For further details with respect to this action, see the EA and other documents related to this proposed action which are available for public inspection and copying at the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC 20555. For additional information, contact Jack Parrott, NRC Project Manager for the UNC site at (301) 415–6700 or Mail Stop T–8F37, Washington, DC 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 9th day of August, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael F. Weber,

Chief, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 95–22183 Filed 9–6–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–397]

Washington Public Power Supply System; Notice of Withdrawal of Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted a request by Washington Public Power Supply System (the licensee) to withdraw its May 10, 1993, and supplement dated May 21, 1993, application for an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF–21 for operation of the Nuclear Project No. 2, located in Benton County, Washington.

The proposed amendment would have revised Section 6 (Administrative Controls) of the Technical Specifications (TS) to modify the composition, organizational assignments, and reporting relationship of the personnel performing the Independent Safety Engineering Group (ISEG) function in the current Nuclear Safety Assurance Division (NSAD). Also, the change would have modified the title of the Quality Assurance (QA) member of the Plant Operations Committee (POC) to reflect the new QA organization.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of this amendment published in the **Federal Register** on August 18, 1993 (58 FR 43937). However, by letter dated September 8, 1993, the licensee withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated May 10, 1993, and supplement dated May 21, 1993, and the licensee's letter dated September 8, 1993, which withdrew the application for license amendment.

The above documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Richland Public Library, 955 Northgate Street, Richland, Washington 99352.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 29th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brian E. Holian,

Senior Project Manager, Project Directorate IV–2, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–22184 Filed 9–6–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket 70–27]

Finding of No Significant Impact and Notice of Opportunity for a Hearing, Renewal of Special Nuclear Material License SNM–42, Babcock & Wilcox Company, Naval Nuclear Fuel Division, Lynchburg, VA

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering the renewal of Special Nuclear Material License SNM–42 for the continued operation of the Babcock & Wilcox (B&W) Naval Nuclear Fuel Division (NNFD) and Lynchburg Technology Center (LTC) in Lynchburg, Virginia.

Summary of the Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action:

B&W has requested the renewal of Special Nuclear Material License SNM–42 for the NNFD and LTC for a period of 10 years. In 1994, the NRC approved the consolidation of all activities authorized under LTC's License SNM–778 into NNFD's License SNM–42.

The B&W facility is located on a 212-hectare (525-acre) site in the northeastern corner of Campbell County, approximately 8 km (5 miles) east of Lynchburg, Virginia. This site is located in a generally rural area, consisting primarily of rolling hills with gentle slopes, farmland, and woodlands. The NNFD/LTC coexists on the site with the B&W Fuel Company plant which is separately licensed by the NRC. The combined NNFD/LTC facility is centrally located on the site with the main manufacturing complex contained in a 7.7-hectare (19-acre) fenced area and the LTC complex contained in a 5.5-hectare (13.6-acre) area for a combined total of 13.2 hectares (32.6 acres).

With this renewal, the combined NNFD/LTC activities will continue. The licensed activities include:

- The fabrication of unirradiated, highly enriched uranium into complete core assemblies for nuclear reactor fuel components for the U.S. Navy propulsion program and other government agencies, as well as university and other research reactors.
- The recovery of process uranium from scrap material.
- The continuation of existing research and development operations and non-nuclear process control research.
- The availability of analytical services for commercial power plants.
- The decontamination of reactor related hardware for inspection and evaluation.

The Need for The Proposed Action

The NNFD operation primarily supports the U.S. Navy propulsion program including fuel loading and subsequent refueling of ship reactors. The demand for this operation will continue in order to maintain at least the present fleet operation. If the operation of the NNFD is discontinued, another facility will have to be used in order to meet the national security needs of the U.S. Navy. In addition, this facility provides nuclear fuel modules to U.S. Department of Energy contractors and other research institutions. The LTC performs research and development necessary to create new products and processes, along with examining and improving those of the present generation.

