Mitigating Strategies

The NRC has issued this Bulletin for three purposes:
1. To require that addresses provide a comprehensive verification of their compliance with the regulatory requirements of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) 50.54(hh)[2].
2. To notify addresses about the NRC staff’s need for information associated with licensee mitigating strategies under 10 CFR 50.54(hh)[2] in light of the recent events at Japan’s Fukushima Daiichi facility in order to determine if (1) additional assessment of program implementation is needed, (2) the current inspection program should be enhanced, or (3) further regulatory action is warranted, and
3. To require that addresses provide a written response to the NRC in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(f).

The purpose of the proposed amendment is to approve a revision, Decommissioning Plan Revision (DP) 2, to the previously approved site DP for the licensee's facility. The original DP was approved on June 1, 2004, and revision 1 was approved on July 8, 2009. Specifically, this Revision 2 to the approved DP expands the scope of the DP and provides the radiological status and remediation plans for select Formerly Utilized Sites Remedial Action Program (FUSRAP) areas, including the Site Brook and the adjacent Debris Pile. In addition, site-specific derived concentration guideline limits (DCGLs) for the radioactive materials have been developed and submitted for approval as a supplement to the DP. Revision 2 (Derivation of Site-Specific Soil DCGLs) was approved on June 1, 2004, and revision 1 was approved on July 8, 2009. The revised DP does not change any previously approved remediation activities or DCGLs for uranium or cobalt-60 at the site. On February 26, 2010, and as supplemented on August 6, 2010, ABB, Inc. requested that the NRC approve the proposed amendment. The licensee’s request for the proposed change, including an opportunity to request a hearing or provide comments, was previously noticed in the Federal Register on February 15, 2011 (76 FR 8785).
impact the Site Brook. The DCGLs established in the DP Revision 2 for Ra-226 and Th-232 do not exceed the trigger levels requiring consultation with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) under the Memorandum of Understanding between the EPA and the NRC.

Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow ABB to complete the remaining Facility remediation and decommissioning activities, thereby reducing residual radioactivity at the Facility to a level that permits release of the entire property for unrestricted use and termination of the license. The licensee has been successfully remediating and decommissioning the Facility since 2004 under the previously-approved DP. In order to complete remediation of the entire Facility, the FUSRAP areas must be remediated. NRC is fulfilling its responsibilities under the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, to make a decommissioning license amendment for decommissioning that ensures safety and protection of the public and the environment.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

In preparing this EA, the NRC staff reviewed the 2004 EA issued in connection with the initial DP; the 2009 EA issued in conjunction with the prior DP Revision 1; the licensee’s Environmental Report submitted on February 28, 2010; and the revised DP submitted in February 2010 and supplemented in August 2010. Additionally, the staff has continuously reviewed the performance of the decommissioning activities conducted by the licensee and their contractors through periodic inspections. The staff concluded that the bases for the findings of the 2004 and 2009 EAs remain valid, and are applicable to the revised DP. Regarding remediation of the FUSRAP areas, decommissioning methodologies are unchanged from the initial approved DP and remain appropriate for the contaminant concentrations found in the FUSRAP area soils. The same isotopes that were present in the Facility’s non-FUSRAP areas (namely, those associated with enriched uranium and cobalt-60) exist in the FUSRAP areas as well. The FUSRAP areas requiring remediation are similar to those already successfully remediated and decommissioned at the Facility. The amount of waste in FUSRAP areas that will need to be packaged and shipped to a licensed disposal facility is similar to the amounts evaluated in the 2004 and 2009 EAs, and this waste will be packaged and transported to the same disposal facility previously used for non-FUSRAP area remediation activities.

