similar facilities, specifically laboratories. Heat dissipation is generally accomplished by use of a cooling tower located on the roof of the building. These cooling towers typically are on the order of  $10' \times 10' \times 10'$  and are comparable to cooling towers associated with the air-conditioning systems of large office buildings.

Make-up for the cooling system is readily available and usually obtained from the local water supply. Radioactive gaseous effluents are limited to Ar-41 and the release of radioactive liquid effluents can be carefully monitored and controlled. Liquid wastes are collected in storage tanks to allow for decay and monitoring prior to dilution and release to the sanitary sewer system. Solid radioactive wastes are packaged and shipped offsite for storage at NRC-approved sites. The transportation of such waste is done in accordance with existing NRC-DOT regulations in approved shipping containers.

Chemical and sanitary waste systems are similar to those existing at other similar laboratories and buildings.

Environmental Effects of Site Preparation and Facility Construction

Construction of such facilities invariably occurs in areas that have already been disturbed by other building construction and, in some cases, solely within an already existing building. Therefore, construction would not be expected to have any significant effect on the terrain, vegetation, wildlife or nearby waters or aquatic life. The societal, economic and aesthetic impacts of construction would be no greater than those associated with the construction of a large office building or similar research facility.

Environmental Effects of Facility Operation

Release of thermal effluents from a reactor of less than 2 MWt will not have a significant effect on the environment. This small amount of waste heat is generally rejected to the atmosphere by means of small cooling towers. Extensive drift and/or fog will not occur at this low power level.

Release of routine gaseous effluents can be limited to Ar-41, which Is generated by neutron activation of air. Even this will be kept as low as practicable by using gases other than air for supporting experiments. Yearly doses to un-restricted areas will be at or below established guidelines in 10 CFR part 20 limits. Routine releases of radioactive liquid effluents can be carefully monitored and controlled in a manner that will ensure compliance with current standards. Solid radioactive wastes will be shipped to an authorized disposal site in approved containers. These wastes should not require more than a few shipping containers a year.

Based on experience with other research reactors, specifically TRIGA reactors

operating in the 1 to 2 MWt range, the annual release of gaseous and liquid effluents to unrestricted areas should be less than 30 curies and 0.01 curies, respectively.

No release of potentially harmful chemical substances will occur during normal operation. Small amounts of chemicals and/ or high-solid content water may be released from the facility through the sanitary sewer during periodic blowdown of the cooling tower or from laboratory experiments.

Other potential effects of the facility, such as aesthetics, noise, societal or impact on local flora and fauna are expected to be too small to measure.

Environmental Effects of Accidents

Accidents ranging from the failure of experiments up to the largest core damage and fission product release considered possible result in doses that are less than 10 CFR part 20 guidelines and are considered negligible with respect to the environment.

Unavoidable Effects of Facility Construction and Operation

The unavoidable effects of construction and operation involve the materials used in construction that cannot be recovered and the fissionable material used in the reactor. No adverse impact on the environment is expected from either of these unavoidable effects

Alternatives to Construction and Operation of the Facility

To accomplish the objectives associated with research reactors, there are no suitable alternatives. Some of these objectives are training of students in the operation of reactors, production of radioisotopes, and use of neutron and gamma ray beams to conduct experiments.

Long-Term Effects of Facility Construction and Operation

The long-tern effects of research facilities are considered to be beneficial as a result of the contribution to scientific knowledge and training. Because of the relatively small amount of capital resources involved and the small impact on the environment, very little irreversible and irretrievable commitment is associated with such facilities.

Costs and Benefits of Facility Alternatives

The costs are on the order of several millions of dollars with very little environmental impact. The benefits include, but are not limited to, some combination of the following: conduct of activation analyses, conduct of neutron radiography, training of operating personnel, and education of students. Some of these activities could be conducted using particle accelerators or radioactive sources which would be more

costly and less efficient. There is no reasonable alternative to a nuclear research reactor for conducting this spectrum of activities.

Conclusion

The staff concludes that there will be no significant environmental impact associated with the licensing of research reactors or critical facilities designed to operate at power levels of 2 MWt or lower and that no environmental impact statements are required to be written for the issuance of construction permits or operating licenses for such facilities.

