



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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 7 TO

FACILITY LICENSE NO. R-113

UNITED STATES GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

DOCKET NO. 50-274

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter dated October 16, 1991, as supplemented on November 20, 1991, the United States Geological Survey (USGS) requested changes to the Technical Specifications (TS) for Facility License No. R-113 for the USGS TRIGA Reactor Facility. The requested changes would add a requirement to the TS to have a biennial audit of the facility emergency plan, emergency procedures, and physical security plan by the Reactor Operations Committee.

2.0 EVALUATION

The licensee has requested that the following requirement be added to the TS for the USGS Reactor Facility:

The reactor facility emergency plan, emergency procedures, and physical security plan shall be audited by the Reactor Operations Committee at least biennially, with the interval not to exceed 30 months.

This change moves the requirement for the audits from the emergency plan and security plan to the technical specifications, clarifies the requirement as an audit (the emergency and security plans referred to a review which is less comprehensive than an audit), and allows the interval between audits not to exceed 30 months. The existing requirements do not provide for a maximum interval. The maximum interval allows for operational flexibility and is not used to reduce frequency of the audit. The frequency of the audits over the long term will be maintained at two years. This is consistent with the guidance of ANSI/ANS-15.1-1990, "The Development of Technical Specifications for Research Reactors" which is supported by the NRC staff. This interval between audits is consistent with what the staff has approved at other research reactors.

The staff concludes that the frequency of audits will not be decreased, operational flexibility will be increased, and the Reactor Operations Committee will be performing an audit which is more comprehensive than the former review. Therefore, these changes are acceptable to the staff.

### 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.

Date: January 30, 1992