

study, would result in anomalous results.

Response: The staff concurs that seismic rebinning solely on the basis of generic seismic fragilities could result in anomalous results, since such items as the plant design basis and vintage of the plant might not be appropriately included. For instance, plants located at the same site were put in different bins (Salem and Hope Creek), and the plants in the New Madrid area were placed in the modified-scope bin. These observations contributed to the staff's decision to eliminate the use of an absolute risk criterion in the seismic scope modifications.

(9) *Information exchange through a workshop on lessons learned from IPEEE*: An information exchange workshop on IPEEE lessons learned to discuss the experience gained from practical or more efficient ways of carrying out the seismic IPEEEs (i.e., relay chatter issue) would benefit both industry and staff.

Response: The staff will consider such a workshop in the future.

(10) *Components and items needing evaluation and bases*: Certain evaluations of a few known weaker and critical components and items need to be retained in the seismic IPEEE program.

Response: Those components and items identified as needing evaluation and the bases for the retention are briefly described below:

(a) Relay Chatter Issue

While preparing the original guidance in NUREG-1407, the NRC staff developed its position on relay chatter issue after thoroughly discussing the issue with industry and evaluating the results of previous studies. The staff drastically reduced the scope of relay chatter evaluation, retaining only the identification of *bad actor* relays. Since these relays are of low capacity, their identification is considered minimum scope for the IPEEE review. The guidance does not preclude any efficient and expeditious means of identifying these relays.

(b) Masonry and Block Walls

Probabilistic risk assessments and margin studies have demonstrated that failure of masonry or block walls might be a significant safety concern in existing nuclear power plants. The earthquake experience database and analytical evaluations of seismic fragility demonstrate that masonry and block walls without proper reinforcements are vulnerable to earthquake motion. Although this type of construction would not be

appropriate for use in the current design of nuclear power plants, it has been used in several plants. In evaluating these walls, more lenient criteria were used; thus, the available margins beyond the safe shutdown earthquake may not be comparable to those of other components of the plant. Therefore, in doing the seismic IPEEE review, the licensee needs to identify and evaluate masonry and block walls where they may affect safety components required for safe plant operation. The licensee would need to correct, if warranted, any situation that may present a significant threat to plant safety.

(c) Flat-Bottom Tanks

Earthquake experience data and analytical fragility evaluations have demonstrated that flat-bottom tanks with poor anchorage are vulnerable to earthquake ground motion. The typical failure mode of concern is the buckling at the base of the tank, which could cause the liquid contents to escape or cause the tank to collapse. If a flat-bottom tank fails, it could flood surrounding areas in the plant, in addition to the consequences of loss of function of the tanks. Past seismic studies of nuclear power plants have designated flat-bottom tanks as low-capacity components. Such components include the refueling water storage tank and the condensate storage tank, whose failures would often significantly affect plant safety. The identification and evaluation of flat-bottom tanks should, therefore, be included as a fundamental element of the seismic IPEEE review to correct, if warranted, any situation that may threaten plant safety.

(d) Other Items

The licensee would also need to consider several other items that pertain to inadequate anchorage and bracing, adverse physical interactions, building impact, or pounding. These items include the weaker components of the diesel generators or pumps. However, the licensee's seismic review team should determine whether seismic capacities of those components need to be evaluated in the seismic review.

Attachment 2—References

- [1] U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Generic Letter 88-20, Supplement No. 4, "Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities—10 CFR 50.54(f)," June 1991.
- [2] NRC, NUREG-1407, "Procedural and Submittal Guidance for the Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE) for Severe Accident Vulnerabilities," Final Report, June 1991.

- [3] NRC, NUREG/CR-5250, "Seismic Hazard Characterization of 69 Nuclear Power Plant Sites East of the Rocky Mountains," January 1989.
- [4] Electric Power Research Institute (EPRI), NP-6395-D, "Probabilistic Seismic Hazard Evaluation at Nuclear Plant Sites in the Central and Eastern United States: Resolution of the Charleston Issue," April 1989.
- [5] NRC, NUREG-1488, "Revised Livermore Seismic Hazard Estimates for 69 Nuclear Power Plant Sites East of the Rocky Mountains," April 1994.
- [6] Letter from W. Rasin (NEI) to A. Thadani (NRC), "NEI White Paper, 'Justification for Reduction in IPEEE Program Based on Revised LLNL Seismic Hazard Results,'" April 5, 1994.
- [7] NRC IN 94-32, "Revised Seismic Hazard Estimate," April 29, 1994.
- [8] Energy Research, Inc. (ERI) Report (ERI/NRC 94-502), "A Proposed Approach to Seismic Scope Re-assessment for Individual Plant Examination of External Events (IPEEE)," Final Draft, September 1994
- [9] ERI/NRC 94-504, "Approaches for Proposed Modifications of Seismic IPEEE Guidelines for Focused-Scope Plants", Final Draft, September 1994.
- [10] NRC Transcript, "Workshop in Seismic IPEEE Revisit," October 21, 1994.
- [11] EPRI NP-6041, "A Methodology for Assessment of Nuclear Power Plant Seismic Margin," October 1988.
- [12] NRC Generic Letter 94-03, "Intergranular stress Corrosion Cracking of Core Shrouds in BWR Reactors," July 25, 1994.
- [13] NRC memorandum from W. Russell to E. Beckjord, "NRR User Need Request for Support of Resolving Problem of Stress Corrosion of Reactor Vessel Internal Components," December 2, 1994.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brian K. Grimes,

