



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D. C. 20555

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 10 TO

FACILITY LICENSE NO. R-120

NORTH CAROLINA STATE UNIVERSITY

DOCKET NO. 50-297

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated November 10, 1989, the North Carolina State University requested a change to Facility License No. R-120 for the North Carolina State PULSTAR Research Reactor. The requested change would allow more than three people to serve on the Reactor Safeguards Advisory Group (RSAG).

2.0 EVALUATION

The existing Technical Specification 6.2.3 states that the RSAG shall consist of three persons appointed by the Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Radiation Protection Council. To allow a greater number of qualified individuals to gain RSAG experience, the licensee has proposed that the RSAG consist of a minimum of three persons. This would allow the creation of a pool of RSAG experienced people and would ensure that a minimum of three positions can be filled. This change would also increase the expertise available in the RSAG.

The members of the RSAG will continue to be appointed by the Chancellor upon the recommendation of the Radiation Protection Council. The duties of the RSAG as stated in the Technical Specifications will not change. Technical Specification 6.2.6 continues to define an RSAG quorum as not less than a majority of the full RSAG with a minority or less of people from the reactor line organization.

The staff concludes that this change is administrative in nature, will not impact upon the safety of the reactor, and is acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

We have determined that this amendment is in the category of recordkeeping, reporting, and administrative procedures and requirements. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(10). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environment impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

4.0 CONCLUSION

The staff has concluded, based on the considerations discussed above, that: (1) because the amendment does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of accidents previously evaluated, or create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated, and does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety, the amendment does not involve a significant hazards consideration, (2) there is reasonable assurance that the health and safety of the public will not be endangered by the proposed activities, and (3) such activities will be conducted in compliance with the Commission's regulations and the issuance of this amendment will not be inimical to the common defense and security or the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Alexander Adams, Jr.

Dated: December 21, 1989