

November 19, 2013

Dr. Jay F. Kunze
Reactor Administrator
Idaho State University
P.O. Box 8060
Pocatello, ID 83209-8060

SUBJECT: IDAHO STATE UNIVERSITY – NRC INSPECTION REPORT NO.
50-284/2013-201

Dear Dr. Kunze:

From October 28–31, 2013, the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) completed an inspection at the Idaho State University AGN-201M Research Reactor Facility. The inspection included a review of activities authorized for your facility. The enclosed report documents the areas examined and the results of the inspection. Within these areas the inspection consisted of selective examinations of procedures and representative records, interviews with personnel, and observations of activities in progress. An exit meeting to discuss the inspection findings was held on October 31, 2013, with you, members of your staff, Dr. Peter Farina, Radiation Safety Officer for the University, and Dr. Mary-Lou Dunzik-Gougar, Associate Chair of Nuclear Engineering and Health Physics.

Based on the results of this inspection, the NRC has determined that a Severity Level IV violation of NRC requirements occurred. The violation was evaluated in accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy, which is included on the NRC's Web site at www.nrc.gov; select **What We Do, Enforcement**, then **Enforcement Policy**. The violation is cited in the enclosed Notice of Violation (Notice) and the circumstances surrounding it are described in detail in the subject inspection report. The violation is being cited in the Notice because it constitutes a failure to meet regulatory requirements that has more than minor safety significance and the issue was identified by the NRC.

You are required to respond to this letter and should follow the instructions specified in the enclosed Notice when preparing your response. If you have additional information that you believe the NRC should consider, you may provide it in your response to the Notice. The NRC review of your response to the Notice will also determine whether further enforcement action is necessary to ensure compliance with regulatory requirements.

In accordance with Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Section 2.390, "Public inspections, exemptions, and requests for withholding," a copy of this letter and its enclosure will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the Publicly Available Records component of NRC's document system (Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS)). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at (the Public Electronic Reading Room) <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>.

Dr. J. Kunze

- 2 -

Should you have any questions concerning this inspection, please contact Craig Bassett at (301) 466-4495 or by electronic mail at Craig.Bassett@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Gregory T. Bowman, Chief
Research and Test Reactors Oversight Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-284
License No. R-110

Enclosure:
As stated

cc.: See next page

Idaho State University

Docket No. 50-284

cc:

Idaho State University
ATTN: Dr. Richard T. Jacobsen
College of Engineering Dean
Campus Box 8060
Pocatello, ID 83209-8060

Idaho State University
ATTN: Dr. Richard R. Brey
Radiation Safety Officer
Physics Department
Box 8106
Pocatello, ID 83209-8106

Director
Idaho Dept. of Environmental Quality
1410 North Hilton Boise, ID 83606

Test, Research and Training
Reactor Newsletter
202 Nuclear Sciences Center
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32611

Idaho State University
ATTN: Adam Mallicoat
Reactor Supervisor
Campus Box 8060
Pocatello, ID 83209-8060

Dr. J. Kunze

- 2 -

Should you have any questions concerning this inspection, please contact Craig Bassett at (301) 466-4495 or by electronic mail at Craig.Bassett@nrc.gov.

Sincerely,

/RA/

Gregory T. Bowman, Chief
Research and Test Reactors Oversight Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

Docket No. 50-284
License No. R-110

Enclosure:
As stated

cc.: See next page

DISTRIBUTION:

PUBLIC	RidsNrrDprPrta	RidsNrrDprPrtb	PROB r/f
MNorris	MCompton (Ltr only)	PBlechman	
DHardesty			

ADAMS Accession No.: **ML13312A155** *concurrence via e-mail **NRC-002**

OFFICE	NRR/DPR/PROB*	NRR/DPR/PROB
NAME	CBassett	GBowman
DATE	11/8/13	11/ 19 /13

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

NOTICE OF VIOLATION

Idaho State University
AGN-201M Research Reactor Facility

Docket 50-284
License No. R-110

During a U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection conducted from October 28–31, 2013, a violation of NRC requirements was identified. In accordance with the NRC Enforcement Policy, the violation is listed below:

License Condition 2.C.5 requires, in part, that the licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the NRC-approved Reactor Operator Requalification Plan.