Denial of license renewal for the NNFD/LTC facility would require that similar activities be undertaken at another site.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

Renewal of the combined NNFD/LTC license, involves a balance of positive and negative impacts. The positive impacts include contribution to national security, lessening of dependence on fossil fuels, and lessening of the negative environmental impacts related to production and utilization of fossil fuels. The negative impacts include releases of radioactive materials in the various environmental media associated with facility operation.

For the proposed action, renewal of the combined NNFD/LTC license, the continued handling of materials and conduct of operations at the facility poses a potential impact to the environment and public health and safety. For normal operations, the impact is related to the release of low levels of toxic or radioactive materials to the environment over extended periods of time. For accident conditions, the

hazard may involve release of higher concentrations of materials over relatively short periods of time.

The nonradioactive gaseous emissions from the combined NNFD/LTC are nitrogen oxides and fluoride compounds released from the process buildings and combustion products released from the steam plant. The state-issued air quality permit for the facility calls for the NO_X concentration at the site boundary to meet National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). It has been determined that a maximum sector annual average NO_X concentration is approximately 0.8 percent of the NAAQS limit for NO_X. Consequently, it is concluded that NO_X emissions produce an insignificant environmental impact (NRC, 1991). The maximum hydrogen fluoride (HF) site boundary concentration is estimated as 0.04 μg/m^3. This concentration is approximately 1 percent of the time weighted average threshold limit value (TLV) proposed for workers by the American Conference of Governmental Industrial Hygienists (ACGIH) (ACGIH, 1986). Consequently, no significant impacts are expected.

Potential surface water impacts associated with operation of the combined NNFD/LTC include disruption of flow of the James River due to withdrawals and degradation of water quality of the river due to contaminant releases. The design capacity for withdrawal by the B&W facility is 0.02 m^3/s (0.67 ft^3/s). To date, this use of the James River by the B&W facility has had no adverse impact on the James River flow rate. The flow rates associated with future operations are expected to be similar or less than the historical flows; no additional impact is expected.

Degradation of surface water quality is prevented by enforcement of release limits and monitoring programs mandated under the facility National Pollution Discharge Elimination Systems (NPDES) permit. LTC liquid discharges are a small part of the combined discharges, which are monitored under this permit. NPDES permit conditions were exceeded twice during the 1989 through 1993 period. In the first instance, the discharge load for fluoride was exceeded during September 1993. In the second instance, the permit level for fecal coliform was exceeded at an internal monitoring point during July 1994 but was within limits at the final release monitoring point. This infrequent exceedance of NPDES levels does not indicate occurrence of a significant environmental impact.

Potential groundwater impacts include drawdown of the water table in the vicinity of facility wells and degradation of groundwater quality due to uncontrolled leakage to the subsurface soils. The B&W withdrawals of groundwater in the area of the James River are small in comparison to the capacity of the wells and the groundwater system.

There are no discharges of waste waters to ponds that could result in groundwater contamination from proposed operations except for those ponds that are used to manage the flow rate of discharges into the James River. The groundwater does have high levels of trichloroethylene (TCE) contamination from previous leaks which have been identified and eliminated.

On September 27, 1991, the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Region III issued a Final Order of Consent (Docket RCRA–III–050–CA) under Section 3008(h) of the Resource Conservation Reauthorization Act (RCRA), as amended. The Consent Order specified that B&W perform interim measures to prevent or relieve immediate threats to human health or the environment, perform a RCRA field investigation (RFI) to delineate the nature and extent of any releases of past raw products or wastes, and to perform a corrective measures study (CMS) to identify and evaluate alternatives for corrective action (B&W, 1995b).

On April 17, 1995, the draft RFI report was completed and submitted to EPA Region III. The RFI report identified three groundwater plumes which were contaminated with TCE, tetrachloroethylene (PCE), and related degradation constituents above the drinking water limit of 0.005 parts per million (ppm). The largest plume (Plume A) is located beneath the NNFD plant, extending 884 m (2,900 feet) from the upper road on the southwest portion of the site northeast to the James River. Plume A has a maximum width 365 m (1,200 feet), an approximate area of 28 hectares (70 acres), and an average concentration of 0.1 ppm TCE. The TCE source areas for plume A are the former TCE storage tank location where the maximum groundwater contamination is 145 ppm TCE, and a former zirconium chip burning area near the James River where the maximum groundwater contamination is 44.3 ppm TCE (B&W, 1995b).