The revised DP includes new site-specific soil DCGLs for Ra-226 and Th-232, to support the unrestricted release of the impacted areas of the Burning Grounds. The staff’s technical review confirmed that the licensee’s requested site specific Ra-226 and Th-232 soil DCGLs of 4.5 and 4.0 picocuries/gram, respectively, would result in a maximum annual dose of less than 19 millirem of total effective dose equivalent, considering a resident farmer scenario and using the RESRAD 6.4 computer code to model the input parameters of the scenario and compute the dose to an individual. Because this dose is less than 25 millirem per year, use of these DCGLs will meet the radiological criteria for unrestricted release specified in 10 CFR 20.1402. The conclusions of the 2004 and 2009 EAs thus remain valid for the proposed action.

In summary, NRC staff has reviewed the revised decommissioning plan for the Facility, and examined the impact of the proposed additional decommissioning activities. Based upon its review, the staff has determined that environmental impacts associated with the proposed action are not greater than the impacts found in the 2004 and 2009 EAs, and are bounded by the impacts discussed in NUREG–1496, “A Generic Environmental Impact Statement in Support of Rulemaking on Radiological Criteria for License Termination of NRC–Licensed Nuclear Facilities,” Volumes 1–3. The staff finds that there have been no significant environmental impacts to date from the use and cleanup of radioactive material at the Facility. The NRC staff reviewed the docket file records to identify any non-radiological hazards that may impact the environment surrounding the Facility, and no such hazards or impacts to the environment were identified. The NRC has identified no other radiological or non-radiological activities in the area that could result in cumulative environmental impacts.

The staff has considered the impact of the proposed FUSRAP area remediation at the Facility, and finds that the proposed action will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action

The Facility is in the process of being decommissioned under an approved DP. Although the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has responsibility for coordinating the radiological clean up in the FUSRAP areas, ABB entered into a formal agreement with the USACE and the NRC to conduct the clean up due to extensive comingling of FUSRAP and NRC licensed materials from past commercial operations in order to facilitate the efficient and effective decommissioning and clean up of the Facility. Therefore, the only alternative to the proposed action to continue the decommissioning process at the Facility is no action. The no-action alternative is not acceptable because it is inconsistent with NRC’s Timeliness Rule (10 CFR 30.36), which requires licensees to decommission their facilities when licensed activities cease and to request termination of their radioactive materials license. Although termination of the NRC and USACE agreement would result in unnecessary remediation and decommissioning delay, the environmental impacts created by the action would be unchanged. Additionally, denying the amendment request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative are therefore similar, and the no-action alternative is, accordingly, not considered further.

Conclusion

The NRC staff reviewed the environmental impacts of the proposed action in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 51 and NRC’s unrestricted release criteria specified in 10 CFR 20.1402. The NRC staff has determined that the remaining radioactive materials license. Although the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) has responsibility for coordinating the radiological clean up in the FUSRAP areas, ABB entered into a formal agreement with the USACE and the NRC to conduct the clean up due to extensive comingling of FUSRAP and NRC licensed materials from past commercial operations in order to facilitate the efficient and effective decommissioning and clean up of the Facility. Therefore, the only alternative to the proposed action to continue the decommissioning process at the Facility is no action. The no-action alternative is not acceptable because it is inconsistent with NRC’s Timeliness Rule (10 CFR 30.36), which requires licensees to decommission their facilities when licensed activities cease and to request termination of their radioactive materials license. Although termination of the NRC and USACE agreement would result in unnecessary remediation and decommissioning delay, the environmental impacts created by the action would be unchanged. Additionally, denying the amendment request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative are therefore similar, and the no-action alternative is, accordingly, not considered further.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

This EA was prepared by NRC staff and coordinated with the following agencies: Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services. NRC provided a draft of this EA to the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection for review on April 29, 2011. On May 16, 2011, Michael Firsick of the Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection responded by e-mail. The State agreed with the conclusions of the EA.

III. Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the EA, NRC has concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action to continue the decommissioning process at the Facility. Therefore, the only alternative to the proposed action to continue the decommissioning process at the Facility is no action. The no-action alternative is not acceptable because it is inconsistent with NRC’s Timeliness Rule (10 CFR 30.36), which requires licensees to decommission their facilities when licensed activities cease and to request termination of their radioactive materials license. Although termination of the NRC and USACE agreement would result in unnecessary remediation and decommissioning delay, the environmental impacts created by the action would be unchanged. Additionally, denying the amendment request would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the no-action alternative are therefore similar, and the no-action alternative is, accordingly, not considered further.
environmental impacts from the proposed amendment and has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement.

