

General Design Criterion 4 of Appendix A to 10 CFR Part 50 requires that structures, systems, and components important to safety be appropriately protected from the effects of missiles that may result from equipment failures. Application of the design criteria to turbine missiles is described in SRP Section 10.2 and in subsequent safety evaluations related to probabilities of turbine failures, turbine orientations, and surveillance requirements for turbine overspeed protection systems. In NUREG-1366, "Improvements to Technical Specifications Surveillance Requirements," the staff discusses the benefits, resultant costs, and the safety impact of performing turbine overspeed protection surveillances.

Although the design basis accidents and transients include a variety of system failures and conditions which might result from turbine overspeed events and potential missiles striking various plant systems and equipment, the system failures and plant conditions are much more likely to be caused by events other than turbine failures. In view of the low likelihood of turbine missiles, assumptions related to the turbine overspeed protection system are not part of an initial condition of a design basis accident or transient that either assumes the failure of or presents a challenge to the integrity of a fission product barrier. The turbine overspeed protection system is not relied upon in the design basis accident or transient analyses as a primary success path which functions or actuates to mitigate such events.

Probabilistic safety assessments and operating experience have demonstrated that proper maintenance of the turbine overspeed control valves is important to minimize the potential for overspeed events and turbine damage; however that experience has also demonstrated that there is low likelihood of significant risk to public health and safety because of turbine overspeed events. Further, the potential for and consequences of turbine overspeed events are diminished by factors such as the orientation of the turbine relative to plant structures and equipment, licensee inservice testing programs, which must comply with 10 CFR 50.55(a), and surveillance programs for the turbine control and stop valves derived from the manufacturer's recommendations.

Accordingly, the staff has concluded that the turbine overspeed protection system does not satisfy the final policy statement criteria and need not be included in TS. Licensees may propose to relocate the turbine overspeed protection requirements to the UFSAF

requirements to the UFSAR and control changes to those provisions in accordance with 10 CFR 50.59.

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

**Brian K. Grimes,**

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

[FR Doc. 95-15677 Filed 6-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket 70-1257]

**Finding of No Significant Impact and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing Renewal of Special Nuclear Material License SNM-1227 Siemens Power Corporation Richland Engineering and Manufacturing Facility Richland, Washington**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering the renewal of Special Nuclear Material License SNM-1227 for the continued operation of the Siemens Power Corporation's (SPC) Engineering and Manufacturing Facility located in Richland, Washington. The facility manufactures low-enriched uranium fuel for commercial nuclear power reactors.

**Summary of the Environmental Assessment**

*Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is the renewal of SPC's special nuclear material license for 10 years. With this renewal, SPC will continue to operate the Richland Engineering and Manufacturing Facility to fabricate fuel assemblies for commercial nuclear power reactors. SPC is authorized to possess and use up to 25,000 kilograms of uranium-235 in compounds enriched up to 5 weight percent in the U-235.

The facility converts low-enriched uranium hexafluoride (UF<sub>6</sub>) to uranium dioxide (UO<sub>2</sub>) powder, presses the UO<sub>2</sub> into pellets, loads the pellets into rods, and assembles the rods into final fuel assemblies. Most of the UF<sub>6</sub>-to-UO<sub>2</sub> conversion is performed using the ammonium diuranate (ADU) process; however, with this license renewal, SPC will significantly expand its existing dry conversion capacity and shut down most of the ADU process capacity. The environmental assessment considers both the impacts of continued operation of the ADU process and the impacts of the expanded dry conversion capacity, which are expected to be significantly reduced.

*The Need for the Proposed Action*

SPC performs a necessary service for the commercial nuclear power industry

by fabricating fuel assemblies. Currently, the SPC facility is one of four such producers of low-enriched uranium fuel that operates within the United States. Denial of the license renewal application is an alternative available to the NRC but would result in either the expansion of production capacity or transfer of fuel production activities at another facility.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The continued operation of the SPC facility will result in the continued release of low levels of hazardous and radioactive constituents. Under accident conditions, the facility could release higher concentrations over a short period of time. The facility uses a number of controls to reduce the release of hazardous and radioactive materials to the environment and performs monitoring of effluents and the environment. These controls and the monitoring program are described below.