The second largest plume (Plume C) is located beneath the Commercial Nuclear Fuel Plant (CNFP), extending 503 m (1,650 feet) from the upper side of the CNFP plant north towards the James River. Plume C has a maximum width of 190 m (625 feet), an approximate area of 10 hectare (24 acres) and an average concentration of 0.01 ppm TCE. The TCE source area for plume C is the former TCE storage tank location, and the maximum groundwater contamination is 0.397 ppm TCE (B&W, 1995b).

The third largest plume (Plume B) is located on the western portion of the site where the former uranium recovery building was buried. Plume B has a maximum length of 229 m (750 feet), a maximum width of 90 meters (300 feet), an approximate area of 2 hectares (5 acres), and an average concentration of 0.1 ppm TCE and 0.1 ppm PCE. The exact TCE and PCE source areas for plume B are unknown, but are most likely due to past waste disposal practices in the building disposal area. The maximum groundwater contamination is 3.4 ppm TCE and 58.6 ppm PCE. Upon EPA Region III approval of the RFI report, B&W will proceed with the CMS, where alternatives for corrective action will be evaluated (B&W, 1995b).

All but two of the underground tanks installed at the site have been removed and so the potential for accidental contamination of the groundwater is reduced. Remediation plans are being prepared for the cleanup of the TCE plume. The continued operation of the combined NNFD/LTC is not expected to result in any additional negative impact on the local groundwater.

Operation of the NNFD and LTC may pose risks to public health and safety due to release of radioactive material under normal operational or accident conditions. Radioactive materials released from the NNFD and LTC may reach the public through a variety of transport pathways contributing to both internal and external exposures. For atmospheric releases; internal exposures may occur through inhalation of radioactive material dispersed in the air or ingestion of crops and animal products which come in contact with radioactive material deposited from the air. External exposures may occur through direct radiation from an airborne plume or from particulates deposited onto the ground from the plume. For liquid releases, internal exposures from ingestion of water or irrigated crops may occur. External exposures from recreational activities, including swimming and boating may occur. For atmospheric releases, potentially exposed members of the public considered in the analysis include a maximally exposed individual located at the site boundary and the population out to a distance of 80 kilometers (50 miles). In order to

provide a conservative evaluation of potential liquid pathway impacts, the analysis assumes that a maximally exposed individual downstream of the facility and the surrounding population obtain drinking water and irrigation water from the James River.

The NNFD releases radioactive material to the atmosphere from approximately 27 stacks while the LTC releases radioactive material from 2 stacks. The NNFD releases are primarily uranium while the LTC releases are mixed fission products, including H–3 and Kr-85. For internal exposures, uranium is the dominant radionuclide; inhalation exposures are greater than ingestion exposures, and the lung is the controlling organ.

Low-level liquid radioactive waste from the NNFD and the LTC are processed through the Waste Treatment Facility. The system effluent is monitored and released to the James River. Releases attributable to the NNFD are primarily uranium while those from the LTC are primarily tritium.

NRC regulations (10 CFR 20.1301) require that total effective dose equivalent (TEDE) for members of the public not exceed 1.0×10^{-3} Sv (100 mrem) per year. In addition, EPA regulations (40 CFR Part 190) require that for routine releases to the general environment, the annual dose equivalent not exceed 2.5×10^{-4} Sv (25 mrem) to the whole body, 7.5×10^{-4} Sv (75 mrem) to the thyroid, and 2.5×10^{-4} Sv (25 mrem) to any other organ (EPA, 1977). For releases to the atmosphere, EPA regulations (40 CFR Part 61) require that the annual effective dose equivalent not exceed 1.0×10^{-4} Sv (10 mrem) (EPA, 1991). Doses associated with NNFD and LTC operations are dominated by releases to the atmosphere. For the maximally exposed individual, TEDE is estimated as 2.4×10^{-7} Sv (0.024 mrem) while the largest dose to a tissue is estimated as 2.0×10^{-6} Sv (0.2 mrem) to the lung. The doses are small fractions of the limits established by the NRC and EPA and indicate that facility operations will have insignificant impact on public health and safety. Because conservative assumptions were used in the analysis, actual doses are expected to be lower.

