

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY

PULLMAN, WASHINGTON 99164

NUCLEAR RADIATION CENTER

August 30, 1979

James R. Miller
Assistant Director
Site and Safeguards
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation
U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Washington, D. C. 20555

Dear Mr. Miller:

Enclosed you will find a response to the questions asked in your letter of July 30, 1979, relating to the impact of the upgrade rule. I did not receive a copy of this letter until last week.

Sincerely,

W. E. Wilson

William E. Wilson
Associate Director

WEW:atp
Enclosure

cc: Steve Ramos

8007110231

(b) Elimination of over a half-million dollars of research projects in energy and environmental areas.

7. Medical Impact:

Loss of \$50,000/yr worth of research in Veterinary Science, Biology and Pharmacy.

8. New Planning Costs: \$50,000

9. Upgrade Rule Impact:

Facility would be shut-down rather than provide the above items and costs.

10. Education Program:

- (a) Five courses eliminated (labs).
- (b) One program eliminated.
- (c) Ten student theses projects eliminated.
- (d) Four faculty positions eliminated.

11. Faculty/Staff is about 12 positions, 10 of which would be eliminated if the facility closed.

12. Students - 30/yr. 5 could not finish their degrees.

13. 10 graduate students/yr who use the facility and who could not finish their degrees if the facility is shut-down.

14. Annual operating budget : \$300,000/yr
(State funds)

15. 100R/hr at 3 feet can be met if we run about 20 hr/week. This would at times present scheduling problems and running of the reactor to keep the fuel hot and make outages a disaster. ALARA (As Low As Reasonably Achievable) criteria and the 100R/hr at 3 feet requirements obviously conflict.

16. Five courses eliminated.