NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 For the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant, Paducah, Kentucky

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination, the staff concluded that: (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(c)(19). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

Date of amendment request: November 5, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to change the completion dates for Compliance Plan Issues 46 and 50. The completion dates are being changed from December 15, 1998, to January 18, 2000. These issues require plant modifications to ensure that the criticality accident alarm system (CAAS) alarm horns are capable of being heard throughout the affected areas of the process buildings and to provide CAAS alarm horns for those unalarmed facilities within the evacuation area of other buildings. USEC will provide alternative means of personnel notification in the event of a CAAS alarm. The amendment also proposes criteria for determining audibility of the CAAS alarm horns.

Basis for finding of no significance: 1. The proposed amendment will not result in a change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite.

The proposed changes to the Compliance Plan completion dates and the addition of criteria for determining alarm horn audibility will have no effect on the generation or disposition of effluents. Therefore, the proposed changes will not result in a change to the types or amount of effluents that may be released offsite.

2. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The CAAS does not prevent criticality, therefore, the possibility of a criticality occurring is not increased. However, in the unlikely event a criticality did occur, the personnel notification might not be as prompt as relying on the CAAS horns. Therefore, the potential radiation exposure for an individual could be higher because the individual remained in the area for a longer period of time. This slight chance for increased exposure is not considered to be significant. The proposed changes will not significantly increase any exposure to radiation due to normal operations. Therefore, the changes will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

3. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant construction impact.

The proposed changes will not result in any building construction, therefore, there will be no construction impacts.

4. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents.

The CAAS system is not involved in any precursor to an evaluated accident. Extension of the completion dates for the modifications to improve CAAS audibility has no effect on the probability of occurrence of a criticality accident. The consequences of a potential criticality accident will not be significantly increased since the ability of the CAAS to detect a criticality is unchanged and the compensatory measures currently in place will remain in place until the modifications are completed. It is possible that personnel exposure could be slightly increased due to possible short delays in personnel notification. The addition of acceptance criteria for subjectively measuring audibility will not alter either the probability or the

consequences. Therefore, these changes will not significantly increase the probability of occurrence or consequence of any postulated accident currently identified in the safety analysis report.

5. The proposed amendment will not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

The CAAS is used to mitigate the consequences of a criticality accident. The proposed changes do not introduce any new or different accidents than those previously analyzed. Therefore, the proposed changes will not create the possibility of a new or different type of equipment malfunction or a new or different type of accident.

6. The proposed amendment will not result in a significant reduction in any margin of safety.

The proposed changes to the completion dates for the CAAS modifications extend the period for having areas of the plant not covered by the audible alarm horn, however, the compensatory measures provided in Compliance Plan Issues 46 and 50 will remain in place. These include use of building howlers for the process buildings and the use of radios in unalarmed buildings. These measures will provide adequate notification in the event of a criticality accident. The proposed acceptance criteria for determining audibility provide a subjective means for ensuring audibility. Therefore, the changes do not result in a significant decrease in the margins of safety.

7. The proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs.

The proposed changes do not change the safeguards or security programs. The CAAS audibility acceptance criteria provide a subjective means of determining audibility and may improve the effectiveness of the safety program. The continued use of alternative methods of notification for the CAAS alarms (building howlers and radios) due to the extension of the completion dates for Compliance Plan Issues 46 and 50 will ensure that personnel are promptly notified of CAAS alarms. Therefore, the overall effectiveness of the safety, safeguards, and security programs is not decreased.

Effective date: The amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 becomes effective immediately after being signed by the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP–1: Amendment will revise Compliance Plan Issues 46 and 50 to reflect the new completion dates of January 18, 2000. The amendment will also add acceptance criteria for determining CAAS alarm horn audibility.

Local Public Document Room location: Paducah Public Library, 555 Washington Street, Paducah, Kentucky 42003.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 7th day of December, 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Carl J. Paperiello,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–33204 Filed 12–14–98; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70–7001]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP–1 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation (Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant), Paducah, Kentucky

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, has made a determination that the following amendment request is not significant in accordance with 10 CFR 76.45. In making that determination, the staff concluded that: (1) there is no change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite; (2) there is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure; (3) there is no significant construction impact; (4) there is no significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from, previously analyzed accidents; (5) the proposed changes do not result in the possibility of a new or different kind of accident; (6) there is no significant reduction in any margin of safety; and (7) the proposed changes will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safety, safeguards or security programs. The basis for this determination for the amendment request is shown below.

The NRC staff has reviewed the certificate amendment application and concluded that it provides reasonable assurance of adequate safety, safeguards, and security, and compliance with NRC requirements. Therefore, the Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Paducah Gaseous Diffusion Plant. The staff has prepared a Compliance Evaluation Report which provides details of the staff's evaluation.

The NRC staff has determined that this amendment satisfies the criteria for a categorical exclusion in accordance with 10 CFR 51.22(c)(19). Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

USEC or any person whose interest may be affected may file a petition, not exceeding 30 pages, requesting review of the Director's Decision. The petition must be filed with the Commission not later than 15 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice. A petition for review of the Director's Decision shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner and how that interest may be affected by the results of the decision. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why review of the Decision should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the interest of the petitioner; (2) how that interest may be affected by the Decision, including the reasons why the petitioner should be permitted a review of the Decision; and (3) the petitioner's areas of concern about the activity that is the subject matter of the Decision. Any person described in this paragraph (USEC or any person who filed a petition) may file a response to any petition for review, not to exceed 30 pages, within 10 days after filing of the petition. If no petition is received within the designated 15-day period, the Director will issue the final amendment to the Certificate of Compliance without further delay. If a petition for review is received, the decision on the amendment application will become final in 60 days, unless the Commission grants the petition for review or otherwise acts within 60 days after publication of this **Federal Register** Notice.

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, by the above date.

For further details with respect to the action see (1) the application for amendment and (2) the Commission's Compliance Evaluation Report. These items 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.

Date of amendment request: September 15, 1997