IV. Further Information

Documents related to this action, including the application for amendment and supporting documentation, are available electronically through the NRC Library at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html. From this site, you can access the NRC's Agencywide Document Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents.

The ADAMS accession numbers for the documents related to this notice are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>PDR</th>
<th>Web</th>
<th>ADAMS Accession Numbers</th>
<th>NRC staff</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ABB, Inc. Decommissioning Plan, Revision 2, CE Windsor Site (Previously Identified FUSRAP Areas Including Debris Piles &amp; Site Brook). August 2010.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ML012310473</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABB, Inc. Decommissioning Plan, Revision 2, CE Windsor Site—Tables. August 2010.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ML012310479</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABB, Inc. Derivation of the Site Specific Soil DGCLs, Addendum, Soil DGCLs for thorium and radium. August 2010.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ML012310539</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Memorandum of Understanding Between the Environmental Protection Agency and the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Consultation and Finality on Decommissioning and Decontamination of Contaminated Sites. October 2002.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ML022830208</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you do not have access to ADAMS or if there are problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by e-mail to pdr.resource@nrc.gov.

These documents may also be viewed electronically on the public computers located at the NRC’s Public Document Room (PDR), O 1 F21, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852. The PDR reproduction contractor will copy documents for a fee.

Dated at King of Prussia, Pennsylvania this 18th day of May 2011.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Judith A. Joustra,
Chief, Decommissioning Branch, Division of Nuclear Materials Safety, Region I.

[FR Doc. 2011–13362 Filed 5–27–11; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[NRC–2011–0119]

Office Of New Reactors; Proposed Revision 4 to Standard Review Plan; Section 8.1 on Electric Power—Introduction

AGENCY: U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Solicitation of public comment.

SUMMARY: The NRC is soliciting public comment on NUREG–0800, “Standard Review Plan for the Review of Safety Analysis Reports for Nuclear Power Plants,” on a proposed Revision 4 to Standard Review Plan (SRP), Section 8.1 on “Electric Power—Introduction,” (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML111180542). The previous version of this SRP section was published in March, 2007 as proposed Revision 3 (ADAMS Accession No. ML070550067). The current revision issues a new Branch Technical Position (BTP) 8–8 on “Onsite (Emergency Diesel Generators) and Offsite Power Sources Allowed Outage Time Extensions.” (ADAMS Accession No. ML111180521). The new BTP will be added to Chapter 8 of the SRP and Table 8–1 is updated to include the BTP 8–8.

The NRC staff issues notices to facilitate timely implementation of the current staff guidance and to facilitate activities associated with the review of amendment applications and review of design certification and combined license applications for NRO. The NRC staff intends to incorporate the final approved guidance into the next revision of NUREG–0800, SRP Section 8.1, Revision 4 and Regulatory Guide 1.206, “Combined License Applications for Nuclear Power Plants (LWR Edition),” June 2007.

DATES: Comments must be filed no later than June 30, 2011. Comments received after this date will be considered, if it is practical to do so, but the Commission is able to ensure consideration only for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: You may submit comments by any one of the following methods. Please include Docket ID NRC–2011–0119 in the subject line of your comments. Comments submitted in writing or in electronic form will be posted on the NRC Web site and on the Federal rulemaking Web site at http://www.regulations.gov. Because your comments will not be edited to remove any identifying or contact information, the NRC cautions you against including any information in your submission that you do not want to be publicly disclosed.

The NRC requests that any party soliciting or aggregating comments received from other persons for submission to the NRC inform those persons that the NRC will not edit their comments to remove any identifying or contact information, and therefore, they should not include any information in their comments that they do not want publicly disclosed.


Mail comments to: Cindy K. Bladey, Chief, Rules, Announcements, and Directives Branch (RADB), Division of...