[FR Doc. 00–12554 Filed 5–17–00; 8:45 am] **BILLING CODE 7590–01–P** 

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

# Experts' Meeting on High-Burnup Fuel Behavior Under Postulated Accident Conditions

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of meeting.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission will hold a meeting to further develop a Phenomena Identification and Ranking Table (PIRT) for fuel rod response to loss of coolant accidents (LOCAs). PIRTs have been used at NRC since 1988, and they provide a structured way to obtain a technical understanding that is needed to address certain issues. About twenty of the world's best technical experts are participating in this activity, and the experts represent a balance between industry, universities, foreign researchers, and regulatory organizations. The current PIRT activity is addressing postulated LOCAs in a BWR and a PWR.

**DATES:** May 31–June 2, 2000, 8:30 a.m.–5:30 p.m.

**ADDRESSES:** Room T10A1 (TWFN) of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The meeting agenda will be posted on the NRC Web site at <a href="http://www.nrc.gov/RES/meetings.htm">http://www.nrc.gov/RES/meetings.htm</a> by May 25, 2000. The meeting is open to the public. Attendees will need to obtain a visitor badge at the TWFN building lobby.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Ralph Meyer, SMSAB, Division of Systems Analysis and Regulatory Effectiveness, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research, Washington, DC 20555–0001, telephone (301) 415–6789.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 12th day of May 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Charles E. Rossi,

Director, Division of Systems Analysis and Regulatory Effectiveness, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research.

[FR Doc. 00–12555 Filed 5–17–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

### NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, Subcommittee Meeting on Severe Accident Management; Cancellation

The meeting of the ACRS Subcommittee on Severe Accident Management scheduled for May 18, 2000, in Room T–2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland has been canceled. Notice of this meeting was previously published in the **Federal Register** on Monday, May 8, 2000 (65 FR 26644).

Further information contact: Mr. Paul A. Boehnert, cognizant ACRS staff engineer, (telephone 301/415–8065) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EDT).

Dated: May 11, 2000.

#### Howard J. Larson,

Acting Associate Director for Technical Support, ACRS/ACNW.

[FR Doc. 00–12552 Filed 5–17–00; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

# NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Risk Analysis and Evaluation of Regulatory Options for Nuclear Byproduct Material Systems

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory

Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice of availability.

**SUMMARY:** The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is announcing the availability of NUREG/CR-6642, "Risk Analysis and Evaluation of Regulatory Options for Nuclear Byproduct Material Systems," dated December 1999.

ADDRESSES: Copies of NUREG/CR-6642 may be obtained by writing to the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20402-9328. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, Virginia 22161. A copy of the document is also available for inspection and/or copying for a fee in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20555-0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Ms. Torre Taylor, Mail Stop TWFN 9-C-24, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, telephone: (301) 415-7900, e-mail: tmt@nrc.gov.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** On August 25, 1999 (64 FR 46456), NRC published draft NUREG/CR-6642, "Risk Analysis and Evaluation of Regulatory Options for Nuclear Byproduct Material Systems," for public comment. All comments received during the comment period were reviewed in the preparation of the final NUREG report. The final version of NUREG/CR-6642 is now available. NUREG/CR-6642 presents a detailed, comparative risk analysis of nuclear byproduct materials, organized into groups of activities or "systems," such as nuclear pharmacy, pool irradiators, and industrial radiography. It also describes the methodology used in the risk analysis and provides the results of the analysis.

#### **Electronic Access**

NUREG/CR-6642 will also be available at NRC's web site under Reference Library—Technical Reports or directly at http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ NUREGS/CR6642/index.html.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of March, 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. **Catherine Haney**,

Acting Chief, Rulemaking and Guidance Branch, Division of Industrial and Medical Nuclear Safety, NMSS.

[FR Doc. 00–12553 Filed 5–17–00; 8:45 am]

#### BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

# Proposed Collection; Comment Request

SUMMARY: In accordance with the requirement of Section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Board (RRB) will publish periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

Comments are invited on: (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected; and (d) ways to minimize the burden related to the collection of information on respondents, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology.

Title and purpose of information collection: Statement of Claimant or other Person: OMB 3220–0183.

To support an application for an annuity under Section 2 of the Railroad Retirement Act (RRA) or for unemployment benefits under Section 2 of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act (RUIA), pertinent information and proofs must be furnished for the RRB to determine benefit entitlement. Circumstances may require an applicant or other person(s) having knowledge of facts relevant to the applicant's eligibility for an annuity or benefits to provide written statements supplementing or changing statements previously provided by the applicant.