The radiological environmental impacts of normal operations and postulated accidents were evaluated for the SPC facility. These impacts are summarized following the description of controls and monitoring.

*Effluent Controls and Monitoring*

The SPC facility produces gaseous, liquid, and solid effluent streams. Gaseous effluents are controlled by minimizing the amount of airborne radioactive materials within the plant and by the use of stack scrubbers and High Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filters. Liquid effluents are controlled by the use of waste water retention lagoons and treatment systems that reduce the concentration of radioactive materials prior to discharge to the Richland city sewer system. Solid effluents are controlled by segregation of radioactive wastes from trash and hazardous wastes; containment of wastes in drums or boxes on site; treatment by decontamination, compaction, or incineration, as appropriate; and final disposal off site.

SPC monitors these effluents at or just prior to the points of release. Gaseous stack effluents are sampled continuously at isokinetic flow conditions, and the samples are analyzed for radioactivity. Liquid effluents are sampled at the lift station at the point of discharge to the sewer, and the samples are analyzed for uranium and other constituents. Solid wastes are surveyed prior to treatment or off-site disposal.

Action levels have been selected for each of these effluents, in accordance

with applicable NRC, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and State regulations, and are incorporated into the renewed license. These action levels specify radionuclide concentrations at which investigations would be initiated and operations would be shut down.

The effluent monitoring program will cover the expanded dry conversion process, including monitoring of new process off-gas and building ventilation systems.

#### **Environmental Monitoring**

SPC also performs monitoring to detect accumulation of radioactive materials in the environment. Off-site soils are sampled from two stations quarterly and are analyzed for uranium. Off-site vegetation is sampled from two stations monthly during the growing season and is analyzed for fluoride as an indicator of plant emissions. Ambient air is sampled continuously at two stations and analyzed for fluoride.

The lagoon liner systems are inspected monthly for the presence of liquids. If liquids are present, a sample is taken and analyzed for constituents present in the lagoon. If the liquids are identified as lagoon contents, the lagoon would be emptied and the liner repaired.

Ground water near the lagoons is sampled on a quarterly basis, and the samples analyzed for gross alpha and beta and for chlorides, nitrate nitrogen, ammonia nitrogen, and pH. If the ground water data indicate a lagoon leak, then the lagoon would be emptied and the liner repaired.

Richland city sewage plant sludge is sampled monthly and analyzed for uranium. If a running average of the analyses over a 6-month period exceeds 25 pico-curies per gram, or any single confirmed result equals or exceeds 30 pico-curies per gram discharges to the sewer will be stopped and an investigation will be performed.

The environmental monitoring program will not change as a result of the dry conversion process expansion.

#### *Environmental Impacts From Normal Operations*

The release of radioactive material to air and water represents a potential negative impact on the health and safety of the surrounding population. This impact results in a very small increase in the risk of cancer due to low levels of radiation exposure. The risk has been calculated and presented in terms of committed effective dose equivalent and organ doses resulting from a single year of operation. For doses resulting from inhalation or ingestion of uranium, this quantity is the total effective dose

equivalent or organ dose that will accrue to an individual over a 50-year period beginning with the year the intake occurs. Doses to a hypothetical maximally exposed individual and collective dose to the population living within an 80 kilometer (50 mile) radius of the SPC facility were calculated and are summarized below.

Based on effluent data for the past 5 years, the SPC facility is expected to release approximately 15 microcuries per year ( $\mu\text{Ci}/\text{yr}$ ) of alpha activity and 1.4  $\mu\text{Ci}/\text{yr}$  of beta activity via gaseous emissions and less than 0.06 curies per year of uranium via sewer discharges. The amount of gaseous alpha emissions is expected to be reduced significantly when the change from ADU conversion to dry conversion is completed.

