

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

SAFETY EVALUATION BY THE

OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

SUPPORTING AMENDMENT NO. 13 TO

FACILITY LICENSE NO. R-71

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA AT LOS ANGELES

DOCKET NO. 50-142

Background

By letter dated June 22, 1984, UCLA indicated that they were withdrawing their license renewal application and requested that their license be amended to "possession only" status. In letters dated July 25, 1984 and July 26, 1984 UCLA formally requested amendments to their license:

- (a) to reduce the fuel inventory from 5 kg to 3.6 kg of contained uranium, the amount of fuel remaining on-site, and
- (b) to change the license and technical specifications to reflect the fact that UCLA, in preparation for dismantling and decommissioning the reactor facility, has removed the fuel from the reactor and has rendered the reactor permanently inoperable.

UCLA has also indicated that certain additional pre-decommissioning activities are continuing, as permitted under their existing license. A plan for the balance of the required decommissioning activities will be forwarded for staff review in a subsequent submittal.

II. Evaluation

In preparation for dismantling and decommissioning the reactor, UCLA shipped excess unirradiated fuel off-site, removed the irradiated fuel from the core and stored it in storage thimbles in the reactor room. The request for a decrease in the quantity of fuel permitted under the license reflects the actual inventory now on-site. The license has been amended to limit the amount of U-235 to 3.6 kilograms. This is the inventory of U-235 in the irradiated fuel removed form the core and placed in storage. This amendment is consistent with staff practice which limits the amount of fuel permitted under any license to the minimum required. The license also has been amended to prohibit the reinstallation of fuel or experiments within the core or core area.

The technical specifications have been redified extensively to reflect the "possession only" status requested by UCLA. In general, those technical specifications relating to reactor operation, performance, safety, surveillance and related reporting were deleted. Those relating to fuel storage and staff and population safety, surveillance, monitoring, organization and related reporting requirements have been retained.

All specifications relating to in-core fuel, coolant and moderator systems, reactor control and safety systems and in-core experiments have been deleted. Since the reactor cannot be fueled or operated, these items are no longer relevant and technical specifications which address them are not meaningful. Those technical specifications that pertain to the "possession only" status of the facility were retained. They include the reactor room ventilation system, radiation monitoring system, fuel storage and handling and administrative functions. The amended technical specifications will continue to assure that the various activities permitted under the "possession only" license status will be conducted without significant risk to the health and safety of on-site personnel or the public or to the environment.

III. Environmental Considerations

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 hazards consideration, there is no significant increase in the amounts 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 statement or environmental assessment need be prepared in connection with the issuance of this amendment.

IV. Conclusion

Accordingly, the staff concludes that amendment of this license to a "possession only" status is appropriate. We have further 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 considered and does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin, 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 to the health and safety of the public.

Principal Contributor: Harold Bernard

Dated: December 12, 1984