requirements and license commitments.

9. Emergency Preparedness

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

To verify that the licensee was implementing and complying with the "University of Utah Center for Excellence in Nuclear Technology, Engineering, and Research Emergency Plan for NRC License R-126: TRIGA Nuclear Reactor," Rev 6, dated September 30, 2004, as approved by the NRC, the inspector reviewed selected aspects of:

- emergency drills and critiques
- coordination with offsite support groups
- training records for staff and offsite support personnel
- emergency response supplies, equipment, and instrumentation
- Emergency (Implementing) Procedures last revised December 31, 2001
- Letter of Agreement with the Gold Cross Ambulance Service dated April 8, 1993
- CENTER Annual Emergency Training Attendance Record forms for 2004 and 2005
- Emergency Call List - CENTER Emergency Call List, last revised June 10, 2004
- Form CENTER-015, Rev 3, "Emergency Kit Check," RSC approval dated September 17, 2003
- Form CENTER-037, "Radiological Emergency Classification Checklist," RSC approval dated December 14, 1994

b. Observations and Findings

The Emergency Plan (E-Plan) in use at the reactor and emergency facilities was the same as the version most recently approved by the NRC. The E-Plan was being audited and reviewed biennially as required. Implementing procedures were reviewed and revised as needed. Facilities, supplies, instrumentation and equipment were being

maintained, controlled, and inventoried as required in the E-Plan. During the inspection, the contents of various emergency kits were inventoried and verified by the inspector and a licensee representative.

Through records review and interviews with licensee personnel, emergency responders were determined to be knowledgeable of the proper actions to take in case of an emergency. According to the licensee, agreements with outside response organizations were maintained between the various groups and the University. Communications capabilities with these support groups were acceptable.

Emergency drills had been conducted annually as required. Critiques were typically held following the drills to discuss the strengths and weaknesses identified during the exercise and to develop possible solutions to any problems identified. The results of these critiques were documented and filed. Training for reactor staff and support personnel was acceptable and was conducted and documented as required.

The inspector visited the Salt Lake City Fire Department (SLCFD) station that would respond to the facility in case of emergency. The inspector interviewed SLCFD personnel and observed the supplies and equipment at the support site that would be available in the event of a problem. There appeared to be a good working relationship between the licensee and this support organization.

c. Conclusions

The emergency preparedness program was being implemented adequately as evidenced by the following : 1) the Emergency Plan and Implementing Procedures were being reviewed and updated biennially as required and were acceptable, 2) emergency response facilities and equipment were being maintained as required and responders were knowledgeable of proper actions to take in case of an emergency, 3) off-site support was acceptable and communications capabilities were adequate, 4) annual drills were being conducted and critiques were being held as required by the Emergency Plan, and 5) emergency preparedness training for staff and off-site personnel was being completed as required.

10. Follow-up on Previously Identified Items

a. Inspection Scope (IP 92701)

The inspector reviewed the licensee's actions taken in response to a previously identified Inspector Follow-up Item.

b. Observation and Findings

Inspector Follow-up Item (IFI) 50-407/2003-201-01 - Follow-up on the licensee’s actions to conduct emergency training and hold a drill within the next six months (from the end date of the inspection).

During a previous inspection in September 2003, the inspector noted that emergency drills had been conducted annually as required by the E-Plan except for 2002. The drill was suspended due to the extensive amount of construction that was underway in the entire Engineering Building. This drill suspension was documented with a memo to file. Because of the suspension of the drill and training in 2002, the inspector requested that the licensee conduct training and hold a drill within the next six months. The licensee committed to this time frame and indicated that the required training and drill would be conducted.

The inspector followed up on the actions taken by the licensee. Following completion of the construction project in the spring of 2004, the reactor staff members and various local support groups were asked to participate in training that was to be held on April 16, 2004. Various staff members and support personnel attended that session. Subsequently a drill was scheduled and conducted on June 30, 2004, with good participation from staff and members of local support groups.

During this inspection, it was noted that emergency response training was held on February 9, 2005, with approximately 100 individuals attending. Attendees included reactor staff members and personnel from various support groups including the University Police Department, SLCFD, and the University of Utah Environmental Health and Safety Department. Because of the actions taken by the licensee, this item is considered closed.

c. Conclusions

One IFI identified during a previous inspection was closed.

11. Exit Interview

The inspection scope and results were summarized on July 7, 2005, with licensee representatives. The inspector discussed the findings for each area reviewed. The licensee acknowledged the findings and did not identify as proprietary any of the material provided to or reviewed by the inspector during the inspection.

PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Licensee Personnel

J. Bess, Graduate Research Assistant
D. Choe, Reactor Supervisor and Senior Reactor Operator
M. Krahenbuhl, Reactor Administrator and Senior Reactor Operator
R. Pugmire, Associate Vice President for Research

Other Personnel

R. McMiken, Lieutenant, Engine 4, Platoon C, Salt Lake City Fire Department

INSPECTION PROCEDURE USED

IP 69001	Class II Research and Test Reactors
IP 92701	Review of Previously Identified Items

ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

Opened

None

Closed

50-407/2003-201-01	IFI	Follow-up on the licensee's actions to conduct emergency training and hold a drill within the next six months (from the end date of the inspection).

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED

CENTER	Center for Excellence in Nuclear Technology, Engineering, and Research
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
E-Plan	Emergency Plan
IFI	Inspector Follow-up Item
IP	Inspection Procedure
kW	Kilowatt
LCO	Limiting Conditions of Operation
No.	Number
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Rev	Revision
RO	Reactor operator
RSC	Reactor Safety Committee
SLCFD	Salt Lake City Fire Department
SRO	Senior reactor operator
TS	Technical Specifications