Paragraph V. of the licensee's NRC-approved Operator Requalification Program states that the ability of the operator to perform licensed functions shall be determined through evaluations which shall be conducted annually. Paragraph V.B of the Reactor Operator Requalification Program requires that each operator shall demonstrate familiarity with operator activities during a console examination.

Contrary to License Condition 2.C.5, the licensee failed to operate the facility in accordance with the NRC-approved Operator Requalification Plan. Specifically, two operators did not have annual console examinations in 2011 and one operator did not have an annual console examination in 2012, as required by Paragraph V.B. of the NRC-approved Operator Requalification Plan.

This has been determined to be a Severity Level IV violation (Section 6.4).

Pursuant to the provisions of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 2.201, Idaho State University is hereby required to submit a written statement or explanation to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, ATTN: Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001, with a copy to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, within 30 days of the date of the letter transmitting this Notice of Violation (Notice). This reply should be clearly marked as a "Reply to a Notice of Violation" and should include: (1) the reason for the violation, or, if contested, the basis for disputing the violation or severity level; (2) the corrective steps that have been taken and the results achieved; (3) the corrective steps that will be taken; and (4) the date when full compliance will be achieved. Your response may reference or include previous docketed correspondence, if the correspondence adequately addresses the required response. If an adequate reply is not received within the time specified in this Notice, an order or a Demand for Information may be issued as to why the license should not be modified, suspended, or revoked, or why such other action as may be proper should not be taken. Where good cause is shown, consideration will be given to extending the response time.

If you contest this enforcement action, you should also provide a copy of your response, with the basis for your denial, to the Director, Office of Enforcement, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, D.C. 20555-0001.

Because your response will be made available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room or from the NRC's document system (ADAMS), accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>, to the extent possible, it should not include any personal privacy, proprietary, or safeguards information so that it can be made available to the public without redaction. If personal privacy or proprietary information is

necessary to provide an acceptable response, then please provide a bracketed copy of your response that identifies the information that should be protected and a redacted copy of your response that deletes such information. If you request withholding of such material, you must specifically identify the portions of your response that you seek to have withheld and provide in detail the bases for your claim of withholding (e.g., explain why the disclosure of information will create an unwarranted invasion of personal privacy or provide the information required by 10 CFR 2.390(b) to support a request for withholding confidential commercial or financial information). If safeguards information is necessary to provide an acceptable response, please provide the level of protection described in 10 CFR 73.21.

In accordance with 10 CFR 19.11, you may be required to post this Notice within 2 working days.

Dated this ____ day of ____, 2013

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
OFFICE OF NUCLEAR REACTOR REGULATION

Docket No: 50-284

License No: R-110

Report No: 50-284/2013-201

Licensee: Idaho State University

Facility: AGN-201M Research Reactor Facility

Location: Pocatello, Idaho

Dates: October 28–31, 2013

Inspector: Craig Bassett

Approved by: Gregory T. Bowman, Chief
Research and Test Reactors Oversight Branch
Division of Policy and Rulemaking
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Idaho State University
AGN-201M Research Reactor Facility
NRC Inspection Report No.: 50-284/2013-201

The primary focus of this routine, announced inspection included onsite review of selected aspects of the Idaho State University's (the licensee's) Class II research reactor safety program including: (1) organizational structure and staffing, (2) review and audit and design change functions, (3) reactor operations, (4) operator requalification, (5) maintenance and surveillance, (6) fuel handling, and (7) emergency preparedness since the last U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) inspection of these areas. The licensee's program was acceptably directed toward the protection of public health and safety and was generally in compliance with NRC requirements. One violation of regulatory requirements was identified.

