

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, LOS ANGELES

S. Engelken 3

BERKELEY • DAVIS • IRVINE • LOS ANGELES • RIVERSIDE • SAN DIEGO • SAN FRANCISCO



SANTA BARBARA • SANTA CRUZ

SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING AND APPLIED SCIENCE
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90024

Boelter Hall 2567
November 9, 1978

Mr. George L. Rogosa, Director
Division of Nuclear Physics
Office of High Energy and Nuclear Physics
Department of Energy
Washington, D.C. 20545

Reactor Fuel Cycle Assistance
DOE: EY-76-S-0034
Project Agreement 192

Dear Mr. Rogosa:

I have received your letter of October 31, 1978 regarding the return of irradiated fuel elements to the U.S. Government. The return will reduce our fuel inventory to a level commensurate with our security provisions and will eliminate an "unresolved item" noted by a Nuclear Regulatory Commission inspector during a recent routine security inspection.

An estimate of the minimum cost of return is shown in Attachment 1. Penalties due to delays beyond the control of UCLA could increase the cost to something over \$4000.

Our request for DOE funding of the return is based upon our Reactor Fuel Cycle Assistance contract. That agreement stipulates under part A-11(b)(2); that, among items to be contributed by the government and, (iii) during the term of this Project Agreement 192, the Commission will:

- (B) Reimburse the University for costs incurred in returning spent fuel elements for reprocessing, including rental of or fabrication charges for shipping containers as mutually agreed to by the parties.

The University supports the normal on-going cost of reactor operations. Because of Project Agreement 192, the University has never budgeted the cost of fuel return. Under the tight budgets to today, \$4000 represents a major matter to the School and a serious matter to the Nuclear Energy Facility.

I believe the government should honor the commitment of PA 192 and the current Mod 7 supplement. I respectfully request DOE support of the cost of this fuel return.

Sincerely,

I. Catton, Director
Nuclear Energy Laboratory

H. Dhillon
Contract and Grant Officer

8204020271 811228
PDR FOIA
CUSHNIR81-481 PDR

IC/NCO/li
cc: C. A. Berger, DOE/SAN
D. G. McIntosh, DOE/SAN
R. R. O'Neill, Dean, UCLA/SEAS
C. E. Ashbaugh, UCLA, SEAS/NEL
R. H. Engelken, USNRC/Region V



Attachment 1

ESTIMATE OF FUEL SHIPMENT COST

The principal cost items are (1) container costs and (2) transportation costs. Costs to UCLA of administration (organizing and scheduling) and man power (initial transfer to carrier) will be absorbed by UCLA. The external costs are:

1. <u>Container Cost:</u>	
Preparation Charge	925.00
Lease, 3 days @ \$185/day	555.00
	<u>\$1480.00</u>
2. <u>Transportation Cost:</u>	
Pleasanton, Ca. to UCLA	319.06
UCLA to Arco, Idaho	1176.35
Arco, Idaho to Pleasanton, Ca.	675.06
Dual Drivers	318.90
	<u>\$2489.37</u>
TOTAL (minimum)	<u>\$3969.37</u>

Penalties are applied for late return of the container (\$370/day) and extra loading/unloading time (\$17.50/hr plus \$238.45 if unloading time exceeds 24 hrs at each loading/unloading point).

The container cost estimate is by Mr. J. E. Morrissey, Manager of Irradiation Services, General Electric Company, Pleasanton, Ca., Quotation Number 78-1053, July 18, 1978. It provides a G.E. Model 700 Shipping Container. The transportation cost figures are by Mr. C. H. Mayer, Vice President (Nuclear Division), Tri-State Motor Transit Company, Joplin, Missouri in a letter dated July 31, 1978.