

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
REGION V

Report No. 50-142/82-02
Docket No. 50-142 License No. R-71 Safeguards Group _____
Licensee: University of California at Los Angeles
Los Angeles, California 90024
Facility Name: UCLA Research Reactor (Argonaut-100KW)
Inspection at: UCLA Campus
Inspection conducted: June 28-30, 1982

Inspectors: P. J. Morrill 20 July 1982
P. Morrill, Reactor Inspector Date Signed
P. Stewart 20 July 82
P. Stewart, Reactor Inspector Date Signed
Approved by: P. J. Morrill for 20 July 1982
T. Young, Jr., Chief, Reactor Projects Section 2 Date Signed
Reactor Operations Projects Branch

Summary:

Inspection on June 28-30, 1982 (Report No. 50-142/82-02)

Areas Inspected: Routine, unannounced inspection of licensee's organization, logs and records, review and audit function, requalification training, procedures, calibrations, and experiments. This inspection involved 32 inspector-hours on-site by two NRC inspectors.

Results One item of noncompliance was identified in one area.

DETAILS

1. Persons Contacted

R. Reyes, Health Physicist
*N. Ostrander, Manager, Nuclear Energy Laboratory
*A. Zane, Reactor Supervisor

*Denotes those attending the exit interview.

2. Organization, Logs and Records

Mr. Bob Reyes is now the health physicist. There are presently three licensed operators at the facility. Two of the operators hold senior reactor operator licenses.

The records of operations for the period since the last inspection (June 1981) were examined. These records included the operations logs, pre-start checklists, maintenance repair and calibration logs, and operating procedures. The data of the 1981 (draft) Annual Report was also examined.

The inspector stated that the submittal of the Annual Report appeared to be slipping to later in the year, which was not acceptable. Licensee representatives stated that the 1981 Annual Report would be submitted by the end of July 1982 and that the 1982 Annual Report would be submitted by the end of April 1983.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

3. Review and Audit

The minutes of the Radiation Use Committee (RUC) meetings since the last inspection were reviewed to verify that the RUC review and audit functions were consistent with the requirements of the Technical Specifications. Meetings have been held at the frequency required by the Technical Specifications, and the membership of each meeting satisfied quorum requirements.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

4. Requalification Training

The inspector, through review of records, verified that the requalification program is being performed in accordance with the approved program. Records indicated satisfactory completion of lecture attendance and examinations by all participants. There are also continuous records maintained of each operator's reactivity manipulations indicating that all have been actively engaged as operators or senior operators.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

5. Procedures

The inspector performed an examination of the technical adequacy of procedures, and of adherence to these procedures by licensed operators. The inspector also observed a checkout of the facility prior to operation, startup, and operation at 100KW. The following procedures were examined:

Normal Startup, September 9, 1980
Standard Shutdown, April 7, 1980
Sample Handling Procedure, April 7, 1980
Pre-Startup Check-off, April 7, 1980

The inspector observed that the licensee's personnel were using a handwritten addendum, dated January 11, 1982, to the pre-start check-off list. The reactor supervisor explained that he had written this addendum to reflect replacement of the electronic instrumentation for the power linear channels in December 1981. The inspectors observed that the procedure should be signed and dated by the reactor supervisor to document his approval. The inspectors also observed that Section VII.J of the Technical Specifications requires this type of change to be submitted to the Director on a routine basis. Since the addendum had been in use for approximately six months, the inspectors stated that the routine submission was overdue and, consequently, that this was an item of noncompliance. Licensee representatives stated that they would improve their administrative work as required by the Technical Specifications.

6. Surveillance

The inspector examined selected surveillance records and discussed these surveillances with licensee personnel. Surveillances examined included: rod worth, rod drop times, shutdown margin, excess reactivity, calibration of neutron instruments, calibration of area radiation monitors, and temperature coefficient of reactivity. The inspector also observed the performance of operability surveillance tests as part of the startup checklist as required by paragraph D.2 of the Technical Specifications.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

7. Experiments

The inspector examined 14 of the current experiments and three experiments approved in 1981 after the last inspection (June 1981). The experiments are described and reviewed on Experimental Safety Analysis (ESA) forms in accordance with the Technical Specifications. The inspector also observed that the licensee is reviewing and

rewriting ESAs on a yearly basis to keep the experiment log more current.

No items of noncompliance or deviations were identified.

8. Follow-up on Licensee Reportable Item

An apparent violation of UCLA's Technical Specifications was reported by licensee personnel to the NRC on October 29, 1981 and followed up by a letter dated November 16, 1981. The apparent violation occurred on October 23, 1981, when licensee personnel failed to insert all control plates prior to removal of a large negative reactivity (Technical Specification VII.B.2).

The inspector confirmed the licensee's corrective actions outlined in the licensee's November 16, 1981 letter and the circumstance surrounding the original occurrence. Based on a review of licensee records and discussions with licensee personnel, the inspector confirmed that the Radiation Use Committee (RUC) had directed that any new or novel experiment, as well as any associated experiment procedures, will be reviewed by the RUC prior to performing the experiment. The inspector concluded that this was a licensee identified violation for which adequate corrective action had been taken. No further action is planned.

9. Exit Interview

The inspectors met with the licensee representatives (denoted in paragraph 1) at the conclusion of the inspection on June 30, 1982. The inspectors summarized the scope of the inspection and the findings.