Organizational Structure and Staffing

- The licensee's organization and staffing remain in compliance with the requirements specified in the Technical Specifications.

Review and Audit and Design Change Functions

- Review, audit, and oversight functions required by Technical Specification Section 6.4 were acceptably completed by the Reactor Safety Committee.
- Design changes were being completed in accordance with the requirements specified in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* Section 50.59.

Reactor Operations

- Reactor operations were conducted in accordance with Technical Specification requirements and applicable procedures.

Operator Requalification

- Operator requalification was generally being completed as required by the Idaho State University Requalification Program and the program was being maintained up-to-date.
- Operators were generally receiving their biennial physical examinations as required.
- A violation was noted for failure of the licensee to give two operators a required annual console examination in 2011 and failure to give one operator a required annual console examination in 2012.

Maintenance and Surveillance

- Maintenance was being completed in accordance with Technical Specification and procedural requirements.

- The program for surveillance verifications and calibrations was being implemented in accordance with Technical Specification requirements.

Fuel Handling

- The licensee performed limited fuel handling operations, which were conducted in accordance with procedure.

Emergency Preparedness

- The Emergency Plan and the associated implementing procedures were being reviewed biennially and updated as needed.
- Emergency response equipment was available and was being maintained and inventoried as required.
- Memoranda of Understanding with various support organizations were being maintained and updated as required.
- Training for facility and off-site personnel was being completed as required.
- Emergency drills were being conducted annually as required by the Emergency Plan and critiques were held following the drills.

REPORT DETAILS

Summary of Plant Status

The Idaho State University (ISU) Aerojet General Nucleonics-201M (AGN-201M) Research Reactor Facility, licensed to operate at a maximum steady-state thermal power of 5 Watts, continued to be operated in support of operator training, surveillance, experiments, and laboratory work. During the inspection the reactor was operated to support an undergraduate class experiment.

1. Organization and Staffing

a. Inspection Scope (Inspection Procedure (IP) 69001)

The inspector reviewed the following regarding the licensee's organization and staffing to ensure that the requirements of the Technical Specification (TS) Sections 6.1 and 6.2 were being met:

- Organizational structure and staffing for the facility
- Administrative controls and management responsibilities
- TS for the ISU AGN-201M Reactor, implemented through License Number (No.) R-110 Amendment No. 7, dated March 16, 2011
- ISU AGN-201M Procedure, "General Operating Rules," Revision (Rev.) 4, dated October 7, 1994
- ISU AGN-201M Reactor Facility Master Log for the period from December 11, 2012, to the present
- American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society 15.4-1988, "Standards for Selection and Training for Personnel for Research Reactors"

b. Observations and Findings

Through interviews with licensee personnel and document review, it was determined that there have been no changes to the licensee's organizational staff structure at the facility since the last inspection. The recent administrative name changes to the University Officer, currently referred to as the Vice President for Research, and the Dean, College of Engineering, currently the Dean, College of Science/Engineering, have been submitted through an amendment request to the NRC for approval. That amendment request is still pending.

Through review of records and logs and through discussions with licensee personnel, the inspector determined that the staffing at the facility was acceptable to support the current workload and ongoing activities. The staffing and organization were consistent with the requirements of the TS.

c. Conclusion

TS organization and staffing requirements at the reactor were being met.