The NNFD and LTC handle materials which could pose a risk to public health and safety if released during accidents. Prior NRC analysis of operation of the NNFD considered accidents including criticality, fire, and flood (NRC, 1978). This prior analysis is supplemented by consideration of the research and development, analytical, and decontamination operations conducted at the LTC. The initial step in the accident analysis is auditing of hazardous materials and potentially hazardous activities present or conducted at the facility. Other than radioactive materials, the LTC does not contain significant inventories of potentially hazardous materials. In addition, the facility does not fabricate or convert materials in any continuous process. Thus, the handling and examination of fuel assemblies and the management of effluents associated with these operations are the activities which may pose a risk to the public health and safety.

The NNFD conducts an environmental monitoring program which includes sediment, soil, vegetation, surface water, air, and groundwater media at 20 locations on or near the facility. The program is intended to identify trends in concentrations or accumulation of uranium or other contaminants in the environment. Action levels have been established for each media to provide a basis for response to potential problems. Actions triggered by exceedance of an action level may include resampling of the area, performance of isotopic analysis, investigation of the source of contamination, elimination of the source of contamination, or termination of operations pending identification of a method for reduction of contaminant levels. Environmental monitoring results are reviewed as part of the ALARA program.

The NRC staff has reviewed the location of the environmental monitoring program sampling points, the frequency of sample collection, and the trends of the sampling program results in conjunction with environmental pathway and exposure analysis and concluded that the monitoring program provides adequate protection of public health and safety.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Implementation of the license renewal alternative involves continued operation of the facility at levels consistent with past practice for both the NNFD and LTC. Data and analysis presented in this Environmental Assessment updates and supplements the data and analysis presented in an Environmental Assessment (NRC, 1991) prepared earlier in the license renewal process. No new major construction or introduction of new processes is contemplated. The nature of the manufacturing, research, and waste management operations is summarized in this section. The system description presented in this section is adapted from material contained in the prior B&W Environmental Assessment (NRC, 1991) and license renewal application (B&W, 1995a).

The alternative of denial of license renewal for the B&W combined NNFD/LTC facility at the Lynchburg, Virginia site implies cessation of manufacturing and commencement of decontamination and decommissioning (D&D) of the facility. Decontamination and decommissioning activities would be substantially the same as those described for the license renewal alternative in Section 2.1 of this environmental assessment. However, since the fuel utilization requirements of the naval propulsion program and the university training and research programs would remain unchanged, selection of this alternative implies transfer of fuel production activities to a new site.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

- Virginia State Health Department, Bureau of Radiological Health.
- Virginia Department of Environmental Quality.

—Mixed Waste Issues Enforcement Branch
—Water Control
—Air Quality
—West Central Regional Office
—Enforcement

- Virginia Labor Market Area Office, Virginia Employment Commission.
- City of Lynchburg, Economic Development Office.
- Environmental Protection Agency, RCRA Enforcement Branch, Region 3.
- Appomatax County Administrator.

Other sources used in the preparation of the EA include the following:

Babcock & Wilcox, 1995a, License Renewal Application, SNM–42, Naval Nuclear Fuel Division, Lynchburg, VA, February 1995.

Babcock & Wilcox, 1995b, Supplemental Information to NRC, April 1995.

Babcock & Wilcox, 1991, Environmental Report, Naval Nuclear Fuel Division, Lynchburg, VA, August 1991.

Babcock & Wilcox, 1989, National Pollution Discharge Permit Application, VA0003697, September 27, 1989.

