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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 6 TO

FACILITY OPERATING LICENSE NO. R-126

DOCKET NO. 50-407

THE UNIVERSITY OF UTAH

1.0 INTRODUCTION

By letter of May 20, 1992, the University of Utah (the licensee) indicated that a sentence (associated with Technical Specification 4.4) had been left out in their request for license renewal, and so had been omitted in the issuance of the license renewal (Amendment No. 5 dated April 17, 1985). This change is to correct that omission.

2.0 EVALUATION

The Amendment No. 5 Technical Specification 4.4 specifies:

> All fuel elements shall be inspected visually for damage or deterioration every two years. The reactor shall not be operated with damaged fuel. A fuel element shall be considered damaged and must be removed from the core if:
>
> (1) in measuring the transverse bend, its sagitta exceeds 0.125 inches over the length of the cladding,
>
> (2) in measuring the elongation, its length exceeds its original length by 0.250 inches,
>
> (3) a clad defect exists as indicated by release of fission products. However the reactor may be operated on a short-term basis as needed to assist in determining the source of the leakage.

The sentence that was left out was immediately after the first sentence of the specification and specified:

"Any fuel element which appears damaged shall be measured for length and bend."

The sentence, in the context of Technical Specification 4.4, made it clear that the visual inspection was the mechanism for determining if fuel is damaged, and that measurement of sagitta, elongation or fission product leakage was the criteria to remove the fuel from service. This is consistent with fuel inspection at similar facilities and provides assurance that problems with the fuel will be identified, quantified and corrected.

The staff reviewed the licensee's requests dated March 8 and May 12, 1983, and NRC staff issuance documents dated April 17, 1985, and found nothing indicating that the deletion of the sentence was required by the NRC staff.

Therefore, the staff finds reinstatement of the previously discussed and omitted sentence acceptable.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION

This amendment involves changes in the installation or use of facility components located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20 and changes in inspection and surveillance requirements. The staff has determined that the amendment involves no significant increase in the amounts, and no significant change in the types, of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, this amendment meets the eligibility criteria for categorical exclusion set forth in 10 CFR 51.22(c)(9). Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no Environmental Impact Statament 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: M. M. Mendonca

Dated: August 12, 1992