

January 9, 1998

Dr. Gerald E. Tripard, Director
Nuclear Radiation Center
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NO. 79607)

Dear Dr. Tripard:

We are continuing our review of your September 25, 1995, January 8, 1996, February 23, 1996, and May 15, 1997, requests for amendment of the Washington State University Research Reactor Technical Specifications. During our review, questions have arisen for which we require additional information and clarification. Please provide responses to the enclosed request for additional information within 60 days of the date of this letter. In accordance with 10 CFR 50.20(b), your response must be executed in a signed original under oath or affirmation. This request affects nine or fewer respondents and therefore, is not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under P. L. 293-511. Following receipt of the additional information, we will continue our evaluation of your application.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-1128.

Sincerely,

Original signed by:

Marvin M. Mendonca, Senior Project Manager
Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning
Project Directorate
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-27

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

NRC FILE CENTER COPY

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

E-MAIL

TBurdick
PDoyle
CBassett
AAdams

TDragoun
TMichaels
WEresian
SHolmes

Plsac

HARD COPY

Docket File 50-407
PUBLIC
EHylton
MMendonca

JRoe
SWeiss
PDND r/f
OGC

PDND:PM
MMendonca
1/5/98

PDND:LA
EHylton
1/6/98

PDND:B
SWeiss
1/9/98

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY
DOCUMENT NAME: A:\RAI79607

9801200116 980109
PDR ADOCK 05000027
P PDR





UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

January 9, 1998

Dr. Gerald E. Tripard, Director
Nuclear Radiation Center
Washington State University
Pullman, Washington 99164

SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION (TAC NO. 79607)

Dear Dr. Tripard:

We are continuing our review of your September 25, 1995, January 8, 1996, February 23, 1996, and May 15, 1997, requests for amendment of the Washington State University Research Reactor Technical Specifications. During our review, questions have arisen for which we require additional information and clarification. Please provide responses to the enclosed request for additional information within 60 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. This request affects nine or fewer respondents and therefore, is not subject to Office of Management and Budget review under P. L. 296-511. Following receipt of the additional information, we will continue our evaluation of your application.

If you have any questions regarding this review, please contact me at (301) 415-1128.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in dark ink, appearing to read "Marvin M. Mendonca", is written over a horizontal line.

Marvin M. Mendonca, Senior Project Manager
Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning
Project Directorate
Division of Reactor Program Management
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-27

Enclosure:
Request for Additional Information

cc w/enclosure:
See next page

Washington State University

Docket No. 50-27

cc:

State Planning Division
Office of Financial Management
Room 105, House Office Building
Olympia, Washington 98504

REQUEST FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

WASHINGTON STATE UNIVERSITY RESEARCH REACTOR

DOCKET NO. 50-27

1. The review of the submittals is in part to ensure medical use or human irradiation by the neutron beam is not permitted. The technical information was not reviewed for human therapy. Additional information and license authority and controls would be required for human therapy. Therefore, the "Applicability" section page 2 of the May 15, 1997, Tech Spec should be amended to explicitly state the neutron beam generated will not be used for the irradiation of human subjects or any parts of live human subjects.
2. Provide drawings or diagrams appropriate to demonstrate the configuration of the BNC facility. Indicate the locations of the major safety features including the control panel, access gate, cameras, monitors, and reactor log power, linear power levels and reactor position indications. Describe how the reactor is scrammed from the control panel. Describe the access gate.
3. Definition 4 on page 1 of the Tech Specs with the May 15, 1997, submittal, indicates a $\pm 19\%$ that was identified as a typographical error in the January 8, 1996, submittal. Provide corrections or analysis as appropriate for the entire proposed Tech Specs.
4. Definition 1, page 1 of the May 15, 1997, Tech Specs, provides that the experimental bench, positioning equipment, and other equipment used for the beam targets are not considered part of the BNC facility (in the case of medical treatment these may be provided by the medical use licensee and in that case would not be part of the BNC facility). Describe the reactor or facility controls that pertain to these components.
5. Describe the accuracy requirements on the position of the reactor bridge. Describe how accurate is the alternative method identified in Specification 4 page 19b (Specification 4, page 3, May 15, 1997) in verifying the position of the bridge position? Provide acceptance criteria that will be followed for the alternate reactor bridge position indication means allowed by Specification 4 of page 3 of the May 15, 1997, submittal.
6. Specification 10g of page 6 in the May 15, 1997, submittal, indicates that the bridge can be moved manually from within the facility. This may be confused with the BNC facility. Provide clarification.

7. Term "medical" in Specification 10 may be confused with treatment of human patients. Remove the term from here and any where else it may have been used in the Tech Specs
8. Provide a description of the controls to ensure that the monitor's audible alarm (as described in the basis) is disabled only after the BNC facility is secured so that access is controlled if the beam is active, and that the alarm is reinstated prior to activating the beam.
9. Clarify the location of and controls for the instructions in Specification 14.(b)(ii) to notify the operator of abnormalities.