2. Review and Audit and Design Change Functions

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

The inspector reviewed the following to ensure that the audits and reviews stipulated in the requirements of the TS Section 6.4 were being completed and to verify that any modifications to the facility were being reviewed as required by Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) Section 50.59:

- 10 CFR 50.59 change reviews conducted by the licensee including:
 - Rod Drop Timing associated with ISU AGN-201M Maintenance Procedure (MP)-1
 - Replacement of two Strip Chart Recorders with one Digital Chart Recorder
- Reactor Safety Committee (RSC) meeting minutes from June 2012 to date
- Audits and reviews completed by the RSC from July 2011 to date
- ISU RSC Charter, Rev 1, dated May 7, 1993
- TS duties specified for the RSC, including audit and review functions

b. Observations and Findings

(1) Review and Audit Functions

The inspector reviewed the RSC's meeting minutes from June 2012 to the present. These meeting minutes showed that the RSC, or a subcommittee thereof, met as required by the TS with a quorum being present. The inspector also noted that the RSC had considered the types of topics outlined by the TS. Review of the committee meeting minutes indicated that the RSC provided appropriate guidance and direction for reactor operations, and ensured suitable use and oversight of the reactor.

It was noted that RSC members completed audits required by the TS, including conformance to the TS; performance, training, and requalification; corrective actions; and the radiation protection, emergency preparedness, and security programs. The audits were generally completed within the time stipulated by the TS. The inspector noted that the audits and the resulting findings were acceptable. If the findings contained recommendations for possible changes, the licensee responded and took corrective actions as necessary.

(2) Design Change

Through review of applicable records and interviews with licensee personnel, the inspector determined that various changes had been initiated and/or completed at the facility since the last NRC inspection in this area. The inspector verified that changes or modifications to the facility had been analyzed by the staff and presented to and reviewed and approved by the Reactor Administrator. The inspector noted that the licensee did not have a procedure for conducting 10 CFR 50.59 reviews, but the licensee indicated that they were developing such a procedure.

c. Conclusions

Audits and reviews were being conducted acceptably by the RSC according to the requirements specified in the TS. Changes that had been made at the facility since the last inspection had been reviewed and approved as required.

3. Reactor Operations

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

The inspector reviewed selected aspects of the following to ensure that the operations program was being implemented as required in TS Section 6:

- ISU AGN-201M Procedure, "General Operating Rules," Rev. 4, dated October 7, 1994
- ISU AGN-201M Operating Procedure (OP)-1, "AGN-201 Operating Procedure No. 1," Rev. 3, dated April 26, 1994
- Form ROL-101 Page 1, "Check Out," Rev. 3, dated April 26, 1994
- Form ROL-101 Page 2, "Prestart Data," Rev. 3, dated April 26, 1994
- Form ROL-101 Page 3, "Operational Data," Rev. 3, dated April 26, 1994
- ISU AGN-201M Reactor Facility Master Log for the period from December 11, 2012, to the present

b. Observations and Findings

Reactor operations were carried out according to written procedures and TS requirements. During this inspection the inspector observed the performance of the required checklist for operation of the reactor. Subsequently, a reactor start-up was observed and the reactor was operated in support of an experiment. The inspector noted that the licensed senior reactor operator (SRO) was knowledgeable and competent. The inspector verified that reactor operating characteristics and other TS and procedurally-required entries were recorded on the appropriate forms and logs and that the reactor was operated in accordance with procedure.

Through a review of logs and prestart-up check off lists (i.e., Form ROL-101), the

inspector noted that the required personnel were present during reactor operations (i.e., a licensed SRO or a reactor operator (RO) and another person who was either an authorized operator or a certified observer). Information on the operational status of the facility was generally recorded properly on the log sheets and/or check-off lists as required by procedure. Scrams were identified in the logs and were reported and resolved as required before the resumption of operations.

c. Conclusions

Operational activities were consistent with applicable TS and procedural requirements.

