

September 8, 1995

Dr. John A. Bernard
Director of Reactor Operations
Nuclear Reactor Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
138 Albany Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Dear Dr. Bernard:

We are continuing our review of your amendment request for Amended Facility Operating License No. R-37 for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Research Reactor which you submitted on February 22, 1995, as supplemented on April 10, 1995. During our review of your amendment request, questions have arisen for which we require additional information and clarification. Please provide responses to the enclosed request for additional information within 30 days of the date of this letter. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.30(b), your response must be executed in a signed original under oath or affirmation. Following receipt of the additional information, we will continue our evaluation of your amendment request.

This requirement affects nine or fewer respondents and, therefore, is not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under P. L. 96-511.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-1127.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Alexander Adams, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning
Project Directorate
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-20

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

Distribution:
Docket File 50-20
PDND r/f
DCrutchfield

Sweiss
EHylton
AAdams

BGrimes
Region I
TDragoun, Region I
PUBLIC

PDND:LA
EHylton
9/7/95

PDND:PM
AAdams
9/7/95

PDND:D
Sweiss
9/8/95

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

DOCUMENT G:\SECY\ADAMS\20RAI2.29

9509110188 950908
PDR ADOCK 05000020
P PDR

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

DF01



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

September 8, 1995

Dr. John A. Bernard
Director of Reactor Operations
Nuclear Reactor Laboratory
Massachusetts Institute of Technology
138 Albany Street
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Dear Dr. Bernard:

We are continuing our review of your amendment request for Amended Facility Operating License No. R-37 for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Research Reactor which you submitted on February 22, 1995, as supplemented on April 10, 1995. During our review of your amendment request, questions have arisen for which we require additional information and clarification. Please provide responses to the enclosed request for additional information within 30 days of the date of this letter. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.30(b), your response must be executed in a signed original under oath or affirmation. Following receipt of the additional information, we will continue our evaluation of your amendment request.

This requirement affects nine or fewer respondents and, therefore, is not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under P. L. 96-511.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-1127.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "Alexander Adams, Jr.", written in dark ink.

Alexander Adams, Jr., Senior Project Manager
Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning
Project Directorate
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-20

Enclosure:
As stated

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

Massachusetts Institute of
Technology

Docket No. 50-20

cc:

City Manager
City Hall
Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139

Assistant Secretary for Policy
Executive Office of Energy Resources
100 Cambridge Street, Room 1500
Boston, Massachusetts 02202

Department of Environmental
Quality Engineering
100 Cambridge Street
Boston, Massachusetts 02108

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

MASSACHUSETTS INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY RESEARCH REACTOR

DOCKET NO. 50-20

1. In your response of April 10, 1995, you discuss an emergency battery discharge test that is performed annually as being an important part of verifying operability of your emergency battery system. However, your proposed technical specification (TS) discusses a discharge test performed every two years. Please explain and correct this discrepancy. NRC assumes in our evaluation that surveillances will be performed at TS intervals. To take credit for a shorter interval, this interval must be in the TS.
2. In your proposed TS you have added the condition that battery voltage and specific gravity will be measured whenever the reactor is scheduled to be operated during the surveillance time period. Please provide an analysis to justify this change.
3. What would be the impact on reactor safety if the emergency battery failed to operate when called upon?