Director, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-2168 Filed 1-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Nominations for Medical Visiting Fellow Program

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Call for nominations.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is re-opening the invitation period for nominations of physicians, having expert qualifications in the medical specialty field of Radiation Oncology (Therapy), to apply for positions as Medical Visiting Fellows (Fellows). Others having expert qualifications in related fields such as Therapeutic Radiological Physics are also invited to apply. NRC noticed an

invitation for nominations in the **Federal Register** on November 7, 1994, for submittal by January 15, 1995 (59 FR 55497). This notice re-opens the submittal date to April 15, 1995.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Objectives

NRC is seeking to expand its knowledge of the medical specialty of radiation oncology. Specifically, the therapeutic uses of radioisotopes in brachytherapy patient procedures. Recently, significant misadministrations have occurred involving errors in the delivery of the prescribed radiation dose to the patient during either manual or remote afterloading brachytherapy procedures. As a result of evaluating the circumstances surrounding these events, NRC has identified the need to reevaluate certain aspects of its regulatory program to determine whether modifications are indicated.

NRC intends to keep abreast of this technology and future developments in the therapeutic uses of radioisotopes and believes that such a Fellow, with expertise in these uses, can assist NRC staff in meeting this goal. The program is open to physicians interested in seeking an appointment for individual sabbatical pursuits. Other radiation specialists on sabbatical, or those who wish to engage in post-doctoral research, will also be considered. Individuals participating as Fellows would join NRC for approximately one year, to undertake activities consistent with the interests and needs of NRC and with the individual's training and experience; and that will result in a clearly defined assignment useful to NRC's regulatory program. Ideally, each Fellow would be available to NRC on a full-time basis; however, NRC will consider nominees who are available only on a part-time basis. Additionally, the number of appointments made will depend on the range of skills embodied in the nomination, individuals' interests and needs of NRC.

In addition to a specific assignment, or research project, it is anticipated that the Fellow would attend meetings of NRC's Advisory Committee on the Medical Uses of Isotopes (ACMUI); Federal, State, and local agencies; professional organizations; and groups, to participate in discussions on issues related to medical affairs and the use of radiation in medicine. Therefore, NRC is primarily soliciting nominations of physicians involved with the medical use of radioisotopes, but will be pleased to receive nominations of other radiation health professionals and medical radiation specialists to serve as Fellows. The selectee may also

participate in public meetings and seminars sponsored by NRC for exchanging information and discussing issues, of mutual interest, that will benefit the regulation of medical practice. A collateral goal is to create a cadre of individuals with experience in the regulation of medical use of isotopes; therefore, it is likely that former Fellows may be asked to participate, from time to time, in NRC-sponsored meetings and seminars after their appointment ends, to provide advice and consultation about the regulated program.

Appointment Method

Appointments will be made by means of Intergovernmental Personnel Act assignment, reimbursable detail, or professional term appointment, depending on the selectee's situation.

Term of Appointment

The term of appointment will be approximately one year. Appointments may be lengthened, depending on the depth and scope of the Fellow's project, availability and the needs of the NRC, to approximately two years.

Compensation

Fellows will receive compensation commensurate with their experience, salary history, and Federal pay guidelines while serving their appointment. Fellows will be reimbursed for official travel and relocation expenses.

Duty Location

Fellows may be assigned to any Office in NRC, including the Office of the Commissioners, consistent with the interests and needs of NRC and the individual's training and experience. The duty location is at NRC Headquarters, Rockville, Maryland. It is anticipated that there will be some travel associated with this position.

Eligibility Requirements

NRC is an equal opportunity employer. Nominees must be U.S. citizens. Nominees must also satisfy applicable, NRC security, conflict of interest, and drug-free work place standards. Eligibility is open to physicians specializing in Radiation Oncology (Radiation Therapy), or medical physicists specializing in Therapeutic Radiological Physics. Other nominees will also be considered based on the needs of NRC and the individual's interest.

How to Nominate

Candidates may be nominated by professional groups, medical societies,

government agencies, or may be self-nominated. Nominations must provide the nominee's current address and telephone number and include a resume describing the educational and professional qualifications of the nominee. A brief statement of the individual's professional objectives should also be included.

Where to Submit Nominations

Submit nominations to: Secretary of the Commission. ATTN: Medical Visiting Fellows Program Manager, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

Date Nominations Are Due

Nominations are due to the Secretary of the Commission by April 15, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Janet Schlueter, Medical, Academic, and Commercial Use Safety Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Mail Stop: T8 F 5, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone (301) 415-7894, facsimile (301) 415-5369.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 23rd day of January 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Larry W. Camper,

Acting Chief, Medical, Academic, and Commercial Use Safety Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.
[FR Doc. 95-2165 Filed 1-27-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

NUREG: Issuance, Availability

The Nuclear Regulatory Commission has issued NUREG-1435, Supplement 4, Status of Safety Issues at Licensed Power Plants, TMI Action Plan (TMI) Requirements, Unresolved Safety Issues (USIs), Generic Safety Issues (GSIs) and Other Multiplant Actions, (MPAs). The document covers the status of implementation and verification of these issues at licensed operating plants.

This NUREG has been prepared to provide a comprehensive description of the implementation and verification status of all TMI, USI, GSI and other MPAs at licensed operating plants and to make this information available to other interested parties, including the public.

Copies of the Report have been placed in the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW, Lower Level, Washington, D.C. 20555. Copies of the Report may be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Post Office