4. Operator Licenses, Requalification, and Medical Activities

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

To determine that operator requalification activities and training were conducted and that medical examinations were completed as required by the licensee's operator requalification program, TS 6.3, and 10 CFR Part 55, the inspector reviewed:

- Medical examination records for operators
- Active license status for all licensed operators
- Written examinations given annually to operators
- Documentation of training lectures and records of reactivity manipulations noted on the Idaho State University Nuclear Engineering Requalification Program Progress Checklist forms
- ISU AGN-201M Reactor Facility Master Log for the period from December 11, 2012, to the present
- "Reactor Operator Requalification Program for the Idaho State University Reactor," Rev 2, dated August 17, 1995
- ISU AGN-201M Experimental Plan 2, "Operator Training," Rev 1, dated May 3, 1979

b. Observations and Findings

(1) General Aspects of the Operator Requalification Program

There are currently four qualified SROs and two qualified ROs at the facility. Through a review of the licenses, the inspector verified that their licenses were current. A review of the logs and records showed that the required lectures were being given as stipulated and training reviews had been documented. Written and console examinations were being administered in accordance with the licensee's requalification and training program except as noted below. It was noted that records of quarterly reactor operations, reactivity manipulations, and other licensed activities

were generally being maintained.

(2) Violation of Reactor Operator Requalification Program Requirements

License Condition 2.C.5 requires, in part, that the licensee shall operate the facility in accordance with the NRC-approved Reactor Operator Requalification Plan.

Paragraph V. of the licensee's NRC-approved Operator Requalification Program states that the ability of the operator to perform licensed functions shall be determined through evaluations which shall be conducted annually. Paragraph V.B of the Reactor Operator Requalification Program requires that each operator shall demonstrate familiarity with operator activities during a console examination.

The inspector reviewed the forms used by licensed operators to document their qualification status. These forms outlined the lecture program given by the licensee and the dates when the various lectures were presented. Licensed functions were documented by recording the date and number of hours an operator performed licensed activities. The dates of the annual written examinations were recorded, as were indications of whether the operator passed or failed. Likewise, the dates of the annual console examinations were maintained and the evaluation results were noted. During this review the inspector noted that there were no dates recorded for two operators' console examinations during 2011 and no date recorded for one operator in 2012. Further review and investigation by the licensee determined that no examinations had been given during those time periods for the operators in question.

The licensee was informed that failure of two operators to have a required annual console examination during 2011 and failure of one operator to have a required annual console examination during 2012 was a violation of License Condition 2.C.5 (VIO 50-284/2013-201-01).

c. Conclusions

The operator requalification/training program was generally being maintained up-to-date and medical examinations were being completed as required. However, one violation was noted for failure of the licensee to give two operators a console examination in 2011 and failure to give one operator a console examination in 2012.

5. Maintenance and Surveillance Activities

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

To determine that reactor maintenance activities and surveillance and limiting conditions for operation (LCO) checks, calibrations, and verifications were being

completed as required by TS Sections 3 and 4, the inspector reviewed:

- Selected surveillance data sheets
- The previously used AGN-201 Surveillance Log
- Selected ISU AGN-201M Maintenance Procedures
- Selected maintenance forms, data sheets, and records
- Selected ISU AGN-201M Operations Log Form (ROL-101), Rev 3, dated April 26, 1994, including forms documenting check out, prestart data, operational data, and reactor shut down
- ISU AGN-201M Reactor Facility Master Log for the period from December 11, 2012, to the present
- ISU AGN-201M OP-1, "AGN-201 Operating Procedure No. 1," Rev 3, dated April 26, 1994
- ISU AGN-201M OP-2, "AGN-201 Operating Procedure No. 2," Rev 3, dated April 26, 1994
- Selected ISU AGN-201M surveillance procedures for calibrations and LCO verifications

b. Observations and Findings

(1) Maintenance

Logs and associated records indicated that preventive maintenance activities were conducted as scheduled or as needed. Any problems found were addressed in accordance with the TS, applicable procedures, or equipment manuals. Maintenance activities ensured that equipment remained consistent with the Safety Analysis Report and TS requirements.

(2) Surveillance Activities

The inspector determined that selected daily, annual, and biennial checks, tests, and/or calibrations for TS-required surveillance and LCO activities and verifications were completed as stipulated. Surveillance and LCO verifications reviewed by the inspector were completed on schedule and in accordance with licensee procedures. All the recorded results were within the TS and procedurally prescribed parameters. The records and logs reviewed were generally complete and were being maintained as required.

c. Conclusions

The maintenance program satisfied TS requirements. The program for surveillance and LCO verifications was being carried out in accordance with TS requirements.

6. Fuel Movement

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

The inspector reviewed the following to ensure that TS Section 4 and procedural requirements were met:

- MP-1, "AGN-201 Rod Maintenance," Rev. 6 dated March 11, 2013
- MP-2, "Procedure to Open the AGN-201 Core," Rev. 0, dated May 2, 1989
- ISU AGN-201M Reactor Facility Master Log for the period from December 11, 2012, to the present

b. Observations and Findings

The inspector determined that no reactor fuel inspection or movement had been completed in the period since the last inspection. The control and safety rods, which contain a small amount of fuel, were inspected every year to check for deterioration, but the contained fuel was not routinely inspected and no inspection of the contained fuel was required by the TS.

c. Conclusions

The safety and control rods were inspected annually, but no contained fuel movements or inspections were required or conducted.

7. Emergency Planning

a. Inspection Scope (IP 69001)

The inspector reviewed selected aspects of:

- Emergency Locker Inventory Sheets
- Emergency Plan implementing procedures
- Emergency Plan audit and audit responses
- Documentation of emergency drills and critiques
- Memoranda of Understanding with offsite support agencies
- Emergency response supplies, equipment, and instrumentation
- Idaho State University Nuclear Reactor Laboratory Annual Emergency Personnel Training forms and records

b. Observations and Findings

The current version of the Emergency Plan (E-Plan) approved for use at the facility was Rev. 6, dated August 14, 2006. The plan and implementing procedures were being audited and reviewed biennially as required. Audits were appropriate and problems, if any, were addressed by the licensee. Memoranda

of Understanding agreements with off-site response organizations (i.e., the Portneuf Medical Center, the City of Pocatello, and the Idaho State Police) were being maintained and updated as required.

Supplies, instrumentation, and equipment were being maintained and controlled as required in the E-Plan. Annual inspections and inventories of the equipment were being completed as well. The inspector and a licensee representative conducted an inventory of the supplies and survey meters that were staged for use in the Emergency Support Center (i.e., in the Engineering Machine Shop).

Emergency drills had been conducted annually as required by the E-Plan. Critiques were written following the drills to identify any lessons learned noted during the exercise and to develop possible solutions to any problems identified. The results of these critiques were documented and filed. The last drill, which was held on July 30, 2013, involved a person with a simulated medical problem in the Subcritical Assembly Room. The drill provided a practical, reasonable, and effective test of the knowledge and training of the participants.

Emergency training for the reactor staff and for response organization personnel was conducted and documented as required. This was typically done in conjunction with the annual drill. Through records review and interviews with various personnel, emergency responders were determined to be knowledgeable of the proper actions to take in case of an emergency.

The inspector, accompanied by the Reactor Supervisor, visited the Portneuf Medical Center. While there, a tour of the Emergency Room and adjoining facilities was given by the hospital Radiation Safety Officer. There appeared to be adequate supplies and appropriate facilities to handle any emergency that might arise at the licensee's facility.

The inspector also met with a Battalion Chief from the City of Pocatello Fire Department and discussed training, participation in drills, and support of the research reactor facility. The Battalion Chief indicated that Fire Department personnel were well trained, properly equipped, and knowledgeable of the actions to take in case of an emergency at the reactor facility.

c. Conclusions

The emergency preparedness program was being carried out in accordance with the Emergency Plan.