Biological Monitoring, Inc., 1989, Final Year End Report for On-Site Effluent Toxicity Studies and Biological Studies of the James River Performed in August and September 1989, Prepared for Babcock & Wilcox.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1991, Environmental Assessment for Renewal of Special Nuclear Material License No. SNM–42, Docket No. 70–27 Naval Nuclear Fuel Division, Lynchburg, VA, August 1991.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1986, Environmental Assessment for Renewal of Material License No. SNM–778, Docket No. 70–824, Lynchburg Research Center, Lynchburg, VA, December 1986.

U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 1984, Environmental Impact Appraisal for Babcock & Wilcox Company, Naval Nuclear Fuel Division, Docket No.70–27. Renewal of Special Nuclear Material License No. SNM–42, Lynchburg, VA, March 1984.

Conclusion

The NRC staff concludes that the environmental impacts associated with the proposed license renewal for continued operation of B&W's NNFD/LTC 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–42. On the basis of the assessment, the Commission 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.

The Environmental Assessment and the above documents related to this proposed action are available for public inspection and copying at the Commission's Public Document Room at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW, Washington, DC.

Opportunity for a Hearing

Any person whose interest may be affected by the issuance of this 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**; be served on the NRC staff (Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852); and on the licensee (Babcock & Wilcox Company, Naval Nuclear Fuel Division, Lynchburg, Virginia); 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 30th day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Robert C. Pierson,

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

[FR Doc. 95–22186 Filed 9–6–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–424 and 50–425]

Georgia Power Company, et al.; Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–68 and NPF–84, issued to the Georgia Power Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP, Vogtle), Units 1 and 2, located at the licensee's site in Burke County, Georgia.

The proposed amendments, requested by the licensee in a letter dated May 1, 1995, would represent a full conversion from the current Technical Specifications (TS) to a set of TS based on NUREG–1431, ''Standard Technical Specifications, Westinghouse Plants,'' Revision 1, dated April, 1995. NUREG–1431 was developed through working groups composed of NRC staff members and industry representatives and has been endorsed by the staff as part of an industry-wide initiative to standardize and improve the TS. As part of this submittal, the licensee has applied the criteria contained in the Commission's Final Policy Statement on Technical Specification Improvements for Nuclear Power Reactors of July 22, 1993, to the current Vogtle TS, and, using NUREG–1431 as a basis, developed a proposed set of improved TS for Vogtle. The criteria in the Final Policy Statement were subsequently added to 10 CFR 50.36, ''Technical Specifications,'' in a rule change which became effective on August 18, 1995 (60 FR 36953).

The licensee has categorized the proposed changes to the existing TS into four general groupings. These groupings are characterized as administrative changes, relocated changes, more restrictive changes, and less restrictive changes.

Non-technical, administrative changes were intended to incorporate human-factors principles into the form and structure of the improved plant TS so that they would be easier to use for plant operations personnel. Administrative changes are editorial in nature or involve the reorganization or reformatting of requirements without affecting technical content or operational requirements. The proposed changes include: (a) Providing the appropriate numbers, etc., for NUREG–1431 bracketed information (information which must be supplied on a plant-specific basis, and which may change from plant to plant), (b) identifying plant-specific wording for system names, etc., and (c) changing NUREG–1431 section wording to conform to existing licensee practices.

Relocated changes, those current TS requirements which do not satisfy or fall within any of the four criteria specified in the Commission's policy statement, may be relocated to appropriate licensee-controlled documents. The licensee's application states that such requirements will be relocated from the TS to administratively controlled documents such as the Final Safety Evalution Report. Changes made to these documents will be made pursuant to 10 CFR 50.59 or other appropriate control mechanisms. These changes reduce the number of current TS requirements but the actual commitment to continue to perform the requirement will be unchanged upon implementation of the improved TS.

The licensee's proposed improved TS include certain more restrictive requirements than are contained in the current TS, which are either more conservative than corresponding requirements in the current TS, or are additional restrictions that are contained in NUREG–1431 but are not contained in the current TS. Examples