NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket 70-7002]

Notice of Amendment to Certificate of Compliance GDP-2 for the U.S. Enrichment Corporation Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant Portsmouth, Ohio

The Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards (NMSS), 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 Nuclear Regulatory Commission (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, NMSS, is prepared to issue an amendment to the Certificate of Compliance for the Portsmouth 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. Therefore, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(b), no environmental impact statement or environmental assessment need be prepared for this amendment.

United States Enrichment Corporation (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

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, 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: March 16, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: On March 16, 1998, USEC submitted a certification amendment request to revise the Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) surveillances for the two freon degraders in TSR 2.7.3.9, Freon Degrader Fluorine Flow. The new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader surveillance for calibration of the capillary tubes controlling fluorine flow was changed to reflect the as-built configuration of the freon degrader. Initial design had four tubes calibrated at a fluorine flow rate of 100 standard cubic feet per day (scfd) for each tube for a total of 400 scfd. The final design and as-built had four tubes, one for 25 scfd, one for 50 scfd, one for 100 scfd, and one for 200 scfd for a

combined flow rate of 375 scfd. The surveillance was also amended to have the fluorine fore pressure set at 5 pounds per square inch gauge (psig) from the previous 9.5 psig. The other surveillance change for the new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader was lowering the setpoint for the high high pressure fluorine trip from 20 psig to 5 psig. Two surveillances were added for the old (Operating Floor) Freon Degrader for calibrating and testing the high fluorine pressure trip.

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 amendment does not propose any new or unanalyzed activity for the facility. The amendment would lower the fluorine flow rate possible in the new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader and lower the safety system trip point. The lowering of the flow rate and trip point decreases the possibility of an accident which could result in toxic releases of any effluents offsite.

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

For the reasons provided in number 1 above, the proposed amendment will not result in a significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. In fact, the proposed amendment will likely decrease the risk of releases thereby decreasing the risk of individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

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

The proposed amendment does not involve any 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 proposed amendment does not propose any new or unanalyzed activity for the facility. The amendment would lower the fluorine flow rate possible in the new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader and lower the safety system trip point. The lowering of the flow rate and trip point decreases the possibility of an accident. Therefore, the amendment would not result in a significant increase in the potential for, or radiological or chemical consequences from previously analyzed accidents.

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

The proposed amendment does not propose any new or unanalyzed activity for the facility. Therefore, the amendment does not raise the possibility of a new or different kind of accident.

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

The amendment would lower the fluorine flow rate possible in the new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader and lower the safety system trip point. The lowering of the flow rate and trip point decreases the possibility of an accident and would increase any margin 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 amendment would lower the fluorine flow rate possible in the new (Cell Floor) Freon Degrader and lower the safety system trip point and does not change the frequency of surveillances. Therefore, it does not decrease the effectiveness of the plant's safety program. The staff has not identified any safeguards or security related implications from the proposed amendment. Therefore, the proposed amendment will not result in an overall decrease in the effectiveness of the plant's safeguards or security programs.

Effective date: The amendment to GDP-2 will become effective 60 days after issuance by NRC.

Certificate of Compliance No. GDP-2: Amendment will revise TSR 2.7.3.9. Local Public Document Room

location: Portsmouth Public Library, 1220 Gallia Street, Portsmouth, Ohio 45662.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 9th day of September 1998.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Carl J. Paperiello**,

Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 98–25064 Filed 9–17–98; 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. 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

A petition for review must be filed with the Secretary, 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: May 27, 1998.

Brief description of amendment: The amendment proposes to revise Technical Safety Requirement (TSR) 2.6.4.1 to reflect the addition of new, permanent criticality accident alarm system (CAAS) clusters in Building C-710. The amendment will also remove four buildings from the facility listing requiring CAAS coverage because the buildings do not contain fissile material.

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 TSR will have no effect on the generation or disposition of effluents. Therefore, the proposed TSR modifications 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 proposed changes to the TSR to reflect CAAS coverage for C-710 and to remove buildings that do not contain fissile material from the listing requiring