8. Follow-Up on Previously-Identified Issues

a. Inspection Scope (IP 92701)

The inspector followed up on various items which had been identified as inspector follow-up items (IFIs) during previous inspections, including:

- IFI 50-284/2010-202-02 discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-284/2010-201, ADAMS Accession No: ML102290226
- IFI 50-284/2011-201-02 discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-284/2011-201, ADAMS Accession No: ML112350812
- IFI 50-284/2011-201-04 discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-284/2011-201, ADAMS Accession No: ML112350812
- IFI 50-284/2012-201-01 discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-284/2012-201, ADAMS Accession No: ML12249A062
- IFI 50-284/2012-201-02 discussed in NRC Inspection Report 50-284/2012-201, ADAMS Accession No: ML12249A062

b. Observations and Findings

- (1) IFI 50-284/2010-202-02 - Follow-up on the commitment made by the licensee to revise ISU AGN-201M OP-1.

In August 2010, it was noted that there was no step in procedure OP-1 which indicated when the reactor source should be withdrawn from the glory hole and where it was to be placed afterwards. Also, it was noted that there were no precautions specified for this operation.

During this inspection the inspector followed-up on this issue regarding revision of OP-1 to include the proper precautions. It was noted that the licensee had revised the procedure, but it had not yet been presented to the RSC for approval. Therefore, this IFI remains open.

- (2) IFI 50-284/2011-201-02 - Follow-up on previous issues discussed from the non-routine inspection (Inspection Report No. 50-284/2010-201) and commitments made to revise OP-1. Additionally, follow-up and determine if OP-1 was reviewed and approved in accordance with facility TS.

In July 2011, an inspector followed-up on an issue originally identified during a non-routine inspection conducted during the period of February 23–24, 2010 (Inspection Report No. 50-284/2010-201). Specifically, during that inspection the licensee indicated that they intended to revise the procedures that identify the proper storage location of the startup source. Additionally, the inspector followed-up on logging requirements of the startup source per the current operating procedure. At the time of the July 2011 inspection, OP-1 had not yet been revised to indicate the point in the procedure where the startup source was to be removed, nor did it address where the startup source was to be stored after it was removed. The inspector noted that the reactor logs, in some instances, did not indicate the position of the source as required by OP-1.

During this inspection the inspector followed-up on this issue regarding revision of OP-1 and proper logging of the location of the startup source. As noted above, OP-1 has been revised but has yet to be reviewed and

approved by the RSC. Therefore, this IFI remains open.

- (3) IFI 50-284/2011-201-04 - Follow-up on the licensee's commitment to maintain their requalification checklists up-to-date. (The checklists are used as an aid in tracking progress of operators in completing the requalification program requirements and were instituted by the facility as the result of Non-Cited Violation 50-284/2007-201-01, documented in NRC Inspection Report 50-284/2007-201.)

During an inspection in July 2011, an inspector reviewed the requalification program checklists of the facility SROs and ROs. The inspector identified that these checklists were generally being maintained, but that some of the requalification checklists did not include sufficient information to track the operators' licensed activities. At the time of that inspection, the inspector discussed this issue with facility management and the licensee indicated that they would maintain the logs and records more accurately with the required hours, lecture dates, and other requirements filled in as appropriate for all the licensed operators.

During this inspection the inspector followed-up on this issue. It was noted that the issue of properly maintaining the logs and records pertaining to the Operator Requalification Program had not been resolved or corrected. This resulted in identification of a violation for failure to comply with certain requirements of the Operator Requalification Program, as described in Section 4 above. This IFI is closed and corrective actions will be reviewed as part of the inspector's review of the response to the violation.

- (4) IFI 50-284/2012-201-01 - Follow-up on the licensee's commitment to perform a new 10 CFR 50.59 review of the proposed digital reactor console.

In August 2012, an inspector discussed with the licensee their intentions to add a newer solid state reactor console. Several years prior to the inspection, the licensee performed a 10 CFR 50.59 screening analysis on the upgrade. However, the inspector informed the licensee that the previous 10 CFR 50.59 analysis that had been performed was outdated because the NRC regulations had changed since it was completed. Since the console upgrades had not been implemented and there were several additional changes that the licensee planned to make, the licensee indicated that they intended to perform another 10 CFR 50.59 analysis of the solid state reactor console using their current process.

