## NUCLEAR ENGINEERING SCIENCES DEPARTMENT Nuclear Reactor Facility University of Florida

W.G. Ven elson, Director NUCLEAR REACTOR BUILDING Scineville, Florida 32611 Phona (904) 392-1429 - Talex 56330

March 27, 1991

Up ted Proposal To Meet Requirements of 10 CFR 50.64(c)(2)

Director Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, D.C. 20555

Re: University of Florida Training Reactor(UFTR) Facility License: R-56; Docket No. 50-83

Dear oir:

0

Enclosed is an updated proposal intended to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.64(c)(2). Except for scheduling, this proposal is essentially unchanged from that originally submitted with a cover letter dated March 26, 1987 and later revised as to its schedule pursuant to a request from the NRC Project Manager Theodore Michaels dated April 17, 1987. This revised schedule was submitted with a cover letter dated May 14, 1987. It is also essentially unchanged from the updated proposals submitted with letters dated March 22, 1988, March 27, 1989, March 27, 1990 and March 26, 1991 except for the revised schedule and the presence of substantive information on progress to date including now the final fuel bundle design.

The updated written proposal outlines how the R-56 licensee intends to meet the requirements of 10 CFR 50.64 Paragraph(c)(2) to include certification that funcing for conversion has been received through the Department of Energy for the first phase of the project and a tentative schedule for conversion based upon availability of replacement fuel acceptable to the Commission and upon consideration of the availability of additional funding, shipping casks, implementation of arrangements for the available financial support and allowing for commitments of reactor usage. The schedule had slipped significantly in previous years due to delays in work to qualify the SPERT fuel and due to delays in safety analysis as we awaited code implementation and availability of graduate students for the work. The delays in work with the SPERT fuel were most significant in 1988 and 1989 as the SPERT fuel had to be moved, under the SNM-1050 license, and then various license changes approved prior to initiation of the qualification work which was lengthy and subject to several equipment(X-ray machine) failures. The non-destructive testing of the SPEAT fuel was completed successfully by April, 1989; however, shielding and other structural changes necessitated by use of the SPERT fuel resulted in a decision in August, 1989 to utilize plate-type silicide fuel for the conversion. With this decision made, work was then expected to progress more rapidly as the code methodology for safety analyses was being implemented and tested in parallel. A0201 Cent NO 20316

040300

Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action: Employee

Letter to Director, NRC March 27, 1992 Page 2

Unfortunately, the decision by the graduate student performing this work to leave the university to pursue his degree elsewhere in August, 1989 necessitated essentially restarting the safety analysis when a student began work on it for his thesis in early 1990. Although he spent a week at Argonne National Laboratory working with the RERTR group to receive training in the use of the codes, it still took time for the student to become proficient in the use of the codes. Unfortunately several flaws in the implemented codes used for the neutronics analysis also slowed progress though these were cleared up in early, 1991.

In April, 1991, a student project concluded the benchmarking neutronics analysis on the existing HEU core demonstrating acceptability of the static neutronics methodology to model the existing core. Similarly a thesis project concluded in May, 1991 has produced the static neutronics analysis for the proposed LEU core with the number of fuel plates per bundle now set at 14. I. was expected that DOE-supplied funding support of this work would be extended beyond April 30, 1991 but this was not accomplished until March, 1992 resulting in some delays due to administrative problems. Nevertheless, the complementary basic thermal hydraulic analysis and other analysis work required to conclude the HEU to LEU safety analysis is in progress and near completion as work has now begun to prepare the safety analysis report package required for the NRC. We are also working closely with the Department of Energy in Idaho to assure fuel availability in a timely manner and to make decisions on utilization of the existing fuel boxes. After this work is completed, the entire package can be assembled for submission to NRC by August, 1992 with the project progressing as predicted in the attached updated proposal.

If further information is needed, please advise. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Wethan D. Verd

William G. Vernetson Director of Nuclear Facilities

WGV/p Encl. cc: R. Piciullo

Jean Doard

Reactor Safety Review Subcommittee