Doses to the maximally exposed individual via the atmospheric and aqueous release pathways were calculated using the Hanford Environmental Dosimetry Software system (GENII code) and realistic and conservative assumptions.

The total effective dose to a hypothetical resident at the site boundary would be 0.024 millirems per year from atmospheric emissions. The total effective dose to the nearest existing downwind residence, 3.4 kilometers (2.1 miles) southeast of the plant, is calculated at 0.0002 millirem per year from atmospheric emissions. These doses are far below the 25 millirem per year standard in 40 CFR Part 190 for organ doses from fuel cycle operations and the 10 millirem per year standard in 40 CFR Part 61, Subpart I, for doses from atmospheric releases.

The collective dose to the population from routine atmospheric releases is estimated at 0.0035 person-rem per year, less than 0.00005 percent of the 85,000 person-rem per year that the same population is exposed to from natural background sources.

Radioactive material released from the SPC facility to the Richland sewer system, and ultimately to the Columbia River, may result in radiation exposure to humans through a variety of pathways. The primary pathways considered in the analysis were ingestion of drinking water from the Columbia River, consumption of fish from the river and terrestrial foodstuffs irrigated with river water, and exposure during recreational activities such as swimming and boating. Doses to a maximally exposed individual living near the site and to the population within 80 kilometers (50 miles) downstream were calculated. The radionuclide release rates used in the analysis are from measurements of the effluent discharged to the sewer system.

Because most of the reported concentrations were at or below the lower limit of detection for the analytical procedure, the aqueous release used in the dose calculation conservatively overestimates the actual release. The total effective dose from aqueous effluents to the Columbia River from the ADU conversion process was calculated at 0.00056 millirem, which is well below applicable regulatory standards in 40 CFR Part 190 and 10 CFR Part 20, Subpart D. Most of the dose is from U-234, and the bone surface receives the highest dose. Liquid releases from the dry conversion process, after the lagoon contents are processed, are expected to average about 30 percent of the current levels.

The dose to the surrounding population from aqueous releases is estimated at 0.074 person-rem per year. This dose is less than 0.004 percent of the 21,000 person-rem per year from natural background radiation sources to the downstream population.

The treatment in the city sewage treatment plant of liquid releases results in some reconcentration of uranium in sewage sludge. Sludge from the sewage plant is shipped daily to the Richland city landfill where it is mixed with approximately equal amounts of petroleum-contaminated soils and native soils. After 6 months, the mixture is used as intermediate cover at the city landfill. SPC samples the sludge on a monthly basis and analyzes it for uranium content. The concentration of uranium in the sludge has been on the order of 10 picocuries per gram (pCi/g) of sludge (wet weight basis), and SPC has committed to action levels of 25 pCi/g for any 6-month running average or 30 pCi/g for a single sample. If these action levels are exceeded, discharges to the sewer will be halted and an investigation performed.

#### *Environmental Impacts From Accidental Releases*

Release of radioactive or hazardous materials under off-normal or accident conditions poses a potential risk to public health and safety and the environment. The potential consequences of these accidents include personal injury, health effects from acute exposures to toxic materials, non-stochastic effects from acute radiation exposure, and risk of latent cancer fatality from exposure to radioactive material.

A set of four accidents spanning the range of potential consequences was selected and evaluated. Three of the four scenarios evaluated the accidental release of radioactive materials. The intakes and predicted doses for the three

radiological accident scenarios were small, with negligible associated health effects, or below the level normally assumed for the onset of clinically observed effects. The fourth accident analyzed, the release of gaseous ammonia, would be expected to produce noticeable, but not life-threatening effects both on site and off site. Given the low likelihood of these accidents, it is concluded that the license renewal will not have a significant impact on the general population.

#### *Socioeconomic Impacts*

SPC employs 1,000 people at the Richland plant, which is approximately 1.5 percent of the 68,000 people employed in the Tri-Cities area. Renewal of the license will allow the continued operation of the facility and continued employment of these 1,000 people.

#### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

If the license is not renewed, the facility would cease operation and begin decontamination and decommissioning. SPC would perform a survey of the site grounds and buildings and develop a detailed decontamination and decommissioning plan. This plan would include the decontamination of buildings, lagoons, and other outdoor areas; generation and off-site disposal of significant quantities of low-level radioactive waste; and excavation of contaminated soils. Decontamination and decommissioning operations would result in the release of small amounts of radioactivity to the atmosphere and to the Columbia River. Specific estimates of the quantities that would be released and associated doses are too speculative to predict, but the expected range could be about the same as for continued operation to one order of magnitude less. Consequently, the doses to the maximally exposed individual and to the general population would be about the same to an order of magnitude less.

The decontamination and decommissioning operations would require fewer employees than plant operations, resulting in an immediate negative socioeconomic impact. This negative socioeconomic impact would increase when decontamination and decommissioning operations were completed and the facility closed.

The cessation of operations would also result in there being one less operating fuel fabrication facility in the U.S., with a potential impact on the commercial nuclear power industry.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

To prepare the Environmental Assessment, the staff used the license renewal application dated August 1992; Revision 4 to the Supplement to Applicant's Environmental Report dated July 1994; additional information dated September 12 and October 21, 1994, and March 31, 1995; and independent data and analyses. In addition, discussions were held with the Washington Department of Health, Radiation Protection Division; the Washington Department of Ecology Nuclear Waste Program and Water Quality Section; the Benton County Clean Air Authority; the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region X; the City of Richland Department of Water and Waste Utilities; the Washington State Archeologist; the Bureau of Indian Affairs, Yakama Agency; and the Yakama Indian Nation.

#### *Conclusion*

The NRC staff concludes that the environmental impacts associated with the proposed license renewal for continued operation of SPC's Richland facility are expected to be insignificant.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

The Commission has prepared an Environmental Assessment related to the renewal of Special Nuclear Material License SNM-1227. On the basis of this assessment, NRC has concluded that environmental impacts that would be created by the proposed licensing action would not be significant and do not warrant the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. Accordingly, it has been determined that a finding of no significant impact is appropriate.

#### **Opportunity for a Hearing**

Any person whose interest may be affected by the issuance of this license renewal may file a request for a hearing. Any request for hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, within 30 days of the publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**; must be served on the NRC staff (Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852), and on the licensee (Siemens Power Corporation, 2101 Horn Rapids Road, Richland, WA 99352-0130); and must comply with the requirements for requesting a hearing set forth in the Commission's regulation 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L, "Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials Licensing Proceedings."

These requirements, which the requestor must address in detail, are:

1. The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;
2. How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing;
3. The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and
4. The circumstances establishing that the request for hearing is timely, that is, filed within 30 days of the date of this notice.

In addressing how the requestor's interest may be affected by the proceeding, the request should describe the nature of the requestor's right under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to be made a party to the proceeding; the nature and extent of the requestor's property, financial, or other (i.e., health, safety) interest in the proceeding; and the possible effect of any order that may be entered in the proceeding upon the requestor's interest.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Robert C. Pierson,**

*Chief, Licensing Branch, Division of Fuel Cycle Safety and Safeguards, NMSS.*

[FR Doc. 95-15675 Filed 6-26-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

---

## **RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD**

### **Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review**

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1980 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35), the Railroad Retirement Board has submitted the following proposal(s) for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

#### **Summary of Proposal(s)**

- (1) *Collection title:* Release of Canadian Tax Information.
- (2) *Form(s) submitted:* G-261.
- (3) *OMB Number:* N/A.
- (4) *Expiration date of current OMB clearance:* N/A.
- (5) *Type of request:* New Collection.
- (6) *Respondents:* Individuals or households.
- (7) *Estimated annual number of respondents:* 50.
- (8) *Total annual responses:* 50.
- (9) *Total annual reporting hours:* 4.
- (10) *Collection description:* The proposed information collection will request Canadian taxpayers who are