During this inspection the inspector followed-up on this issue. It was noted that various issues involving the electronics of the new console have not been resolved, and as such, an updated 10 CFR 50.59 had not yet been completed. This issue remains open.

- (5) IFI 50-284/2012-201-02 - Follow-up on the licensee's timely completion of surveillances.

During an inspection in August 2012, it was also noted that members of the RSC had completed audits of various aspects of the reactor facility operations, programs, and procedures as required by TS Section 6.4.3. The inspector noted that the RSC's audit findings revealed that the licensee did not always complete TS-required surveillances within the specified interval. The inspector opened an IFI to track the timely completion of corrective actions from the RSC audit and to ensure that TS surveillances were completed at the required periodicity.

During this inspection the inspector followed-up on this issue. It was noted that the licensee had developed a new tracking mechanism to list the dates when the various surveillances were/are due and to send out notification 2 weeks in advance so that the time can be scheduled to complete the checks, tests, calibrations, or verifications. No problems were noted during this inspection and all the surveillances reviewed had been completed in a timely manner. This IFI is closed.

c. Conclusion

Five IFIs were reviewed; two were closed, but three remain open pending further licensee action and NRC review.

9. Exit Meeting Summary

The inspection scope and results were summarized on October 31, 2013, with licensee representatives. The inspector discussed the findings for each area reviewed. The licensee acknowledged the results of the inspection and did not identify any information as proprietary.

PARTIAL LIST OF PERSONS CONTACTED

Licensee

G. Imel	Dean, College of Science and Engineering
T. Krieger	Reactor Operator
J. Kunze	Reactor Administrator
R. Loveland	Senior Reactor Operator
A. Mallicoat	Reactor Supervisor

Other Personnel

R. Davies	Battalion Chief, City of Pocatello Fire Department
M. Dunzik-Gougar	Associate Chair of Nuclear Engineering and Health Physics
T. Shi	Clinical Physicist and Radiation Safety Officer, Portneuf Medical Center

INSPECTION PROCEDURES USED

IP 69001	Class II Research and Test Reactors
IP 92701	Follow-up on Previously Identified Issues

ITEMS OPENED, CLOSED, AND DISCUSSED

Opened:

VIO 50-284/2013-201-01	Failure of two operators to have a required console examination during 2011 and failure of one operator to have a required console examination during 2012 was a violation of Paragraph V.B of the facility Operator Requalification Program.
------------------------	---

Closed:

IFI 50-284/2011-201-04	Follow-up on the licensee's commitment to maintain their requalification checklists up-to-date.
IFI 50-284/2012-201-02	Follow-up on the licensee's timely completion of surveillances.

Discussed:

IFI 50-284/2010-202-02	Follow-up on the commitment made by the licensee to revise ISU AGN-201M OP-1.
IFI 50-284/2011-201-02	Follow-up on previous issues discussed from the non-routine inspection and commitments made to revise OP-1. Additionally, follow-up and determine if OP-1 was reviewed and approved in

accordance with facility TS.

IFI 50-284/2012-201-01

Follow-up on the licensee's commitment to perform a new 10 CFR 50.59 review of the proposed digital reactor console.

LIST OF ACRONYMS USED

10 CFR	Title 10 of the <i>Code of Federal Regulations</i>
ADAMS	Agencywide Documents Access and Management System
AGN-201M	Aerojet General Nucleonics-201M
E-Plan	Emergency Plan
IFI	Inspection Follow-up Item
IP	Inspection Procedure
ISU	Idaho State University
LCO	Limiting Conditions for Operation
MP	Maintenance Procedure
No.	Number
NRC	Nuclear Regulatory Commission
OP	Operating Procedure
Rev.	Revision
RO	Reactor Operator
RSC	Reactor Safety Committee
SRO	Senior Reactor Operator
TS	Technical Specification
VIO	Violation