

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would authorize changes to the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) for the facility. Specifically, the proposed action would authorize changes to the UFSAR to reflect revisions to the radiological dose calculations for the locked rotor accident (LRA) analysis. The BVPS-2 UFSAR would be revised as follows: in Table 15.0-11, atmospheric dispersion values for the LRA analysis would be added; in Table 15.0-12, the Exclusion Area Boundary (EAB) thyroid dose would be revised from 32.5 REM to 37 REM, the EAB Gamma (whole body) dose would be revised from 3.41 REM to 3.6 REM, and the EAB Beta dose would be revised from 2.09 REM to 2.2 REM; in Table 15.0-12, the Low Population Zone (LPZ) thyroid dose would be revised from 14.4 REM to 16 REM, the LPZ Gamma dose would be revised from .348 REM to .36 REM, and the LPZ Beta dose would be revised from .217 REM to .23 REM; the control room dose for the LRA in Table 15.0-12 would be changed so that thyroid dose would be revised from 1.1 REM to 1.7 REM, Gamma dose would be revised from .011 REM to .016 REM, and the Beta dose would be revised from .15 REM to .23 REM; additionally, Table 15.3-3 would be revised to include control room ventilation flow rates assumed in the LRA analysis.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 29, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated November 9, 1998, and June 14, 1999.

The Need for the Proposed Action

As a result of issues involving control room habitability, the licensee re-evaluated Beaver Valley Power Station, Units 1 and 2 (BVPS-1 and BVPS-2) control room dose calculations for Design Basis Accidents (DBA) which credited isolation of the control room during DBA. When analyses associated with the BVPS-2 LRA were reviewed, the licensee identified the need to incorporate more conservative assumptions into the control room dose calculations as well as the calculations for the EAB and LPZ. Therefore, it is necessary to revise the analysis and the BVPS-2 UFSAR. Pursuant to 10 CFR part 50, Section 59, the licensee determined the proposed revisions to be an unreviewed safety question and requested NRC approval of the proposed changes.

The change is not the result of hardware changes to the plant or a change in operating practices. It reflects

corrected analysis results only and allows correction of the licensing basis to reflect conservative assumptions used in the revised dose analysis for the LRA.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the assumptions and methodology used by the licensee in the reanalysis are acceptable and that there is reasonable assurance, in the event of a postulated LRA, that the postulated LPZ and EAB doses would continue to be well within the 10 CFR part 100 guidelines, and the control room operator doses would continue to be less than the 10 CFR part 50, appendix A, General Design Criterion 19 guidelines.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents (although the revisions result in slightly higher calculated doses for the EAB, LPZ, and control room as discussed above), no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (*i.e.*, the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the BVPS-2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on September 27, 1999, the staff

consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Mr. M. Murphy of the Pennsylvania Department of Environmental Protection Bureau, Division of Nuclear Safety, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of no Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated January 29, 1998, as supplemented by letters dated November 9, 1998, and June 14, 1999, which 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 B. F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of November 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Daniel S. Collins,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-29840 Filed 11-15-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Public Workshop on License Renewal

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of public workshop.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has scheduled a public workshop to gather comments from stakeholders on programs for managing the effects of aging on nuclear power plants for license renewal. The agency is developing a Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) report that will document the basis for determining when existing aging management programs are adequate and when they should be modified or augmented for license renewal.

DATES: December 6, 1999, from 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

ADDRESSES: The workshop will be held in the NRC's Auditorium at Two White

Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland 20852-2738.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION, CONTACT: Raj Anand, Mail Stop O-12G15, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Telephone: 301-415-1146; Internet: rka@nrc.gov. If you are planning to attend the workshop, please notify Raj Anand.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The purpose of this workshop is to gather feedback on the NRC staff's plans to develop guidelines on which programs need to be augmented for renewal and which programs adequately manage effects without change. This issue is described in the Commission paper on Credit for Existing Programs for License Renewal, SECY 99-148 (Internet Link: <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/COMMISSION/SECYS/1999-148SCY.PDF>). The Commission concluded that the NRC staff should develop a report on Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL), to generically document the bases for determining when existing programs are adequate and when existing programs should be augmented for license renewal. The GALL report would then be referenced in the standard review plan (SRP) for license renewal as the basis for identifying those programs that warrant attention during the staff's review of a license renewal application.

Following opening remarks by representatives of the NRC, the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI) and the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), the NRC staff will explain how the workshop will be conducted and describe the current plans for GALL, the SRP, and the Regulatory Guide that would endorse an update of the NEI guide for preparing a license renewal application (NEI 95-10, Industry Guideline for Implementing the Requirements of 10 CFR part 54—The License Renewal Rule). With that background, the workshop participants will be engaged in discussion of the adequacy and attributes of examples of programs that are expected to be relied on to manage aging effects in three broad areas: Regulated Programs, Reactive Programs, and General Practice Programs. In closing, the NRC staff will solicit comments on the plan and respond to questions from the participants.

This workshop will be successful if the NRC can find areas of agreement on the attributes of adequate aging management programs for each of the three program areas. The participants will have an opportunity to comment on aging management programs, both generally and for specific programs. The

participants will also have an opportunity to ask about the NRC's plans for license renewal reviews, and we will explain how to submit written comments for NRC consideration.

To ensure that all of the ideas raised are recorded, the workshop will be transcribed and the NRC staff will prepare a summary report to categorize the comments. This one-day session attempts to cover a wide range of views and aging management programs. If your organization is interested in expressing a view on this matter as part of the opening remarks, please coordinate with Doug Walters at NEI or Dave Lochbaum at UCS, as appropriate. The tentative agenda for the workshop is as follows:

License Renewal Workshop Agenda

December 6, 1999

- 8:00 a.m. Registration—TWFN Auditorium
- 8:30 a.m. Opening remarks by NRC
- 8:45 a.m. Opening remarks by the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI)
- 9:00 a.m. Opening remarks by the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS)
- 9:15 a.m. Introduction of workshop purpose by NRC Staff
- 9:30 a.m. Overview of Generic Aging Lessons Learned (GALL) report, Standard Review Plan (SRP) and Regulatory Guide (NEI 95-10)
- 10:30 a.m. Break
- 10:45 a.m. Examples of Regulated Programs
 - Environmental qualification of electrical equipment (§ 50.49), maintenance rule (§ 50.65), inservice inspection (§ 50.55a), containment inservice inspection (§ 50.55a), containment leak rate test (Appendix J), quality assurance (Appendix B), reactor vessel integrity (Appendices G and H), fire protection (§ 50.48), steam generator tube inspection (technical specification).
- 12:15 p.m. Lunch
- 1:15 p.m. Examples of Reactive Programs
 - Service water program (Generic Letter 89-13), erosion/corrosion program (Bulletin 87-01, Generic Letter 89-08), coating program (Generic Letter 88-05), bolting program (Bulletin 82-02), control rod drive mechanism nozzle and other closure head penetration nozzles (Generic Letter 97-01)
- 2:45 p.m. Break
- 3:00 p.m. Examples of General Practice Programs
 - Preventive maintenance, chemistry control, crane inspection

4:15 p.m. Participant comments and questions

4:45 p.m. Summary and conclusions

5:00 p.m. Adjourn

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of November, 1999.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Christopher I. Grimes,

Chief, License Renewal and Standardization Branch, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 99-29843 Filed 11-15-99; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Safety Research Program; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Safety Research Program will hold a meeting on December 1, 1999, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, December 1, 1999—1 p.m. until 5 p.m.

The Subcommittee will discuss and review the final draft of the year 2000 ACRS report on the NRC Safety Research Program. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting