ENCLOSURES

Safety Analysis Report
and
Integrated Safety Analysis Summary

Revision 3, September 2004
Including Page Removal and Insertion Instructions

NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY
SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT, REVISION 3
PAGE REMOVAL AND INSERTION INSTRUCTIONS

REMOVE	**INSERT**
VOLUME 1	VOLUME 1
Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 1 OF 5"	Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 1 OF 3"
List of Effective Pages Pages 1 of 18/2 of 18 through 17 of 18/18 of 18	List of Effective Pages Pages 1 of 10/2 of 10 through 9 of 10/10 of 10
Table of Contents Pages i/ii through xv/xvi	Table of Contents Pages i/ii through ix/x
Acronyms and Abbreviations Pages xvii/xviii through xxi/xxii	Acronyms and Abbreviations Pages xi/xii through xv/xvi
Units of Measure Pages xxiii/xxiv	Units of Measure Pages xvii/xviii
Pages 1-i/1-ii	Pages 1-i/1-ii
Pages 1.1-3/1.1-4 through 1.1-11/1.1-12	Pages 1.1-3/1.1-4 through 1.1-11/1.1-12
Pages 1.3-1/1.3-2 through 1.3-11/1.3-12	Pages 1.3-1/1.3-2 through 1.3-11/1.3-12
---	Tab labeled "3.0 SAFETY PROGRAM COMMITMENTS" (behind Figure 2.1-2)
---	Pages 3.0-i/3.0-ii (behind tab labeled "3.0 SAFETY PROGRAM COMMITMENTS")
---	Pages 3.0-1/3.0-2 through 3.0-3/3.0-4 (behind Page 3.0-ii)
VOLUME 2	VOLUME 2
Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 2 OF 5"	Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSIS SUMMARY VOLUME 1 OF 2"
Notebook front cover insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT"	Notebook front cover insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSIS SUMMARY"

NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY
SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT, REVISION 3
PAGE REMOVAL AND INSERTION INSTRUCTIONS

REMOVE	INSERT
---	List of Effective Pages Pages 1 of 9/2 of 9 through Page 9 of 9 (behind notebook page protector)
---	Table of Contents Pages i/ii through vii/viii (behind List of Effective Pages, Page 9 of 9)
---	Tab labeled "1.0 PURPOSE" (behind Table of Contents Page viii)
---	Pages 1-i/1-ii (behind tab labeled "1.0, PURPOSE")
---	Pages 1.0-1/1.0-2 through 1.0-3/1.0-4 (behind Page 1-ii)
---	Tab labeled "2.0 SCOPE" (behind Page 1.0-4)
---	Pages 2-i/2-ii (behind tab labeled "2.0, SCOPE")
---	Pages 2.0-1/2.0-2 through 2.0-3/2.0-4 (behind Page 2-ii)
Tab labeled "3.0 INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSIS SUMMARY"	Tab labeled "3.0 APPLICABLE REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS/ GUIDANCE"
Pages 3.0-i/3.0-ii	Pages 3.0-i/3.0-ii
Pages 3.0-1/3.0-2 through 3.0-3	Pages 3.0-1/3.0-2 through 3.0-3/3.0-4
Pages 3.1-i/3.1-ii	Pages 3.1-i/3.1-ii
Pages 3.1-1/3.1-2 through 3.1-23/3.1-24	Pages 3.1-1/3.1-2 through 3.1-23/3.1-24
Tables cover page/intentionally blank page	Tables cover page/intentionally blank page
Table 3.1-1/Table 3.1-2 through Table 3.1-11/intentionally blank page	Table 3.1-1/Table 3.1-2 through Table 3.1-11/intentionally blank page
Pages 3.2-i/3.2-ii through Pages 3.2-v/3.2-vi	Pages 3.2-i/3.2-ii through Pages 3.2-v/3.2-vi

NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY
SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT, REVISION 3
PAGE REMOVAL AND INSERTION INSTRUCTIONS

REMOVE	**INSERT**
Pages 3.2-1/3.2-2 through 3.2-37/3.2-38	Pages 3.2-1/3.2-2 through 3.2-37/3.2-38
Tables cover page/intentionally blank page	Tables cover page/intentionally blank page
Table 3.2-1/Table 3.2-2 through Table 3.2-32/Table 3.2-33	Table 3.2-1/Table 3.2-2 through Table 3.2-32/Table 3.2-33
Figures cover page/intentionally blank page	Figures cover page/intentionally blank page
Pages 3.3-i/3.3-ii through 3.3-iii/3.3-iv	Pages 3.3-i/3.3-ii through 3.3-iii/3.3-iv
Pages 3.3-1/3.3-2 through 3.3-33/3.3-34	Pages 3.3-1/3.3-2 through 3.3-33/3.3-34
Tables cover page/intentionally blank page	Tables cover page/intentionally blank page
Table 3.3-1/intentionally blank page	Table 3.3-1/intentionally blank page
Figures cover page/intentionally blank page	Figures cover page/intentionally blank page
Pages 3.4-i/3.4-ii through 3.4-iii/3.4-iv	Pages 3.4-i/3.4-ii through 3.4-iii/3.4-iv
Pages 3.4-1/3.4-2 through 3.4-75/3.4-76	Pages 3.4-1/3.4-2 through 3.4-85/3.4-86
Tables cover page/intentionally blank page	Tables cover page/intentionally blank page
Table 3.4-1 (page 1)/Table 3.4-1 (page 2) through Table 3.4-21/ intentionally blank page	Table 3.4-1 (page 1)/Table 3.4-1 (page 2) through Table 3.4-21/ intentionally blank page
Figures cover page/intentionally blank page	Figures cover page/intentionally blank page
VOLUME 3	VOLUME 3
Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 3 OF 5"	Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSIS SUMMARY VOLUME 2 OF 2"
Notebook front cover insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT"	Notebook front cover insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY INTEGRATED SAFETY ANALYSIS SUMMARY"

NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY
SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT, REVISION 3
PAGE REMOVAL AND INSERTION INSTRUCTIONS

REMOVE	**INSERT**
Pages 3.5-i/3.5-ii through 3.5-v/3.5-vi	Pages 3.5-i/3.5-ii through 3.5-v/3.5-vi
Pages 3.5-1/3.5-2 through 3.5-89/3.5-90	Pages 3.5-1/3.5-2 through 3.5-91/3.5-92
Tables cover page/intentionally blank page	Tables cover page/intentionally blank page
Table 3.5-1 (page 1)/Table 3.5-1 (page 2) through Table 3.5-11/Table 3.5-12	Table 3.5-1 (page 1)/Table 3.5-1 (page 2) through Table 3.5-11/Table 3.5-12
Figures cover page/intentionally blank page	Figures cover page/intentionally blank page
Pages 3.6-i/3.6-ii	Pages 3.6-i/3.6-ii
Page 3.6-1	Pages 3.6-1/3.6-2
Pages 3.7-i/3.7-ii through 3.7-iii/3.7-iv	Pages 3.7-i/3.7-ii through 3.7-iii/3.7-iv
Pages 3.7-1/3.7-2 through 3.7-7/3.7-8	Pages 3.7-1/3.7-2 through 3.7-7/3.7-8
Tables cover page/intentionally blank page	Tables cover page/intentionally blank page
Table 3.7-1 (page 1)/Table 3.7-1 (page 2) through Table 3.7-5 (page 2)/intentionally blank page	Table 3.7-1 (page 1)/Table 3.7-1 (page 2) through Table 3.7-5 (page 2)/intentionally blank page
Figures cover page/intentionally blank page	Figures cover page/intentionally blank page
Pages 3.8-i/3.8-ii	Pages 3.8-i/3.8-ii
Pages 3.8-1/3.8-2 through 3.8-5/3.8-6	Pages 3.8-1/3.8-2 through 3.8-5/3.8-6
Tables cover page/intentionally blank page	Tables cover page/intentionally blank page
Table 3.8-1 (page 1)/Table 3.8-1 (page 2) through Table 3.8-2 (page 3)	Table 3.8-1 (page1)/Table 3.8-1 (page 2) through Table 3.8-2 (page 3)
VOLUME 4	VOLUME 4
Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 4 OF 5"	Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 2 OF 3"
Pages 4.6-1/4.6-2	Pages 4.6-1/4.6-2

NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY
SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT, REVISION 3
PAGE REMOVAL AND INSERTION INSTRUCTIONS

REMOVE	INSERT
Pages 5-i/5-ii through 5-iii/5-iv	Pages 5-i/5-ii through 5-iii/5-iv
Pages 5.0-1/5.0-2 through 5.6-1/5.6-2	Pages 5.0-1/5.0-2 through 5.5-1/5.5-2
Pages 6-i/6-ii	Pages 6-i/6-ii
Pages 6.2-1/6.2-2	Pages 6.2-1/6.2-2
Pages 6.2-7/6.2-8	Pages 6.2-7/6.2-8
Pages 6.3-1/6.3-2 through 6.3-3/6.3-4	Pages 6.3-1/6.3-2 through 6.3-3/6.3-4
Pages 6.4-1/6.4-2 through 6.4-3/6.4-4	Pages 6.4-1/6.4-2 through 6.4-3/6.4-4
Pages 7-i/7-ii	Pages 7-i/7-ii
Pages 7.0-1/7.0-2	Pages 7.0-1/7.0-2
Pages 7.1-1/7.1-2	Pages 7.1-1/7.1-2
Pages 7.2-1/7.2-2	Pages 7.2-1/7.2-2
Pages 7.3-3/7.3-4 through 7.3-5/7.3-6	Pages 7.3-3/7.3-4 through 7.3-5/7.3-6
Pages 7.4-1/7.4-2	Pages 7.4-1/7.4-2
VOLUME 5	VOLUME 5
Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 5 OF 5"	Notebook spine insert "NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT VOLUME 3 OF 3"
Pages 9.2-1/9.2-2	Pages 9.2-1/9.2-2
Pages 10.1-1/10.1-2	Pages 10.1-1/10.1-2
Pages 11.1-3/11.1-4	Pages 11.1-3/11.1-4
Appendix A Pages A1/A2	Appendix A Pages A1/A2
Appendix A Pages A9/A10	Appendix A Pages A9/A10

NATIONAL
ENRICHMENT
FACILITY

SAFETY
ANALYSIS
REPORT

VOLUME
1 OF 3

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
Table of Contents	
i	Revision 0, December 2003
ii through x	Revision 3, September 2004
Acronyms and Abbreviations	
xl through xvi	Revision 3, September 2004
Units of Measure	
xvii through xviii	Revision 3, September 2004
Figure Legend	
Sheet 1 of 3 through Sheet 2 of 3	Revision 0, December 2003
Sheet 3 of 3	Revision 2, July 2004
Chapter 1	
Table of Contents	
1-i	Revision 0, December 2003
1-ii	Revision 1, February 2004
List of Tables	
1-iii	Revision 0, December 2003
List of Figures	
1-iv	Revision 1, February 2004
1.0-1 through 1.0-2	Revision 0, December 2003
1.1-1 through 1.1-2	Revision 0, December 2003
1.1-3 through 1.1-11	Revision 3, September 2004
1.1-12	Revision 0, December 2003
1.2-1	Revision 1, February 2004
1.2-2	Revision 0, December 2003
1.2-3 through 1.2-5	Revision 2, July 2004
1.2-6	Revision 0, December 2003
1.3-1 through 1.3-4	Revision 3, September 2004
1.3-5	Revision 0, December 2003
1.3-6 through 1.3-11	Revision 3, September 2004
1.3-12	Revision 0, December 2003
1.4-1	Revision 2, July 2004
1.4-2	Revision 0, December 2003

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
Chapter 2	
Table of Contents	
2-i	Revision 0, December 2003
List of Figures	
2-ii	Revision 0, December 2003
2.0-1	Revision 0, December 2003
2.0-2	Revision 2, July 2004
2.1-1	Revision 1, February 2004
2.1-2 through 2.1-4	Revision 0, December 2003
2.2-1 through 2.2-5	Revision 2, July 2004
2.2-6	Revision 0, December 2003
2.2-7 through 2.2-12	Revision 2, July 2004
2.3-1 through 2.3-6	Revision 0, December 2003
2.4-1	Revision 2, July 2004
2.4-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Chapter 3	
Section 3.0	
Table of Contents	
3.0-i	Revision 3, September 2004
3.0-1 through 3.0-3	Revision 3, September 2004
Chapter 4	
Table of Contents	
4-i through 4-ii	Revision 1, February 2004
List of Tables	
4-iii	Revision 0, December 2003
List of Figures	
4-iv	Revision 0, December 2003
4.0-1	Revision 0, December 2003
4.0-2	Revision 2, July 2004
4.1-1 through 4.1-2	Revision 2, July 2004
4.1-3 through 4.1-6	Revision 0, December 2003
4.2-1 through 4.2-2	Revision 2, July 2004

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
4.3-1 through 4.3-2	Revision 0, December 2003
4.4-1	Revision 2, July 2004
4.4-2	Revision 0, December 2003
4.5-1 through 4.5-4	Revision 0, December 2003
4.6-1 through 4.6-2	Revision 3, September 2004
4.6-3 through 4.6-6	Revision 0, December 2003
4.7-1 through 4.7-10	Revision 0, December 2003
4.8-1 through 4.8-6	Revision 0, December 2003
4.9-1 through 4.9-2	Revision 0, December 2003
4.10-1 through 4.10-2	Revision 0, December 2003
4.11-1 through 4.11-2	Revision 0, December 2003
4.12-1 through 4.12-3	Revision 0, December 2003
4.12-4	Revision 2, July 2004
Chapter 5	
Table of Contents	
5-i	Revision 3, September 2004
List of Tables	
5-ii	Revision 2, July 2004
List of Figures	
5-iii through 5-iv	Revision 2, July 2004
5.0-1	Revision 2, July 2004
5.0-2	Revision 3, September 2004
5.1-1 through 5.1-2	Revision 3, September 2004
5.1-3 through 5.1-8	Revision 2, July 2004
5.2-1	Revision 2, July 2004
5.2-2 through 5.2-7	Revision 3, September 2004
5.2-8	Revision 2, July 2004
5.3-1 through 5.3-2	Revision 3, September 2004
5.4-1 through 5.4-2	Revision 3, September 2004
5.5-1 through 5.5-2	Revision 3, September 2004
5.6-1 through 5.6-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Chapter 6	
Table of Contents	
6-i	Revision 3, September 2003

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
List of Tables	
6-ii	Revision 0, December 2003
List of Figures	
6-iii	Revision 0, December 2003
6.0-1 through 6.0-2	Revision 0, December 2003
6.1-1 through 6.1-8	Revision 0, December 2003
6.2-1 through 6.2-2	Revision 3, September 2004
6.2-3 through 6.2-7	Revision 0, December 2003
6.2-8	Revision 3, September 2004
6.3-1	Revision 3, September 2004
6.3-2	Revision 2, July 2004
6.3-3 through 6.3-4	Revision 3, September 2004
6.4-1 through 6.4-4	Revision 3, September 2004
6.4-5	Revision 0, December 2003
6.4-6 through 6.4-7	Revision 2, July 2004
6.4-8	Revision 0, December 2003
6.5-1 through 6.5-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Chapter 7	
Table of Contents	
7-i	Revision 3, September 2004
List of Figures	
7- ii	Revision 0, December 2003
7.0-1	Revision 3, September 2004
7.0-2	Revision 0, December 2003
7.1-1	Revision 3, September 2004
7.1-2 through 7.1-3	Revision 0, December 2003
7.1-4	Revision 1, February 2004
7.2-1	Revision 3, September 2003
7.2-2	Revision 0, December 2003
7.3-1 through 7.3-2	Revision 2, July 2004
7.3-3 through 7.3-4	Revision 3, September 2004
7.3-5	Revision 2, July 2004
7.3-6	Revision 3, September 2004
7.4-1	Revision 3, September 2004
7.4-2	Revision 0, December 2003
7.5-1	Revision 0, December 2003

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
7.5-2 through 7.5-8	Revision 2, July 2004
7.6-1 through 7.6-3	Revision 2, July 2004
Chapter 8	
Table of Contents	
8-i through 8-ii	Revision 0, December 2003
8.0-1 through 8.0-2	Revision 0, December 2003
8.1-1 through 8.1-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Chapter 9	
Table of Contents	
9-i through 9-ii	Revision 1, February 2004
9.0-1 through 9.0-2	Revision 0, December 2003
9.1-1	Revision 1, February 2004
9.1-2	Revision 2, July 2004
9.1-3	Revision 1, February 2004
9.1-4	Revision 0, December 2003
9.2-1	Revision 0, December 2003
9.2-2	Revision 3, September 2004
9.2-3 through 9.2-4	Revision 0, December 2003
9.3-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Chapter 10	
Table of Contents	
10-i	Revision 0, December 2003
List of Tables	
10-ii	Revision 2, July 2004
List of Figures	
10-iii	Revision 0, December 2003
10.0-1	Revision 2, July 2004
10.0-2	Revision 0, December 2003
10.1-1	Revision 3, September 2004
10.1-2 through 10.1-6	Revision 0, December 2004
10.1-7	Revision 2, July 2004

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
10.1-8 through 10.1-14	Revision 0, December 2003
10.2-1	Revision 2, July 2004
10.2-2	Revision 0, December 2003
10.3-1 through 10.3-2	Revision 0, December 2003
10.3-3	Revision 2, July 2004
10.3-4	Revision 0, December 2003
10.4-1	Revision 0, December 2003
10.4-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Chapter 11	
Table of Contents	
11-i	Revision 0, December 2003
11-ii	Revision 1, February 2004
11.0-1	Revision 2, July 2004
11.0-2	Revision 0, December 2003
11.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
11.1-2	Revision 2, July 2004
11.1-3	Revision 3, September 2004
11.1-4 through 11.1-12	Revision 2, July 2004
11.2-1	Revision 0, December 2003
11.2-2	Revision 2, July 2004
11.2-3 through 11.2-12	Revision 0, December 2003
11.3-1	Revision 0, December 2003
11.3-2 through 11.3-5	Revision 2, July 2004
11.3-6 through 11.3-10	Revision 0, December 2003
11.3-11	Revision 1, February 2004
11.3-12	Revision 0, December 2003
11.4-1	Revision 2, July 2004
11.4-2	Revision 0, December 2003
11.4-3 through 11.4-8	Revision 2, July 2004
11.5-1 through 11.5-6	Revision 2, July 2004
11.6-1 through 11.6-4	Revision 0, December 2003
11.7-1 through 11.7-4	Revision 0, December 2003
11.8-1	Revision 0, December 2003
11.8-2	Revision 2, July 2004
11.9-1 through 11.9-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Appendix A	
Table of Contents	

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
Ai	Revision 0, December 2003
List of Figures	
Aii	Revision 0, December 2003
A1	Revision 3, September 2004
A2 through A6	Revision 2, July 2004
A7 through A9	Revision 0, December 2003
A10	Revision 3, September 2004
A11 through A12	Revision 2, July 2004
A13	Revision 0, December 2003
A14	Revision 2, July 2004
A15 through A20	Revision 0, December 2003
A21	Revision 2, July 2004
A22 through 30	Revision 0, December 2003
A31 through A32	Revision 2, July 2004
A33 through A52	Revision 0, December 2003
A53 through A54	Revision 2, July 2004
A55 through A68	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 1.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 1.1-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 1.1-3	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 1.1-4	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 1.1-5	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 1.2-1	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 4.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 4.1-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 4.1-3	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 4.7-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 4.11-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 5.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 5.1-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 5.2-1	Revision 2, July 2004

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
Table 6.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.1-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.1-3	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.1-4	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.1-5	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.1-6	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.2-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.2-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.2-3	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.3-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.3-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Table 6.3-3	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 6.3-4	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 6.3-5	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-1A	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-1B	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-1C	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-1D	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-1E	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-1F	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-3	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-4	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-5	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-6	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-7	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-8	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-9	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-10	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-11	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-12	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-13	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.1-14	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.3-1	Revision 2, July 2004
Table 10.3-2	Revision 2, July 2004

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
Figure 1.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-3	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure 1.1-4	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure 1.1-5	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-6	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-7	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-8	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-9	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-10	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-11	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-12	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-13	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-14	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-15	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-16	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-17	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.1-18	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 1.3-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 2.1-1	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure 2.1-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure 4.7-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 4.7-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure 5.2-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 6.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 6.1-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.3-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.3-2	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.3-3	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.3-4	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.3-5	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.3-6	Revision 0, December 2003

LIST OF EFFECTIVE PAGES

Page/Table/Figure Number	Revision Number, Date of Revision
Figure 7.3-7	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.3-8	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.5-1 (Sht 1 of 2)	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure 7.5-1 (Sht 2 of 2)	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure 7.5-2	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure 10.1-1	Revision 0, December 2003
Figure A1	Revision 2, July 2004
Figure A2	Revision 2, July 2004

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME 1

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

VOLUME 2

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(This page intentionally left blank)

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

AC	alternating current
ACI	American Concrete Institute
ADEM	Alabama Department of Environmental Management
AEA	Atomic Energy Act
AEP	American Electric Power
AEGL	Acute Exposure Guideline Level
AHU	air handling unit
AISC	American Institute of Steel Construction
ALARA	as low as reasonably achievable
ALI	Annual Limit on Intake
ANPR	Advance Notice of Proposed Rulemaking
ANS	American Nuclear Society
ANSI	American National Standards Institute
AP	air particulate
APE	area of potential effects
AQB	Air Quality Bureau
ASCE	American Society of Civil Engineers
ASLB	Atomic Safety and Licensing Board
ASME	American Society of Mechanical Engineers
ASNT	American Society of Nondestructive Testing
ASTM	American Society for Testing Materials
ATSDR	Agency for Toxic Substances and Disease Registry
AVLIS	Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation
BDC	baseline design criteria
BEA	Bureau of Economic Analysis
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMP	Best Management Practices
BNFL	British Nuclear Fuels
BNFL-EL	British Nuclear Fuels – Enrichment Limited
BOD	biochemical oxygen demand
BS	Bachelor of Science
CA	Controlled Area
CAA	Clean Air Act
CAAS	Criticality Accident Alarm System
CAB	Centrifuge Assembly Building
CAM	Continuous Air Monitor
CAP	Corrective Action Program
CBG	Census Block Group
CEDE	Committed Effective Dose Equivalent
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFO	Chief Financial Officer
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CHP	certified health physicist
CIS	Commonwealth of Independent States
CM	configuration management

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

COD	chemical oxygen demand
COO	Chief Operating Officer
CRDB	Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building
CUB	Central Utilities Building
CVRF	Central Volume Reduction Facility
CWA	Clean Water Act
D&D	decontamination and decommissioning
DAC	derived air concentration
DBA	design basis accident
DBE	design basis earthquake
DCF	dose conversion factor
DE	Dose Equivalent
DEIS	Draft Environmental Impact Statement
DI	deionized
DOC	United States Department of Commerce
DOE	United States Department of Energy
DOI	United States Department of Interior
DOT	United States Department of Transportation
E	east
EDE	Effective Dose Equivalent
EECP	Entry/Exit Control Point
EIA	Energy Information Administration
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EJ	Environmental Justice
EMS	Emergency Medical Services
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
EPCRA	Emergency Planning and Community Right-to-Know Act
EPRI	Electric Power Research Institute
eqs.	equations
ER	Environmental Report
ERPG	Emergency Response Planning Guideline
ENE	east north east
ESE	east south east
ETTP	East Tennessee Technology Park
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHA	fire hazards analysis
FNMC	Fundamental Nuclear Material Control
FR	Federal Register
FWPCA	Federal Water Pollution Control Act
GDP	Gaseous Diffusion Plant
GET	General Employee Training
GEVS	Gaseous Effluent Vent System
GPS	Global Positioning System
HEPA	high efficiency particulate air
HEU	highly enriched uranium
HMTA	Hazardous Materials Transportation Act
HS&E	Health, Safety, and Environment

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

HUD	United States Department of Housing and Urban Development
HVAC	heating, ventilating, and air conditioning
HWA	Hazardous Waste Act
HWB	Hazardous Waste Bureau
IAEA	International Atomic Energy Agency
ICRP	International Commission on Radiological Protection
INFL	International Nuclear Fuels Plc
I/O or I-O	input/output
IPD	Implicit Price Deflator
IROFS	items relied on for safety
ISA	Integrated Safety Analysis
ISO	International Organization for Standardization
JCIDA	Jackson County Industrial Development Authority
LAN	local area network
LCC	local control center
LCD	local climatic data
L_{dn}	Day-Night Average Sound Level
L_{eq}	Equivalent Sound Level
LES	Louisiana Energy Services
LEU	low enriched uranium
LLC	Limited Liability Company
LLD	lower limits of detection
LLNL	Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory
LLW	low-level waste
LOI	local operator interface
LQ	Location Quotients
LTA	lost time accident
LTC	load tap changer
LTTS	Low Temperature Take-off Station
M&TE	measuring and test equipment
MAPEP	Mixed Analyte Performance Evaluation Program
max.	maximum
MC&A	material control and accountability
MCL	maximum contaminant level
MCNP	Monte Carlo N-Particle
MDA	minimum detectable activity
MDC	minimum detectable concentration
ME&I	mechanical, electrical and instrumentation
min.	minimum
MM	modified mercalli
MMI	modified mercalli intensity
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MOX	mixed oxide fuel
MUA	multi-attribute utility analysis
N	north
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NASA	National Aeronautic Space Administration
NCA	Noise Control Act
NCRP	National Council on Radiological Protection and Measurements

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

NCS	nuclear criticality safety
NCSE	nuclear criticality safety evaluation
NDA	Non-destructive assessment
NE	Northeast
NEF	National Enrichment Facility
NEI	Nuclear Energy Institute
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAPS	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants
NFPA	National Fire Protection Association
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NELAC	National Environmental Laboratory Accreditation Conference
NIOSH	National Institute of Occupational Safety and Health
NIST	National Institute of Standards and Technology
NM	New Mexico
NMAC	New Mexico Administrative Code
NMDGF	New Mexico Department of Game and Fish
NMED	New Mexico Environmental Department
NMHWB	New Mexico Hazardous Waste Bureau
NMRPR	New Mexico Radiation Protection Regulations
NMSA	New Mexico State Agency
NMSE	New Mexico State Engineer
NMSHPO	New Mexico State Historic Preservation Office
NMSLO	New Mexico State Land Office
NMSS	Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards
NMWQB	New Mexico Water Quality Bureau
NMWQCC	New Mexico Quality Control Commission
NNE	north-northeast
NNW	north-northwest
No.	number
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPDWS	National Primary Drinking Water Standard
NRC	United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NSDWS	National Secondary Drinking Water Standard
NSPS	New Source Performance Standards
NSR	New Source Review
NTS	Nevada Test Site
NWS	National Weather Service
NW	northwest
OEPA	Ohio Environmental Protection Agency
ORNL	Oak Ridge National Laboratory
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
OVEC	Ohio Valley Electric Corporation
P&IDs	piping and instrumentation diagrams
p.	page
PA	public address
PEL	Permissible Exposure Level

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

PFPE	perfluorinated polyether
PGA	peak ground acceleration
pH	measure of the acidity or alkalinity
PHA	Process Hazard Analysis
Ph.D.	Doctor of Philosophy
PIA	Potentially Impacted Area
PLC	Programmable Logic Controllers
PM	preventive maintenance
$PM_{2.5}$	particulates $\leq 2.5\mu m$
PM_{10}	particulates $\leq 10\mu m$
PMF	probable maximum flood
PMP	Probable Maximum Precipitation
PMWP	Probable Maximum Winter Precipitation
PORTS	Portsmouth Gaseous Diffusion Plant
POTW	Publicly Owned Treatment Works
pp.	pages
PRC	Peoples Republic of China
PSAR	Preliminary Safety Analysis Report
PSP	Physical Security Plan
QA	quality assurance
QAPD	Quality Assurance Program Description
QC	Quality Control
RCB	Radiation Control Bureau
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
RCZ	radiation control zone
REIS	Regional Economic Information System
REMP	Radiological Environmental Monitoring Program
RIMS	Regional Input-Output Modeling System
ROI	Region of Interest or Radius of Influence
RTE	Rare Threatened and Endangered
RWP	radiation work permit
S	south
SAR	Safety Analysis Report
SB	Separations Building
Sc.D.	Doctor of Science
SCRAM	Support Center for Regulatory Air Models
SDWA	Safe Drinking Water Act
SE	southeast
SER	Safety Evaluation Report
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SILEX	Separation of Isotopes by Laser Excitation
SNM	special nuclear material
SPCC	spill prevention, control, and countermeasures
SPL	Sound Level Pressure
SRC	Safety Review Committee
SSC	structure, system, and component
SSE	safe shutdown earthquake
SSE	south-southeast
SSW	south-southwest

ACRONYMS and ABBREVIATIONS

STEL	short term exposure limits
STP	standard temperature and pressure
SVOC	semivolatile organic compounds
SW	southwest
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TDEC	Tennessee Department of Environment and Conservation
TDS	Total Dissolved Solids
TEDE	total effective dose equivalent
TLD	thermoluminescent dosimeter
TN	Tennessee
TSB	Technical Services Building
TSP	total suspended particulates
TVA	Tennessee Valley Authority
TWA	time weighted average
TWDB	Texas Water Development Board
TX	Texas
UBC	Uranium byproduct cylinder
UCL	Urenco Capenhurst Limited
UCN	Ultra-Centrifuge Netherlands NV
UNAMAP	Users Network for Applied Modeling of Air Pollution
UPS	uninterruptible power supply
US	United States
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
UNSCEAR	United Nations Scientific Committee on the Effects of Atomic Radiation
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
USGS	United States Geological Survey
UV	ultravoilet
VOC	volatile organic compound
W	West
WCS	Waste Control Specialists
WIPP	Waste Isolation Pilot Plant
WMA	wildlife management area
WNA	World Nuclear Association
WNW	west-northwest
WQB	Water Quality Bureau
WQCC	Water Quality Control Commission
WSW	west-southwest

UNITS OF MEASURE

Bq	Becquerel
BTU	british thermal unit
°C	degrees celsius
Ci	curie
cm	centimeter
d	day
dB	decibel
dBA	decibel A-weighted
dpm	disintegrations per minute
°F	degrees farenheit
ft	feet
g	gram
g_a	gravitational acceleration
gal	gallon
gpm	gallons per minute
Gy	Gray
ha	hectares
hp	horsepower
hr	hour
Hz	hertz (cycle per second)
in	inch
in. H_2O	inches of water (column)
J	Joule
kg	kilogram
km	kilometer
kWh	kilowatt-hour
L	liter
lb	pound
lbs	pounds
m	meter
mbar abs	millibar absolute
mbarg	millibar gauge
MBq	megabecquerel
mi	mile
min	minute
M_N	local magnitude
Mo	month
msl	mean sea level
MT or t	metric ton
MTU	Metric ton uranium
oz	ounce
Pa	pascal
ppb	parts per billion
ppm	parts per million
psia	pounds per square inch absolute
psig	pounds per square inch gauge
R	Roentgen
rad	radiation absorbed dose
rem	Roentgen equivalent man

UNITS OF MEASURE

scfm	standard cubic feet per minute
s	second
Sv	sievert
SWU	separative work unit
μmhos	micromhos
V	volt
VA	volt-ampere
W	watt
$^{w}/_{o}$	weight percent
χ/Q	atmospheric concentration per unit source
yd	yard
yr	year
σ	standard deviation

Pico (p)	X 10^{-12}
Nano (n)	X 10^{-9}
Micro (μ)	X 10^{-6}
Milli (m)	X 10^{-3}
Centi (c)	X 10^{-2}
Kilo (k)	X 10^{3}
Mega (M)	X 10^{6}

TABLE OF CONTENTS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

1.1.1 Facility Location, Site Layout, And Surrounding Characteristics

Site features are well suited for the location of a uranium enrichment facility as evidenced by its favorable conditions of hydrology, geology, seismology and meteorology as well as good transportation routes for transporting feed and product by truck.

The facility is located on approximately 220 ha (543 acres) of land in Section 32 of Lea County, New Mexico. The Separations Building Modules, Administration Building, Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building, Centrifuge Assembly Building, Central Utilities Building, Technical Services Building, and UBC Storage Pad are located approximately in the center of the Section on 73 ha (180 acres) of developed area. A Plot Plan of the facility is shown in Figure 1.1-3, Plot Plan (1 Mile Radius). The Facility Layout (Site Plan) depicting the Site Boundary and Controlled Area Boundary is shown in Figure 1.1-4, Facility Layout (Site Plan) with Site Boundary and Controlled Access Area Boundary.

The site lies along the north side of New Mexico Highway 234. It is relatively flat with slight undulations in elevation ranging from 1,033 to 1,061 m (3,390 to 3,430 ft) above mean sea level (msl). The overall slope direction is to the southwest. A barbed wire fence runs along the east, south and west property lines. The fence along the north property line has been dismantled. A 254-mm (10-in) diameter, underground carbon dioxide pipeline owned by Trinity Pipeline LLC, traverses the site from southeast to northwest. A 406-mm (16-in) diameter, underground natural gas pipeline, owned by the Sid Richardson Energy Services Company, is located along the south property line, paralleling New Mexico Highway 234.

The nearest community is Eunice, approximately 8 km (5 mi) from the site. There are no residences, schools, stores or other population centers within a 1.6 km (1 mi) radius of the site.

Additional details of proximity to nearby populations are provided in the Environmental Report.

1.1.2 Facilities Description

The major structures and areas of the facility are outlined below.

<u>Separations Building Modules</u>

The overall layout of a Separations Building Module is presented in Figures 1.1-5 through 1.1-7 and the UF_6 Handling Area is shown in Figure 1.1-8, UF_6 Handling Area Equipment Location. The facility includes three identical Separations Building Modules. Each module consists of two Cascade Halls, each having eight cascades with each cascade having hundreds of centrifuges. Each Cascade Hall is capable of producing approximately 500,000 SWU per year. The major functional areas of the Separations Building Modules are:

- Cascade Halls (2)
- Process Services Area
- UF_6 Handling Area

Source material and special nuclear material (SNM) are used or produced in this area.

Technical Services Building

The overall layout of the Technical Services Building (TSB) is presented in Figures 1.1-9, Technical Services Building First Floor, and 1.1-10, Technical Services Building Second Floor. The TSB contains support areas for the facility. It also acts as the secure point of entry to the Separations Building Modules and the Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building (CRDB). The major functional areas of the TSB are:

- Solid Waste Collection Room
- Vacuum Pump Rebuild Workshop
- Decontamination Workshop
- Ventilated Room
- Cylinder Preparation Room
- Mechanical, Electrical and Instrumentation (ME&I) Workshop
- Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment Room
- Laundry
- TSB Gaseous Effluent Vent System (GEVS) Room
- Mass Spectrometry Laboratory
- Chemical Laboratory
- Environmental Monitoring Laboratory
- Truck Bay/Shipping and Receiving Area
- Medical Room
- Radiation Monitoring Control Room
- Break Room
- Control Room
- Training Room
- Security Alarm Center

Source material and SNM are found in this area.

Centrifuge Assembly Building

This building is used to assemble centrifuges before they are moved into the Separations Building and installed in the cascades. The overall layout of the Centrifuge Assembly Building (CAB) is presented in Figures 1.1-11 through 1.1-13. The Centrifuge Assembly Building is located adjacent to the Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building. The major functional areas of the CAB are:

- Centrifuge Component Storage Area
- Centrifuge Assembly Area

- Assembled Centrifuge Storage Area
- Centrifuge Test Facility
- Centrifuge Post Mortem Facility

Source material and SNM are used and produced in this area.

Administration Building

The general office areas and Entrance Exit Control Point (EECP) are located in the Administration Building, Figure 1.1-14, Administration Building. All personnel access to the facility occurs at this location. Vehicular traffic passes through a security checkpoint before being allowed to park. Parking is located outside of the Controlled Access Area (CAA) security fence. Personnel enter the Administration Building and general office areas via the main lobby.

Personnel requiring access to facility areas or the CAA must pass through the EECP. The EECP is designed to facilitate and control the passage of authorized facility personnel and visitors.

Entry to the facility area from the Administration Building is only possible through the EECP.

Security Building

The main site Security Building is located at the entrance to the plant. It functions as a security checkpoint for incoming and outgoing vehicular traffic. Employees, visitors and trucks that have access approval are screened at this location.

A guard house is located at the secondary site entrance on the west side of the site. Common carriers, such as mail delivery trucks, are screened at this location.

Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building

The overall layout of the Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building (CRDB) is presented in Figures 1.1-15, Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building First Floor Part A, and 1.1-16, Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building First Floor Part B. The CRDB is located between two Separations Building Modules, adjacent to the Blending and Liquid Sampling Area. This building contains equipment to receive, inspect, weigh and temporarily store cylinders of feed UF_6 sent to the plant; temporarily store, inspect, weigh, and ship cylinders of enriched UF_6 to facility customers; receive, inspect, weigh, and temporarily store clean empty product and UBCs prior to being filled in the Separations Building; and inspect, weigh, and transfer filled UBCs to the UBC Storage Pad. The functions of the Cylinder Receipt and Dispatch Building are:

- Loading and unloading of cylinders
- Inventory weighing
- Storage of protective cylinder overpacks
- Storage of clean empty and empty UBCs
- Buffer storage of feed cylinders

Source and SNM are used in this area.

Blending and Liquid Sampling Area

The Blending and Liquid Sampling Area is adjacent to the CRDB and is located between two Separations Building Modules. The Blending and Liquid Sampling Area is shown in Figure 1.1-17, Blending and Liquid Sampling Area First Floor.

The primary function of the Blending and Liquid Sampling Area is to provide means to fill ANSI N14.1 (ANSI, applicable version) Model 30B cylinders with UF_6 at a required ^{235}U enrichment level and to liquefy, homogenize and sample 30B cylinders prior to shipment to the customer. The area contains the major components associated with the Product Liquid Sampling System and the Product Blending System.

SNM is used in this area.

UBC Storage Pad

The facility utilizes an area outside of the CRDB, the UBC Storage Pad, for storage of cylinders containing UF_6 that is depleted in ^{235}U. The cylinder contents are stored under vacuum in corrosion-resistant ANSI N14.1 (ANSI, applicable version) Model 48Y cylinders.

The UBC storage area layout is designed for moving the cylinders with a small truck and a crane. A flatbed truck moves the UBCs from the CRDB to the UBC Storage Pad entrance. A double girder gantry crane removes the cylinders from the flatbed truck and places them in the UBC Storage Pad. The gantry crane is designed to double stack the cylinders in the storage area.

Source material is used in this area.

Central Utilities Building

The Central Utilities Building (CUB) is shown on Figure 1.1-18, Central Utilities Building. The Central Utilities Building houses two diesel generators, which provide the site with standby power. The rooms housing the diesel generators are constructed independent of each other with adequate provisions made for maintenance, equipment removal and equipment replacement, by including roll-up access doors. The building also contains Electrical Rooms, an Air Compressor Room, a Boiler Room and Cooling Water Facility.

Visitor Center

A Visitor Center is located outside of the Controlled Access area.

1.1.3 Process Descriptions

This section provides a description of the various processes analyzed as part of the Integrated Safety Analysis. A brief overview of the entire enrichment process is provided followed by an overview of each major process system.

1.1.3.1 Process Overview

The enrichment process at the NEF is basically the same process described in the SAR for the Claiborne Enrichment Center (LES, 1991). The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff documented its review of the Claiborne Enrichment Center license application and concluded that LES's application provided an adequate basis for safety review of facility operations and that construction and operation of the Claiborne Enrichment Center would not pose an undue risk to public health and safety (NRC, 1993). The design of the NEF incorporates the latest safety improvements and design enhancements from the Urenco enrichment facilities currently operating in Europe.

The primary function of the facility is to enrich natural uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) by separating a feed stream containing the naturally occurring proportions of uranium isotopes into a product stream enriched in ^{235}U and a tails stream depleted in the ^{235}U isotope. The feed material for the enrichment process is uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) with a natural composition of isotopes ^{234}U, ^{235}U, and ^{238}U. The enrichment process is a mechanical separation of isotopes using a fast rotating cylinder (centrifuge) based on a difference in centrifugal forces due to differences in molecular weight of the uranic isotopes. No chemical changes or nuclear reactions take place. The feed, product, and tails streams are all in the form of UF_6.

1.1.3.2 Process System Descriptions

An overview of the four enrichment process systems and the two enrichment support systems is discussed below.

Numerous substances associated with the enrichment process could pose hazards if they were released into the environment. Chapter 6, Chemical Process Safety, contains a discussion of the criteria and identification of the chemicals of concern at the NEF and concludes that uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) is the only chemical of concern that will be used at the facility. Chapter 6, Chemical Process Safety, also identifies the locations where UF_6 is stored or used in the facility and includes a detailed discussion and description of the hazardous characteristics of UF_6 as well as a detailed listing of other chemicals that are in use at the facility.

The enrichment process is comprised of the following major systems:

<u>UF_6 Feed System</u>

The first step in the process is the receipt of the feed cylinders and preparation to feed the UF_6 through the enrichment process.

Natural UF_6 feed is received at the NEF in 48Y or 48X cylinders from a conversion plant. Pressure in the feed cylinders is below atmospheric (vacuum) and the UF_6 is in solid form.

The function of the UF_6 Feed System is to provide a continuous supply of gaseous UF_6 from the feed cylinders to the cascades. There are six Solid Feed Stations per Cascade Hall; three stations in operation and three on standby. The maximum feed flow rate is 187 kg/hr (412 lb/hr) UF_6 based on a maximum capacity of 545,000 SWU per year per Cascade Hall.

Cascade System

The function of the Cascade System is to receive gaseous UF_6 from the UF_6 Feed System and enrich the ^{235}U isotope in the UF_6 to a maximum of 5 $^{w}/_{o}$.

Multiple gas centrifuges make up arrays called cascades. The cascades separate gaseous UF_6 feed with a natural uranium isotopic concentration into two process flow streams – product and tails. The product stream is the enriched UF_6 stream, from 2 - 5 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U, with an average of 4.5 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U. The tails stream is UF_6 that has been depleted of ^{235}U isotope to 0.20 – 0.34 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U, with an average of 0.32 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U.

Product Take-off System

The function of the Product Take-off System is to provide continuous withdrawal of the enriched gaseous UF_6 product from the cascades and to purge and dispose of light gas impurities from the enrichment process.

The product streams leaving the eight cascades are brought together into one common manifold from the Cascade Hall. The product stream is transported via a train of vacuum pumps to Product LTTS in the UF_6 Handling Area. There are five Product LTTS per Cascade Hall; two stations in operation and three stations on standby.

The Product Take-off System also contains a system to purge light gases (typically air and hydrogen fluoride) from the enrichment process. This system consists of UF_6 Cold Traps which capture UF_6 while leaving the light gas in a gaseous state. The cold trap is followed by product vent Vacuum Pump/Trap Sets, each consisting of a carbon trap, an alumina trap, and a vacuum pump. The carbon trap removes small traces of UF_6 and the alumina trap removes any hydrogen fluoride (HF) from the product gas.

Tails Take-off System

The primary function of the Tails Take-off System is to provide continuous withdrawal of the gaseous UF_6 tails from the cascades. A secondary function of this system is to provide a means for removal of UF_6 from the centrifuge cascades under abnormal conditions.

The tails stream exits each Cascade Hall via a primary header, goes through a pumping train, and then to Tails LTTS in the UF_6 Handling Area. There are ten Tails LTTS per Cascade Hall. Under normal operation, seven of the stations are in operation receiving tails and three are on standby.

In addition to the four primary systems listed above, there are two major support systems:

Product Blending System

The primary function of the Product Blending System is to provide a means to fill 30B cylinders with UF_6 at a specific enrichment of ^{235}U to meet customer requirements. This is accomplished by blending (mixing) UF_6 at two different enrichment levels to one specific enrichment level. The system can also be used to transfer product from a 30B or 48Y cylinder to another 30B cylinder without blending.

This system consists of Blending Donor Stations (which are similar to the Solid Feed Stations) and Blending Receiver Stations (which are similar to the Product LTTS) described under the primary systems.

Product Liquid Sampling System

The function of the Product Liquid Sampling System is to obtain an assay sample from filled product 30B cylinders. The sample is used to validate the exact enrichment level of UF_6 in the filled product cylinders before the cylinders are sent to the fuel processor.

This is the only system in the NEF that changes solid UF_6 to liquid UF_6.

1.1.4 Raw Materials, By-Products, Wastes, And Finished Products

The facility handles Special Nuclear Material of ^{235}U contained in uranium enriched above natural but less than or equal to 5.0 $^{w}/_{o}$ in the ^{235}U isotope. The ^{235}U is in the form of uranium hexafluoride (UF_6). The facility processes approximately 690 feed cylinders (Model 48Y or 48X), 350 product cylinders (Model 30B), and 625 UBCs (Model 48Y) per year.

LES does not propose possession of any reflectors or moderators with special characteristics.

Solid Waste Management

Solid waste generated at the NEF will be grouped into industrial (non-hazardous), radioactive, hazardous, and mixed waste categories. In addition, solid radioactive and mixed waste is further segregated according to the quantity of liquid that is not readily separable from the solid material. The solid waste management systems are comprised of a set of facilities, administrative procedures, and practices that provide for the collection, temporary storage, processing, and transportation for disposal of categorized solid waste in accordance with regulatory requirements. All solid radioactive wastes generated are Class A low-level wastes (LLW) as defined in 10 CFR 61 (CFR, 2003a).

Radioactive waste is collected in labeled containers in each Radiation Area and transferred to the Solid Waste Collection Room for processing. Suitable waste will be volume-reduced, and all radioactive waste will be disposed of at a licensed LLW disposal facility.

Hazardous waste and a small amount of mixed waste are generated at the NEF. These wastes are also collected at the point of generation and transferred to the Solid Waste Collection Room. Any mixed waste that may be processed to meet land disposal requirements may be treated in its original collection container and shipped as LLW for disposal.

Industrial waste, including miscellaneous trash, filters, resins and paper is shipped offsite for compaction and then sent to a licensed waste landfill.

Effluent Systems

The following NEF systems handle wastes and effluent.

- Separations Building Gaseous Effluent Vent System
- TSB Gaseous Effluent Vent System
- Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System
- Centrifuge Test and Post Mortem Facilities Exhaust Filtration System
- Septic System
- Solid Waste Collection System

- Decontamination System
- Fomblin Oil Recovery System
- Laundry System

Effluent Quantities

Quantities of radioactive and non-radioactive wastes and effluent are estimated and shown in the tables referenced in this section. The tables include quantities and average uranium concentrations. Portions of the waste considered hazardous or mixed are identified.

The following tables address plant effluents:

- Table 1.1-1, Estimated Annual Gaseous Effluent
- Table 1.1-2, Estimated Annual Radiological and Mixed Wastes
- Table 1.1-3, Estimated Annual Liquid Effluent
- Table 1.1-4, Estimated Annual Non-Radiological Wastes

Radioactive concentration limits and handling for liquid wastes and effluents are detailed in the Environmental Report.

The waste and effluent estimates described in the tables listed above were developed specifically for the NEF. Each system was analyzed to determine the wastes and effluents generated during operation. These values were analyzed and a waste disposal path was developed for each. LES considered the facility site, facility operation, applicable Urenco experience, applicable regulations, and the existing U.S. waste processing/disposal infrastructure during the development of the paths. The Liquid Effluent Collection and Treatment System and the Solid Waste Collection System were designed to meet these criteria.

Construction Wastes

During construction, efforts are made to minimize the environmental impact. Erosion, sedimentation, dust, smoke, noise, unsightly landscape, and waste disposal are controlled to practical levels and applicable regulatory limits. Wastes generated during site preparation and construction will be varied, depending on the activities in progress. The bulk of the wastes will consist of non-hazardous materials such as packing materials, paper and scrap lumber. These wastes will be transported off site to an approved landfill. It is estimated that the NEF will generate a non-compacted average waste volume of 3,058 m^3 (4,000 yd^3) annually.

Hazardous type wastes that may be generated during construction have been identified and annual quantities estimated are shown in Table 1.1-5, Annual Hazardous Construction Wastes. Any of these wastes that are generated will be handled by approved methods and shipped off site to approved disposal sites.

Management and disposal of all wastes from the NEF site will be performed by personnel trained to properly identify, store, and ship wastes, audit vendors, direct and conduct spill cleanup, provide interface with state agencies, maintain inventories and provide annual reports.

A Spill Prevention, Control and Countermeasure Plan (SPCC) will be implemented during construction to minimize the possibility of spills of hazardous substances, minimize environmental impact of any spills and ensure prompt and appropriate remediation. The SPCC plan will identify sources, locations and quantities of potential spills and response measures. The plan will identify individuals and their responsibilities for implementation of the plan and provide for prompt notifications of state and local authorities.

(This page intentionally left blank)

1.3 SITE DESCRIPTION

The NEF is located in southeastern New Mexico in Lea County near the border of Andrews County, Texas. The site consists of land north of New Mexico Highway 234 within Section 32 of Township 21 S, Range 38 E. The nearest communities are Eunice, about 8 km (5 mi) due west and Hobbs about 32 km (20 mi) north of the site. The area surrounding the site consists of vacant land and industrial properties. A railroad spur borders the site to the north. Further north is a sand/aggregate quarry operated by the Wallach Concrete Company. The quarry owner leases land space to a "produced water" reclamation company, Sundance Services, which maintains three small "produced water" lagoons. There is also a man-made pond stocked with fish on the quarry property.

A vacant parcel of land, Section 33, is immediately to the east. Section 33 borders the New Mexico/Texas state line that is 0.8 km (0.5 mi) east of the site. Several disconnected power poles are situated in front of Section 33, parallel to New Mexico Highway 234. Land further east, in Texas, is occupied by Waste Control Specialists (WCS), LLC. WCS possesses a radioactive materials license from Texas, an NRC Agreement state, and is licensed to treat and temporarily store low-level radioactive waste. Land east of WCS is occupied by the Letter B Ranch.

High powered utility lines run in a north-south direction near the property line of WCS, parallel to the New Mexico/Texas state line.

To the southeast, across New Mexico Highway 234, is the Lea County Landfill.

Land further north, south and west has mostly been developed by the oil and gas industry.

An underground CO_2 pipeline owned by Trinity Pipeline, LLC, running southeast-northwest, traverses the property. An underground natural gas pipeline owned by the Sid Richardson Energy Services Company is located along the south property line, paralleling New Mexico Highway 234.

An active railroad line, operated by the Texas-New Mexico Railroad, runs parallel to New Mexico Highway 18 and just east of Eunice within 8 km (5 mi) of Section 32. There is also an active railroad spur that runs from the Texas-New Mexico Railroad line, along the north boundary of Section 32 and terminates at the WCS facility.

Figure 1.3-1, Five Mile Radius, Radial Sectors, shows the physical features surrounding the facility to an 8 km (5 mi) radius.

1.3.1 Site Geography

Site features are well suited for the location of a uranium enrichment facility as evidenced by the favorable conditions of hydrology, geology, seismology and meteorology as well as good transportation routes for transporting feed and product by truck.

1.3.1.1 Site Location Specifics

The proposed 220 ha (543 acre) site is located within Section 32 of Township 21 S in southeastern New Mexico in Lea County approximately 0.8 km (0.5 mi) west of the Texas state border, 51 km (32 mi) west-north-west of Andrews, Texas and 523 km (325 mi) southeast of Albuquerque, New Mexico. This location is 8 km (5 mi) due east of Eunice and 32 km (20 mi) south of Hobbs. The geographic location of the facility is shown on Figures 1.1-1, State Map, and 1.1-2, County Map.

The approximate center of the NEF is at latitude 32 degrees, 26 minutes, 1.74 seconds North and longitude 103 degrees, 4 minutes, 43.47 seconds West. Section 32 is currently owned by the State of New Mexico and is being acquired by LES through a state land swap arrangement. Until the land swap is completed, LES has been granted a 35 year easement by the State of New Mexico for site access and control.

Figure 1.1-4, Facility Layout (Site Plan) with Site Boundary and Controlled Access Area Boundary, shows the site property boundary, including the Controlled Access Area and the general layout of the buildings.

1.3.1.2 Features of Potential Impact to Accident Analysis

The NEF site is located in the Pecos Plains Section of the Great Plains Province. Site topography is relatively level, with an overall gradual rise in elevation from the southwest to the northeast. An area comprised of small sand hills exists along the west property line. There are no mountain ranges in the immediate vicinity. Earthquakes in the region are isolated or occur in small clusters of low to moderate size events toward the Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico and southeast of the NEF site in Texas.

An underground natural gas pipeline owned by the Sid Richardson Energy Services Company is located along the south property line, paralleling New Mexico Highway 234.

An underground CO_2 pipeline owned by Trinity Pipeline, LLC, running southeast-northwest, currently traverses the property. This pipeline will be relocated to the NEF site property boundary.

New Mexico Highway 234 runs parallel to the southern property line. New Mexico Highway 234 intersects New Mexico Highway 18 about 4 km (2.5 mi) to the west.

An active railroad line operated by the Texas-New Mexico Railroad runs parallel to Highway 18 and just east of Eunice within 8 km (5 mi) of Section 32.

1.3.2 Demographics

This section provides the census results for the facility site area, and includes specific information about populations, public facilities (schools, hospitals, parks, etc.) and land and water use near the site.

1.3.2.1 Latest Census Results

The combined population of the two counties in the NEF vicinity, based on the 2000 U.S. Census is 68,515, which represents a 2.3% decrease from the 1990 population of 70,130. This decrease is counter to the trends for the states of New Mexico and Texas which had population increases of 20.1% and 22.8%, respectively during the same decade. Over that 10 year period, Lea County, New Mexico, where the site is located, had a growth decrease of 0.5%. The growth decrease in Andrews County, Texas was 9.3%. Lea County experienced a sharp but short population increase in the mid-1980's due to an influx of petroleum industry jobs. That influx caused its population to increase to over 65,000 during that period.

Based on projections made using historic data, the population of Lea County, New Mexico and Andrews County, Texas is likely to grow more slowly than their respective states over the next 30 years (the anticipated license period of the NEF).

Based on U. S. census data the minority populations of the Lea County New Mexico and Andrews County Texas as of 2000 were 32.9% and 22.9%, respectively. These percentages are consistent with their respective state averages of 34.7% and 26.4%.

The low income population of Lea County, New Mexico and Andrews County, Texas are 21.1% and 16.4% respectively. These percentages are consistent with their respective state averages of 18.4% and 15.4%. Within the site area the percentage of population below the poverty level is significantly lower in both states.

1.3.2.2 Description, Distance, And Direction To Nearby Population Areas

The NEF site is in Lea County, New Mexico near the border of Andrews County, Texas. The nearest community is Eunice, approximately 8 km (5 mi) east of the site. Other population centers are at distances from the site as follows:

- Hobbs, Lea County, New Mexico: 32 km (20 mi north)
- Jal, Lea County, New Mexico: 37 km (23 mi south)
- Lovington, Lea County New Mexico: 64 km (39 mi north-northwest)
- Andrews, Andrews County Texas: 51 km (32 mi east)
- Seminole, Gaines County Texas: 51 km (32 mi east-northeast)
- Denver City, Gaines County, Texas: 65 km (40 mi) north-northeast

Aside from these communities, the population density around the site is extremely low. The nearest large population center (>100,000) is Midland-Odessa, Texas which is approximately 103 km (64 mi) to the southeast.

1.3.2.3 Proximity to Public Facilities – Schools, Hospitals, Parks

The Eunice First Assembly of God Church is located about 9 km (5.4 mi) from the site.

There are two hospitals in the vicinity of the site. The Lea Regional Medical Center is located in Hobbs, New Mexico about 32 km (20 mi) north of the NEF site. This 250-bed hospital can handle acute and stable chronic care patients. In Lovington, New Mexico, 64 km (39 mi) north-northwest of the site, Covenant Medical Systems manages Nor-Lea Hospital, a full-service, 27-bed facility.

Eunice Senior Center is located about 9 km (5.4 mi) from the site.

There are four educational facilities within about 8 km (5 mi) of the NEF site, all in Eunice, New Mexico. These include an elementary school, a middle school, a high school, and a private K-12 school.

Eunice Fire and Rescue and the Eunice Police Department are located approximately 8 km (5 mi) from the site.

The Eunice Golf Course is located approximately 14.7 km (9.4 mi) from the site.

1.3.2.4 Nearby Industrial Facilities (Includes Nuclear Facilities)

Nuclear Facilities

There are no nuclear production facilities located within 32 km (20 mi) of the site, therefore neither environmental nor emergency preparedness interactions between facilities is required.

Non-Nuclear Facilities

The site is bordered to the north by railroad tracks beyond which is a quarry operated by Wallach Concrete Company. The quarry owner leases land space to Sundance Services, a reclamation company, that maintains three small "produced water" lagoons.

Lea County operates a landfill on the south side of Section 33 across New Mexico State Highway 234, approximately 1 km (0.6 mi) from the center of the site.

A vacant parcel of land is immediately east of the site. Land further east, in Texas, is occupied by WCS. WCS possesses a radioactive materials license from Texas, an NRC Agreement state, and is licensed to treat and temporarily store low-level radioactive waste.

Dynegy's Midstream Services Plant is located 6 km (4 mi) from the site. This facility is engaged in the gathering and processing of natural gas for the subsequent fractionation, storage, and transportation of natural gas liquids.

An underground CO_2 pipeline, running southeast-northwest, currently traverses the property.

An underground natural gas pipeline is located along the south property line, paralleling New Mexico Highway 234.

Eunice maintains water supply tanks approximately 8 km (5 mi) north and 8 km (5 mi) south of the site.

Land further north, south and west of the site has mostly been developed by the oil and gas industry.

The Eunice Airport is situated about 8 km (5 mi) west of the town center. The nearest commercial carrier airport is Lea County Regional Airport in Hobbs, New Mexico about 40 km (25 mi) north-northwest of the site. A major commercial airport in Midland-Odessa, Texas is approximately 103 km (64 mi) to the southeast.

1.3.2.5 Land Use Within Eight Kilometers (Five Mile) Radius, Uses Of Nearby Bodies Of Water

The site and vicinity are within the southern part of the Llano Estacado or Staked Plains, which is a remnant of the Southern High Plains. The site area overlies prolific oil and gas geologic formations of the Pennsylvanian and Permian age.

Onsite soils consist of fine sand, loamy fine sand and loose sands surrounding large barren sand dunes and are common to areas used for rangeland and wildlife habitat.

Surrounding property consists of vacant land and industrial developments. Gas and oil field operations are widespread in the area, but significant petroleum potential is absent within 5 to 8 km (3 to 5 mi) of the site.

More than 98% of the area within an 8 km (5 mi) radius of the NEF is an extensive area of open land on which livestock wander and graze. Built-up land (1.2%) and barren land (0.3%) constitute the other two land use classifications in the site vicinity.

Baker Spring, an intermittent surface water feature, is situated a little over 1.6 km (1 mi) northeast of the NEF site.

The facility will make no use of either surface water or groundwater supply from the site. A site Septic System and a Site Stormwater Detention Basin will discharge to the ground with a Groundwater Discharge Permit/Plan from the New Mexico Water Quality Bureau. No significant adverse changes are expected in site hydrology as a result of construction or operation of the NEF. Section 4, Environmental Impacts, of the Environmental Report addresses potential for impacts on site hydrology as a result of activities on the site.

1.3.3 Meteorology

In this section, data characterizing the meteorology (e.g., winds, precipitation, and severe weather) for the site are presented.

1.3.3.1 Primary Wind Directions And Average Wind Speeds

The meteorological conditions at the NEF have been evaluated and summarized in order to characterize the site climatology and to provide a basis for predicting the dispersion of gaseous effluents.

Meteorological data from the National Weather Service (NWS) site at Midland-Odessa, Texas, indicate an annual mean wind speed of 4.9 m/s (11.0 mi/hr). The prevailing wind direction is wind from the south. The maximum five-second wind speed is 31.3 m/sec (70 mph) from 200 degrees with respect to true north.

By comparison, the data from Roswell, New Mexico indicate the annual mean wind speed is 3.7 m/s (8.2 mi/hr) and the prevailing wind direction is wind from the south-southeast. The maximum five-second wind speed is 27.7 m/sec (62 mph) from 270 degrees with respect to true north.

These and additional data are discussed and further analyzed in the Environment Report.

1.3.3.2 Annual Precipitation – Amounts and Forms

The NEF site is located in the Southeast Plains of New Mexico near the Texas border. The climate is typical of a semi-arid region, with generally mild temperatures, low precipitation and humidity, and a high evaporation rate. Vegetation consists mainly of native grasses and some mesquite trees. During the winter, the weather is often dominated by a high-pressure system located in the central part of the western United States and a low-pressure system located in north-central Mexico. During the summer, the region is affected by a low-pressure system normally located over Arizona.

The normal annual total rainfall as measured in Hobbs, New Mexico is 46.1 cm (18.15 in). Precipitation amounts range from an average of 1.22 cm (0.48 in) in March to 7.95 cm (3.13 in) in September. Record maximum and minimum monthly totals are 35.13 cm (13.83 in) and zero respectively. (WRCC, 2003)

The normal annual total rainfall in Midland-Odessa, Texas, is 37.6 cm (14.8 in). Precipitation amounts range from an average of 1.1 cm (0.42 in) in March to 5.9 cm (2.31 in) in September. Record maximum and minimum monthly totals are 24.6 cm (9.70 in) and zero, respectively. The highest 24-hour precipitation total was 15.2 cm (5.99 in) in July 1968 (NOAA, 2002a).

The normal annual rainfall total as measured in Roswell, New Mexico, is 33.9 cm (13.34 in). Record maximum and minimum monthly totals are 17.50 cm (6.88 in) and zero , respectively (NOAA, 2002b, 2002a). The highest 24-hour precipitation total was 12.47 cm (4.91 in) in July 1981 (NOAA, 2002b).

Snowfall in Midland-Odessa, Texas, averages 13.0 cm (5.1 in) per year. Maximum monthly snowfall/ice pellets of 24.9 cm (9.8 in) fell in December 1998. The maximum amount of snowfall/ice pellets to fall in 24 hours was 24.9 cm (9.8 in) in December 1998 (NOAA, 2002a).

Snowfall in Roswell, New Mexico averages 30.2 cm (11.9 in) per year. Maximum monthly snowfall/ice pellets of 53.3 cm (21.0 in) fell in December 1997. The maximum amount of snowfall/ice pellets to fall in 24 hours was 41.91 cm (16.5 in) in February 1988 (NOAA, 2002b).

Additional details on rainfall and snowfall are provided in the Environmental Report.

The design basis snow load was developed using the methodology prescribed in the NRC Site Analysis Branch Position for Winter Precipitation Loads (NRC, 1975). The prescribed load to be included in the combination of normal live loads is based on the weight of the 100 year snowfall or snowpack whichever is greater. The winter precipitation load to be included in the combination of extreme live loads is based on the sum of the weight of the 100 year snowpack and the weight of the 48 hour Probable Maximum Winter Precipitation (PMWP) for the month corresponding to the selected snowpack.

The 100 year mean recurrence ground snow load was calculated to be 58.5 kg/m^2 (12 lb/ft^2), and the applicable PMWP was calculated to be 96.6 kg/m^2 (19.8 psf). The addition of these two figures results in a design load of 155.1 kg/m^2 (32 lb/ft^2).

1.3.3.3 Severe Weather

Tornadoes

Tornadoes occur infrequently in the vicinity of the NEF. Only two tornadoes were reported in Lea County, New Mexico, (Grazulis, 1993) from 1880-1989. Across the state line, only one tornado was reported in Andrews County, Texas, (Grazulis, 1993) from 1880-1989.

Tornadoes are commonly classified by their intensities. The F-Scale classification of tornados is based on the appearance of the damage that the tornado causes. There are six classifications, F0 to F5, with an F0 tornado having winds of 61-116 km/hr (40-72 mi/hr) and an F5 tornado having winds of 420-520 km/hr (261-318 mi/hr) (AMS, 1996). The two tornadoes reported in Lea County were estimated to be F2 tornadoes (Grazulis, 1993).

The design parameters applicable to the design tornado with a period of recurrence of 100,000 years are as follows:

Design Wind Speed	302 km/hr	188 mi/hr
Radius of damaging winds	130 m	425 ft
Atmospheric pressure change (APC)	390 kg/m^2	80 lb/ft^2
Rate of APC	146 $kg/m^2/s$	30 $lb/ft^2/s$

Hurricanes

Hurricanes, or tropical cyclones, are low-pressure weather systems that develop over the tropical oceans. Hurricanes are fueled by the relatively warm tropical ocean water and lose their intensity quickly once they make landfall. Since the NEF is located about 805 km (500 mi) from the coast, it is most likely that any hurricane that tracked towards the site would have dissipated to the tropical depression stage, that is, wind speeds less than 63 km/hr (39 mi/hr), before it reached the NEF. Hurricanes are therefore not considered a threat to the NEF.

Thunderstorms and Lightning Strikes

Thunderstorms occur during every month but are most common in the spring and summer months. Thunderstorms occur an average of 36.4 days/year in Midland/Odessa (based on a 54-year period of record (NOAA, 2002a). The seasonal averages are: 11 days in spring (March through May); 17.4 days in summer (June through August); 6.7 days in fall (September through November); and 1.3 days in winter (December through February).

The current methodology for estimating lightning strike frequencies includes consideration of the attractive area of structures (Marshall, 1973). This method consists of determining the number of lightning flashes to earth per year per square kilometer and then defining an area over which the structure can be expected to attract a lightning strike.

Using this methodology, the attractive area of the facility structures has been conservatively determined to be 0.071 km^2. Using 4 flashes to earth per year per square kilometer (2.1 flashes to earth per year per square mile) (NWS, 2003b) it can be estimated that the NEF will experience approximately 1.36 flashes to earth per year.

Sandstorms

Blowing sand or dust may occur occasionally in the area due to the combination of strong winds, sparse vegetation, and the semi-arid climate. High winds associated with thunderstorms are frequently a source of localized blowing dust. Dust storms that cover an extensive region are rare, and those that reduce visibility to less than 1.61 km (1 mile) occur only with the strongest pressure gradients such as those associated with intense extratropical cyclones which occasionally form in the area during winter and early spring (DOE, 2003).

1.3.4 Hydrology

The hydrology information included in this License Application was largely obtained from prior studies including extensive subsurface investigations for a nearby facility, WCS, located to the east of the NEF site. Other literature searches were also conducted to obtain reference material.

The NEF site itself contains no surface water bodies or surface drainage features. Essentially all the precipitation that occurs at the site is subject to infiltration and/or evapotranspiration. Groundwater was encountered at depths of 65 to 68 m (214 to 222 ft). Significant quantities of groundwater are only found at depths over 340 m (1,115 ft) where cover for that aquifer is provided by 323 to 333 m (1,060 to 1,092 ft) or more of clay.

1.3.4.1 Characteristics Of Nearby Rivers, Streams, And Other Bodies Of Water

The climate in southeast New Mexico is semi-arid. Precipitation averages only 33 to 38 cm (13 to 15 in) a year. Evaporation and transpiration rates are high. This results in minimal, if any surface water occurrence or groundwater recharge.

The NEF site contains no surface drainage features, such as arroyos or buffalo wallows. The site topography is relatively flat. Some localized depressions exist, due to eolian processes, but the size of these features is too small to be of significance with respect to surface water collection.

1.3.4.2 Depth To The Groundwater Table

The site subsurface investigation performed during September 2003 had two main objectives: 1) to delineate the depth to the top of the Chinle Formation red bed clay that exists beneath the NEF site to assess the potential for saturated conditions above the red beds, and 2) to complete three monitoring wells in the siltstone layer beneath the red beds to monitor water level and water quality within this thin horizon of perched intermittent saturation. This work is in progress as discussed below.

The presence of the thick Chinle clay beneath the site essentially isolates the deep and shallow hydrologic systems. Groundwater occurring within the red bed clay occurs at three distinct and distant elevations. Approximately 65 to 68 m (214 to 222 ft) beneath the land surface, within the red bed unit, is a siltstone or silty sandstone unit with some saturation. It is a low permeability formation that does not yield groundwater very readily. This unit is under investigation as the first occurrence of groundwater beneath the NEF site.

The next water bearing unit below the saturated siltstone horizon is a saturated 30.5-meter (100-foot) thick sandstone horizon approximately 183 m (600 ft) below land surface, which overlies the Santa Rosa formation. The Santa Rosa formation is the third water bearing unit and is located about 340 m (1,115 ft) below land surface. Between the siltstone and sandstone saturated horizons and the Santa Rosa formation lie a number of layers of sandstones, siltstones, and shales. Hydraulic connection between the siltstone and sandstone saturated horizons and the Santa Rosa formation is non-existent.

No withdrawals or injection of groundwater will be made as a result of operation of the NEF facility. Thus, there will be no affect on any inter-aquifer water flow.

1.3.4.3 Groundwater Hydrology

The climate in southeast New Mexico is semi-arid, and evapotranspiration processes are significant enough to short-circuit any potential groundwater recharge. There is some evidence for shallow (near-surface) groundwater occurrence in areas to the north at the Wallach Concrete plant. These conditions are intermittent and limited. The typical geologic cross section at that location consists of a layer of caliche at the surface, referred to as the "caprock." In some areas the caprock is missing and the sand and gravel are exposed at the surface. The caprock is generally fractured and, following precipitation events may allow infiltration that quickly bypasses any roots from surface vegetation. In addition, there are areas where the sand and gravel outcrop may allow rapid infiltration of precipitation. These conditions have led to instances of minor amounts of perched groundwater at the base of the sand and gravel unit, atop the red beds of the Chinle Formation.

Conditions at the NEF site are different than at the Wallach Concrete site. The caprock is not present at the NEF site. Therefore, rapid infiltration through fractured caliche does not contribute to localized recharge at the NEF site.

Another instance of possible saturation above the Chinle clay may be seen at Baker Spring, just to the northeast of the NEF site where the caprock ends. The surface water is intermittent, and water typically flows from Baker Spring only after precipitation events. Some water may seep from the sand and gravel unit beneath the caprock, but deep infiltration of water is impeded by the low permeability of the Chinle clay in the area. This condition does not exist at the NEF site due to the absence of the caprock and the low permeability surface soils.

A third instance of localized shallow groundwater occurrence exists to the east of the NEF site where several windmills on the WCS property were formerly used to supply water for live stock tanks. These windmills tapped small saturated lenses above the Chinle Formation red beds, but the amount of groundwater in these zones was limited.

1.3.4.4 Characteristics Of The Uppermost Aquifer

The first occurrence of a well-defined aquifer is approximately 340 m (1,115 ft) below land surface, within the Santa Rosa formation. No impacts are expected to the aquifer from the NEF because of the depth of the Santa Rosa formation, the thick Chinle clay overburden, and the fact that the NEF will not consume surface or groundwater or discharge to the surrounding area.

Treated liquid effluents are discharged to the onsite Treated Effluent Evaporative Basin, a double-lined evaporative basin with leak detection.

1.3.4.5 Design Basis Flood Events Used For Accident Analysis

The closest water conveyance is Monument Draw, a typically dry, intermittent stream located about 4 km (2.5 mi) west of the site. Since there are no bodies of water in the immediate vicinity of the site, flood is not a design basis event for the NEF. Additionally a diversion ditch is strategically located to deflect surface runoff from adjacent land away from the facility structures on the site.

The only potential flooding of the plant results from local intense rainfall. Flood protection against the local Probable Maximum Precipitation (PMP) is provided by establishing the facility floor level above the calculated depth of ponded water caused by the local PMP.

1.3.5 Geology

This section provides information about the characteristics of soil types and bedrock of the NEF site and its vicinity and design-basis earthquake magnitudes and return periods. The WCS site in Texas and the former proposed Atomic Vapor Laser Isotope Separation (AVLIS) site, located in Section 33, have both been thoroughly studied in recent years in preparation for construction of other facilities. A review of those documents and related materials provides a significant description of geological conditions pertinent to the NEF site. In addition, LES performed field confirmation, where necessary, in order to clarify any questions about regional or site-specific conditions.

The NEF site is located in New Mexico immediately west of the Texas border about 48 km (30 mi) from the extreme southeast corner of the state and about 96 km (80 mi) east of the Pecos River. The site is contained in the Eunice NE, Texas-New Mexico USGS topographic quadrangle (USGS, 1979). This location is near the boundary between the Pecos Plains Section to the west; and the Southern High Plains Section of the Great Plains province to the east. The boundary between the two sections is the Mescalero Escarpment, locally referred to as Mescalero Ridge.

NEF site elevations range between +1033 and +1045 m (+3390 and +3430 ft) (msl). The finished site grade is about +1041 m (+3415 ft) msl .

Surface exposures of geologic units at the site include surficial eolian deposits and Tertiary-aged alluvium. These overlie Triassic red-bed clay which overlies sedimentary rock. The principal underlying geologic structure is the Central Basin Platform which divides the Permian Basin into the Midland and Delaware sub-basins.

1.3.5.1 Characteristics Of Soil Types And Bedrock

The dominant subsurface structural feature of this region is the Permian Basin. This 250 million-year-old feature is the source of the Region's prolific oil and gas reserves.

The NEF site is located within the Central Permian Basin Platform area, where the top of the Permian deposits are approximately 434 to 480 m (1,425 to 1,575 ft) below ground surface. Overlying the Permian are the sedimentary rocks of the Triassic Age Dockum Group.

Soil development in the region is generally limited due to its semi-arid climate. The site has a minor thickness of soil (generally less than 0.4 m (1.4 ft)) developed from subaerial weathering. A small deposit of active dune sand is present at the southwest corner of the site. The U. S. Department of Agriculture soil survey for Lea County, New Mexico (USDA, 1974) categorizes site soils as hummocky loamy (silty) fine sand with moderately rapid permeability and slow runoff, well-drained non-calcareous loose sand, active dune sand and dune-associated sands.

Recent deposits are primarily dune sands derived from Permian and Triassic rocks of the Permian Basin. These Mescalero (dune) Sands cover over 80% of Lea County and are generally described as fine to medium-grained and reddish brown in color. The USDA Soil Survey of Lea County identifies the dune sands at the site as either the Brownsfield-Springer Association of reddish brown fine to loamy fine sands; or the Gomez series of brown to yellowish brown loamy fine sand (USDA, 1974).

1.3.5.2 Earthquake Magnitudes And Return Periods

The majority of earthquakes in the United States are located in the tectonically active western portion of the country. However, areas within New Mexico and the southwestern United States also experience earthquakes, although at a lower rate and at lower intensities. Earthquakes in the region around the NEF site include isolated and small clusters of low to moderate size events toward the Rio Grande Valley of New Mexico and in Texas, southeast of the NEF site.

The largest earthquake within 322 km (200 mi) of the NEF is the August 16, 1931 earthquake located near Valentine, Texas. This earthquake has an estimated magnitude of 6.0 to 6.4 and produced a maximum epicentral intensity of VIII on the Modified Mercalli Intensity (MMI) Scale. The intensity observed at the NEF site is IV on the MMI scale.

A site-specific probabilistic seismic hazard analysis was performed for the NEF site using the seismic source zone geometries and earthquake recurrence models. The modeling included attenuation models suited for the regional and local seismic wave transmission characteristics.

Total seismic ground motion hazard to a site results from summation of ground motion effects from all distant and local seismically active areas. The 250-year and 475-year return period peak horizontal ground accelerations are estimated at 0.024 g and 0.036 g, respectively. The 10,000 year return period peak horizontal ground acceleration is estimated at 0.15 g. This return period is equivalent to a mean annual probability of E-4. The associated peak vertical ground motion is also estimated at 0.15 g.

1.3.5.3 Other Geologic Hazards

There are no other known geologic hazards that would adversely impact the NEF site.

(This page intentionally left blank)

TABLE OF CONTENTS

(This page intentionally left blank)

3.0 SAFETY PROGRAM COMMITMENTS

This section presents the commitments pertaining to the facility's safety program including the performance of an ISA. 10 CFR Part 70 (CFR, 2003b) contains a number of specific safety program requirements related to the integrated safety analysis (ISA). These include the primary requirements that an ISA be conducted, and that it evaluate and show that the facility complies with the performance requirements of 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003c).

The commitments for each of the three elements of the safety program defined in 10 CFR 70.62(a) (CFR, 2003d) are addressed below.

3.0.1 Process Safety Information

A. LES has compiled and maintains up-to-date documentation of process safety information. Written process-safety information is used in updating the ISA and in identifying and understanding the hazards associated with the processes. The compilation of written process-safety information includes information pertaining to:

1. The hazards of all materials used or produced in the process, which includes information on chemical and physical properties such as are included on Material Safety Data Sheets meeting the requirements of 29 CFR 1910.1200(g) (CFR, 2003e).

2. Technology of the process which includes block flow diagrams or simplified process flow diagrams, a brief outline of the process chemistry, safe upper and lower limits for controlled parameters (e.g., temperature, pressure, flow, and concentration), and evaluation of the health and safety consequences of process deviations.

3. Equipment used in the process including general information on topics such as the materials of construction, piping and instrumentation diagrams (P&IDs), ventilation, design codes and standards employed, material and energy balances, IROFS (e.g., interlocks, detection, or suppression systems), electrical classification, and relief system design and design basis.

The process-safety information described above is maintained up-to-date by the configuration management program described in Section 11.1, Configuration Management.

B. LES has developed procedures and criteria for changing the ISA. This includes implementation of a facility change mechanism that meets the requirements of 10 CFR 70.72 (CFR, 2003f).

The development and implementation of procedures is described in Section 11.4, Procedures Development and Implementation.

C. LES uses personnel with the appropriate experience and expertise in engineering and process operations to maintain the ISA. The ISA Team for the various processes consists of individuals who are knowledgeable in the ISA method(s) and the operation, hazards, and safety design criteria of the particular process. Training and qualifications of individuals responsible for maintaining the ISA are described in Section 11.3, Training and Qualifications, and Section 2.2, Key Management Positions.

3.0.2 Integrated Safety Analysis

A. LES has conducted an ISA for each process, such that it identifies (i) radiological hazards, (ii) chemical hazards that could increase radiological risk, (iii) facility hazards that could increase radiological risk, (iv) potential accident sequences, (v) consequences and likelihood of each accident sequence and (vi) IROFS including the assumptions and conditions under which they support compliance with the performance requirements of 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003c).

A synopsis of the results of the ISA, including the information specified in 10 CFR 70.65(b) (CFR, 2003a), is provided in the National Enrichment Facility Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

B. LES has implemented programs to maintain the ISA and supporting documentation so that it is accurate and up-to-date. Changes to the ISA Summary are submitted to the NRC, in accordance with 10 CFR 70.72(d)(1) and (3) (CFR, 2003f). The ISA update process accounts for any changes made to the facility or its processes. This update will also verify that initiating event frequencies and IROFS reliability values assumed in the ISA remain valid. Any changes required to the ISA as a result of the update process will be included in a revision to the ISA. Management policies, organizational responsibilities, revision time frame, and procedures to perform and approve revisions to the ISA are outlined in Chapter 11.0, Management Measures. Evaluation of any facility changes or changes in the process safety information that may alter the parameters of an accident sequence is by the ISA method(s) as described in the ISA Summary Document. For any revisions to the ISA, personnel having qualifications similar to those of ISA team members who conducted the original ISA are used.

C. Personnel used to update and maintain the ISA and ISA Summary are trained in the ISA method(s) and are suitably qualified. Training and Qualification of personnel used to update or maintain the ISA are described in Section 11.3, Training and Qualifications.

D. Proposed changes to the facility or its operations are evaluated using the ISA method(s). New or additional IROFS and appropriate management measures are designated as required. The adequacy of existing IROFS and associated management measures are promptly evaluated to determine if they are impacted by changes to the facility and/or its processes. If a proposed change results in a new type of accident sequence or increases the consequences or likelihood of a previously analyzed accident sequence within the context of 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003c), the adequacy of existing IROFS and associated management measures are promptly evaluated and the necessary changes are made, if required.

E. Unacceptable performance deficiencies associated with IROFS are addressed that are identified through updates to the ISA.

F. Written procedures are maintained on site. Section 11.4, Procedures Development and Implementation, discusses the procedures program.

G. All IROFS are maintained so that they are available and reliable when needed.

3.0.3 Management Measures

Management measures are functions applied to IROFS, and any items that may affect the function of IROFS. IROFS management measures ensure compliance with the performance requirements assumed in the ISA documentation. The measures are applied to particular structures, systems, equipment, components, and activities of personnel, and may be graded commensurate with the reduction of the risk attributable to that IROFS. The IROFS management measures shall ensure that these structures, systems, equipment, components, and activities of personnel within the identified IROFS boundary are designed, implemented, and maintained, as necessary, to ensure they are available and reliable to perform their function when needed, to comply with the performance requirements assumed in the ISA documentation.

Additional detail regarding implementation of management measures for IROFS, and any items that may affect the function of IROFS (as well as non-IROFS management measures), is found in Chapter 11.

3.0.4 References

CFR, 2003a. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.65, Additional content of applications, 2003.

CFR, 2003b. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 70, Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material, 2003.

CFR, 2003c. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.61, Performance requirements, 2003.

CFR, 2003d. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.62, Safety program and integrated safety analysis, 2003.

CFR, 2003e. Title 29, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 1910, Occupational Safety and Health Standards, 2003.

CFR, 2003f. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.72, Facility changes and change process, 2003.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Pages 67-720 (Integrated Safety Analysis) removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY

SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

VOLUME 2 OF 3

4.6 VENTILATION AND RESPIRATORY PROTECTION PROGRAMS COMMITMENTS

The regulations contained in 10 CFR 20 (CFR, 2003b), Subpart H, define the required elements of the facility respiratory protection and ventilation programs. This section describes the design and management measures taken to ensure that the installed ventilation and containment systems operate effectively. This section also describes the worker respiratory protection program.

The design of the ventilation and respiratory protection programs is consistent with the guidance contained in the following documents:

- Regulatory Guide 8.24-Health Physics Surveys During Enriched Uranium-235 Processing and Fuel Fabrication (NRC, 1979)
- ANSI N510-1980-Testing of Nuclear Air Cleaning Systems (ANSI,1980)
- ERDA 76-21-Nuclear Air Cleaning Handbook (ERDA,1976)
- NCRP Report No. 59-Operational Radiation Safety Program (NCRP,1978)
- Regulatory Guide 8.15-Acceptable Programs for Respiratory Protection (NRC,1999b)
- ANSI Z88.2-1992-Practices for Respiratory Protection (ANSI,1992).

4.6.1 Ventilation Program

The confinement of uranium and the attenuation of its associated radiation are a design requirement for the facility. The internal radiation exposure of workers is controlled primarily by the containment of UF_6 within process equipment. The entire UF_6 enrichment process, except for liquid sampling, is operated under a partial vacuum so that leaks are into the system and not into work areas.

Ventilation systems for the various buildings control the temperature and the humidity of the air inside the building. The ventilation systems serving normally non-contaminated areas exhaust approximately 10% of the air handled to the atmosphere. Ventilation systems serving potentially contaminated areas include design features that provide for confinement of radiological contamination. Ventilation systems for potentially contaminated areas exhaust 100% of the air handled to the environment through the exhaust stacks. All air released from potentially contaminated areas is filtered to remove radioactive particulates before it is released. The ventilation systems for potentially contaminated areas are designed to maintain the potentially contaminated areas at a slightly negative pressure relative to the uncontaminated areas. This ensures that the airflow direction is from areas of little or no contamination to areas of higher contamination.

Process vents from the Separations Building Module are collected by the Separations Building Gaseous Effluent Vent System (GEVS). Some areas of the Technical Services Building (TSB) also have fume hoods that are connected to the TSB GEVS. Air released from the Centrifuge Test Facility and the Centrifuge Post Mortem Facilities is filtered by the Centrifuge Test and Post Mortem Facilities Exhaust Filtration System prior to release. The systems operate slightly below atmospheric pressure to remove potentially hazardous vapors and particulate from confined areas of the plant. The systems contain particulate and carbon adsorption filters to remove radioactive materials from the gas stream prior to release from the plant. Continuous HF monitors are provided upstream of the filters with high level alarms to inform operators of UF_6 releases in the plant.

Normal operation of the facility will not result in a release of radioactive material that exceeds regulatory limits. Ventilation systems for areas that do not have the potential for contamination are not monitored for radioactivity because radioactive material is not handled or processed in these areas. No emergency ventilation systems are provided for operation when the normal ventilation systems are shut down.

Several measures are in place to ensure effective operation of the ventilation systems. Differential pressure across High Efficiency Particulate Air (HEPA) filters in potentially contaminated ventilation exhaust systems is monitored monthly or automatically monitored and alarmed. Operating procedures specify limits and set points on the differential pressure consistent with manufacturers' recommendations. Filters are changed if they fail to function properly or if the differential pressure exceeds the manufacturers' ratings.

Filter inspection, testing, maintenance and change out criteria are specified in written procedures approved by the Technical Services Manager, or a designated alternate. Change-out frequency is based on considerations of filter loading, operating experience, differential pressure data and any UF_6 releases indicated by HF alarms.

Gloveboxes are designed to maintain a negative differential pressure of about 0.623 mbar (0.25 in H_2O). This differential pressure is maintained anytime that the glovebox is in use. If the differential pressure is lost, use of the glovebox is suspended until the required differential pressure is restored.

Air flow rates at exhausted enclosures and close-capture points, when in use, are adequate to preclude escape of airborne uranium and minimize the potential for intake by workers. Air flow rates are checked monthly when in use and after modification of any hood, exhausted enclosure, close-capture point equipment or ventilation system serving these barriers.

The various programs that pertain to preventive and corrective maintenance are described in Chapter 11, Sections 11.2.2, Corrective Maintenance and 11.2.3, Preventive Maintenance respectively.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

LIST OF FIGURES

(This page intentionally left blank)

5.0 NUCLEAR CRITICALITY SAFETY

The Nuclear Criticality Safety Program for the National Enrichment Facility (NEF) is in accordance with U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) Regulatory Guide 3.71, Nuclear Criticality Safety Standards for Fuels and Material Facilities (NRC, 1998). Regulatory Guide 3.71 (NRC, 1998) provides guidance on complying with the applicable portions of NRC regulations, including 10 CFR 70 (CFR, 2003a), by describing procedures for preventing nuclear criticality accidents in operations involving handling, processing, storing, and transporting special nuclear material (SNM) at fuel and material facilities. The facility is committed to following the guidelines in this regulatory guide for specific ANSI/ANS criticality safety standards with the exception of ANSI/ANS-8.9-1987, "Nuclear Criticality Safety Criteria for Steel-Pipe Intersections Containing Aqueous Solutions of Fissile Material." Piping configurations containing aqueous solutions of fissile material will be evaluated in accordance with ANSI/ANS-8.1-1998, using validated methods to determine subcritical limits.

The information provided in this chapter, the corresponding regulatory requirements, and the section of NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002), Chapter 5 in which the NRC acceptance criteria are presented is summarized below.

Information Category and Requirement	10 CFR 70 Citation	NUREG-1520 Chapter 5 Reference
Section 5.1 Nuclear Criticality Safety (NCS) Program		
Management of the NCS Program	70.61(d) 70.64(a)	5.4.3.1
Control Methods for Prevention of Criticality	70.61	5.4.3.4.2
Safe Margins Against Criticality	70.61	5.4.3.4.2
Description of Safety Criteria	70.61	5.4.3.4.2
Organization and Administration	70.61	5.4.3.2
Section 5.2 Methodologies and Technical Practices		
Methodology	70.61	5.4.3.4.1 5.4.3.4.4 5.4.3.4.6
Section 5.3 Criticality Accident Alarm System (CAAS)		
Criticality Accident Alarm System	70.24	5.4.3.4.3
Section 5.4 Reporting		
Reporting Requirements	Appendix A	5.4.3.4.7 (7)

5.1 THE NUCLEAR CRITICALITY SAFETY (NCS) PROGRAM

The facility has been designed and will be constructed and operated such that a nuclear criticality event is prevented, and to meet the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR 70 (CFR, 2003a). Nuclear criticality safety at the facility is assured by designing the facility, systems and components with safety margins such that safe conditions are maintained under normal and abnormal process conditions and any credible accident. Items Relied On For Safety (IROFS) identified to ensure subcriticality are discussed in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

5.1.1 Management of the Nuclear Criticality Safety (NCS) Program

The NCS criteria in Section 5.2, Methodologies and Technical Practices, are used for managing criticality safety and include adherence to the double contingency principle as stated in the ANSI/ANS-8.1-1998, Nuclear Criticality Safety In Operations with Fissionable Materials Outside Reactors (ANSI, 1998a). The adopted double contingency principle states "process design should incorporate sufficient factors of safety to require at least two unlikely, independent, and concurrent changes in process conditions before a criticality accident is possible." Each process that has accident sequences that could result in an inadvertent nuclear criticality at the NEF has double contingency protection.

In most cases, double contingency protection is provided by at least two-parameter control. Using these criteria, including the double contingency principle, low enriched uranium enrichment facilities have never had an accidental criticality. The plant will produce no greater than 5.0 $^w/_o$ enrichment. However, as additional conservatism, the nuclear criticality safety analyses are performed assuming a ^{235}U enrichment of 6.0 $^w/_o$, except for Contingency Dump System traps which are analyzed assuming a ^{235}U enrichment of 1.5 $^w/_o$, and include appropriate margins to safety. In accordance with 10 CFR 70.61(d) (CFR, 2003b), the general criticality safety philosophy is to prevent accidental uranium enrichment excesses, provide geometrical safety when practical, provide for moderation controls within the UF_6 processes and impose strict mass limits on containers of aqueous, solvent based, or acid solutions containing uranium. Interaction controls provide for safe movement and storage of components. Plant and equipment features assure prevention of excessive enrichment. The plant is divided into six distinctly separate Assay Units (called Cascade Halls) with no common UF_6 piping. UF_6 blending is done in a physically separate portion of the plant. Process piping, individual centrifuges and chemical traps other than the contingency dump chemical traps, are safe by limits placed on their diameters. Product cylinders rely upon uranium enrichment, moderation control and mass limits to protect against the possibility of a criticality event. Each of the liquid effluent collection tanks that hold uranium in solution is mass controlled, as none are geometrically safe. As required by 10 CFR 70.64(a) (CFR, 2003c), by observing the double contingency principle throughout the plant, a criticality accident is prevented. In addition to the double contingency principle, effective management of the NCS Program includes:

- An NCS program to meet the regulatory requirements of 10 CFR 70 (CFR, 2003a) will be developed, implemented, and maintained.

- Safety parameters and procedures will be established.

- The NCS program structure, including definition of the responsibilities and authorities of key program personnel will be provided.

- The NCS methodologies and technical practices will be kept applicable to current configuration by means of the configuration management function. The NCS program will be upgraded, as necessary, to reflect changes in the ISA or NCS methodologies and to modify operating and maintenance procedures in ways that could reduce the likelihood of occurrence of an inadvertent nuclear criticality.

- The NCS program will be used to establish and maintain NCS safety limits and NCS operating limits for IROFS in nuclear processes and a commitment to maintain adequate management measures to ensure the availability and reliability of the IROFS.

- NCS postings will be provided and maintained current.

- NCS emergency procedure training will be provided.

- The NCS baseline design criteria requirements in 10 CFR 70.64(a) (CFR, 2003c) will be adhered to.

- The NCS program will be used to evaluate modifications to operations, to recommend process parameter changes necessary to maintain the safe operation of the facility, and to select appropriate IROFS and management measures.

- The NCS program will be used to promptly detect NCS deficiencies by means of operational inspections, audits, and investigations. Deficiencies will be entered into the corrective action program so as to prevent recurrence of unacceptable performance deficiencies in IROFS, NCS function or management measures.

- NCS program records will be retained as described in Section 11.7, Records Management.

Training will be provided to individuals who handle nuclear material at the facility in criticality safety. The training is based upon the training program described in ANSI/ANS-8.20-1991, Nuclear Criticality Safety Training (ANSI, 1991). The training program is developed and implemented with input from the criticality safety staff, training staff, and management. The training focuses on the following:

- Appreciation of the physics of nuclear criticality safety.
- Analysis of jobs and tasks to determine what a worker must know to perform tasks efficiently.
- Design and development of learning objectives based upon the analysis of jobs and tasks that reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by the worker.
- Implementation of revised or temporary operating procedures.

Additional discussion of management measures is provided in Chapter 11, Management Measures.

5.2 METHODOLOGIES AND TECHNICAL PRACTICES

This section describes the methodologies and technical practices used to perform the Nuclear Criticality Safety (NCS) analyses. The determination of the NCS controlled parameters and their application and the determination of the NCS limits on IROFS are also presented.

5.2.1 Methodology

MONK8A (SA, 2001) is a powerful Monte Carlo tool for nuclear criticality safety analysis. The advanced geometry modeling capability and detailed continuous energy collision modeling treatments provide realistic 3-dimensional models for an accurate simulation of neutronic behavior to provide the best estimate neutron multiplication factor, k-effective. Complex models can be simply set up and verified. Additionally, MONK8A (SA, 2001) has demonstrable accuracy over a wide range of applications and is distributed with a validation database comprising critical experiments covering uranium, plutonium and mixed systems over a wide range of moderation and reflection. The experiments selected are regarded as being representative of systems that are widely encountered in the nuclear industry, particularly with respect to chemical plant operations, transportation and storage. The validation database is subject to on-going review and enhancement. A categorization option is available in MONK8A (SA, 2001) to assist the criticality analyst in determining the type of system being assessed and provides a quick check that a calculation is adequately covered by validation cases.

5.2.1.1 Methods Validation

The validation process establishes method bias by comparing measured results from laboratory critical experiments to method-calculated results for the same systems. The verification and validation processes are controlled and documented. The validation establishes a method bias by correlating the results of critical experiments with results calculated for the same systems by the method being validated. Critical experiments are selected to be representative of the systems to be evaluated in specific design applications. The range of experimental conditions encompassed by a selected set of benchmark experiments establishes the area of applicability over which the calculated method bias is applicable. Benchmark experiments are selected that resemble as closely as practical the systems being evaluated in the design application.

The extensive validation database contains a number of solution experiments applicable to this application involving both low and high-enriched uranium. The MONK8A (SA, 2001) code with the JEF2.2 library was validated against these experiments which are provided in the International Handbook of Evaluated Criticality Safety Benchmark Experiments (NEA, 2002) and Nuclear Science and Engineering (NSE, 1962). The experiments chosen are provided in Table 5.2-1, Uranium Solution Experiments Used for Validation, along with a brief description. The overall mean calculated value from the 80 configurations is 1.0017 ± 0.0005 (AREVA, 2004) and the results are shown in Figure 5.2-1,Validation Results for Uranium Solutions, plotted against H/U-fissile ratio. If only the 36 low-enriched solutions are considered, the mean calculated value is 1.0007 ± 0.0005.

MONK8A is distributed in ready-to-run executable form. This approach provides the user with a level of quality assurance consistent with the needs of safety analysis. The traceability from source code to executable code is maintained by the code vendor. The MONK8A software package contains a set of validation analyses which can be used to support the specific applications. Since the source code is not available to the user, the executable code is identical to that used for the validation analyses. The criticality analyses were performed with MONK8A utilizing the validation provided by the code vendor.

In accordance with the guidance in NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002), code validation for the specific application has been performed (AREVA, 2004). Specifically, the experiments provided in Table 5.2-1, Uranium Solution Experiments Used for Validation, were calculated and documented as part of the integrated safety analysis for the National Enrichment Facility. The MONK8A computer code and JEF2.2 library are within the scope of the Quality Assurance Program.

5.2.1.2 Limits on Control and Controlled Parameters

The validation process established a bias by comparing calculations to measured critical experiments. With the bias determined, an upper safety limit (USL) can be determined using the following equation from NUREG/CR-6698, Guide for Validation of Nuclear Criticality Safety Calculational Methodology (NRC, 2001):

$$USL = 1.0 + Bias - \sigma_{Bias} - \Delta_{SM} - \Delta_{AOA}$$

Where the critical experiments are assumed to have a k_{eff} of unity, and the bias was determined by comparison of calculation to experiment. From Section 5.2.1.1, Methods Validation, the bias is positive and since a positive bias may be non-conservative, the bias is set to zero. The σ_{Bias} from Section 5.2.1.1, Methods Validation is 0.0005 and a value of 0.05 is assigned to the subcritical margin, Δ_{SM}. The term Δ_{AOA} is an additional subcritical margin to account for extensions in the area of applicability. Since the experiments in the benchmark are representative of the application, the term Δ_{AOA} is set to zero. Thus, the USL becomes:

$$USL = 1 - 0.0005 - 0.05 = 0.9495$$

NUREG/CR-6698 (NRC, 2001) requires that the following condition be demonstrated for all normal and credible abnormal operating conditions:

$$k_{calc} + 2\,\sigma_{calc} < USL$$

In the NCS analysis, σ_{calc} is shown to be greater than σ_{Bias}; therefore, the NEF will be designed using the more conservative equation:

$$k_{eff} = k_{calc} + 3\,\sigma_{calc} < 0.95$$

Additionally, criticality safety in the NEF is ensured by use of geometry, volume, mass and moderation control. Table 5.1-1, Safe Values for Uniform Aqueous Solutions of Enriched UO_2F_2 provides the safe values of geometry, volume and mass at 5.0 $^{w}/_{o}$ enrichment UO_2F_2 to ensure the USL is met. Moreover, Table 5.1-2, Safety Criteria for Buildings/Systems/Components, provides the additional conservatism used in the design of the NEF. All criticality safety analyses use an enrichment of 6.0 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U, except for Contingency Dump System traps which are analyzed using an enrichment of 1.5 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U, while the facility is limited to an enrichment of 5.0 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U.

5.2.1.3 General Nuclear Criticality Safety Methodology

The nuclear criticality safety analyses results provide values of k-effective (k_{eff}) to conservatively meet the upper safety limit. The following sections provide a description of the major assumptions used in the criticality analysis.

5.2.1.3.1 Reflection Assumption

The layout of the NEF is a very open design and it is not considered credible that those vessels and plant components requiring criticality control could become flooded from a source of water within the plant. Full water reflection of vessels has therefore been discounted. However, where appropriate, spurious reflection due to walls, fixtures, personnel, etc. has been accounted for by assuming 2.5 cm (1.0 in) of water reflection around vessels.

5.2.1.3.2 Enrichment Assumption

The NEF will operate with a 5.0 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U enrichment limit. However, the nuclear criticality safety calculations used an enrichment of 6.0 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U. This assumption provides additional conservatism for plant design.

5.2.1.3.3 Uranium Accumulation and Moderation Assumption

Most components that form part of the centrifuge plant or are connected to it assume that any accumulation of uranium is taken to be in the form of a uranyl fluoride/water mixture at a maximum H/U atomic ratio of 7 (exceptions are discussed in the associated nuclear criticality safety analyses documentation). The ratio is based on the assumption that significant quantities of moderated uranium could only accumulate by reaction between UF_6 and moisture in air leaking into the plant. Due to the high vacuum requirements of a centrifuge plant, in-leakage is controlled at very low levels and thus the H/U ratio of 7 represents an abnormal condition. The maximum H/U ratio of 7 for the uranyl fluoride-water mixture is derived as follows:

The stoichiometric reaction between UF_6 and water vapor in the presence of excess UF_6 can be represented by the equation:

$$UF_6 + 2H_2O \rightarrow UO_2F_2 + 4HF$$

Due to its hygroscopic nature, the resulting uranyl fluoride is likely to form a hydrate compound. Experimental studies (Lychev, 1990) suggest that solid hydrates of compositions $UO_2F_2 \cdot 1.5H_2O$ and $UO_2F_2 \cdot 2H_2O$ can form in the presence of water vapor, the former composition being the stable form on exposure to atmosphere.

It is assumed that the hydrate $UO_2F_2 \cdot 1.5H_2O$ is formed and, additionally, that the hydrogen fluoride (HF) produced by the UF_6/water vapor reaction is also retained in the uranic breakdown to give an overall reaction represented by:

$$UF_6 + 3.5H_2O \rightarrow UO_2F_2 \cdot 4HF \cdot 1.5H_2O$$

For the MONK8A (SA, 2001) calculations, the composition of the breakdown product was simplified to $UO_2F_2 \cdot 3.5H_2O$ that gives the same H/U ratio of 7 as above.

In the case of oils, UF_6 pumps and vacuum pumps use a fully fluorinated perfluorinated polyether (PFPE) type lubricant, often referred to by the trade name "Fomblin." Mixtures of UF_6

and PFPE oil would be a less conservative case than a uranyl fluoride/water mixture, since the maximum HF solubility in PFPE is only about 0.1 $^{w}/_{o}$. Therefore, the uranyl fluoride/water mixture assumption provides additional conservatism in this case.

5.2.1.3.4 Vessel Movement Assumption

The interaction controls placed on movement of vessels containing enriched uranium are specified in the facility procedures. In general, any item in movement (an item being either an individual vessel or a specified batch of vessels) must be maintained at 60 cm (23.6 in) edge separation from any other enriched uranium, and that only one item of each type, e.g., one trap and one pump, may be in movement at one time. These spacing restrictions are relaxed for vessels being removed from fixed positions, when one vessel may approach adjacent fixed plant without spacing restriction.

5.2.1.3.5 Pump Free Volume Assumption

There are two types of pumps used in product and dump systems of the plant:

- The vacuum pumps (product and dump) are rotary vane pumps. In the enrichment plant fixed equipment, these are assumed to have a free volume of 14 L (3.7 gal) and are modeled as a cylinder in MONK8A (SA, 2001). This adequately covers all models likely to be purchased.
- The UF_6 pumping units are a combination unit of two pumps, one 500 m^3/hr (17,656 ft^3/hr) pump with a free volume of 8.52 L (2.25 gal) modeled as a cylinder, and a larger 2000 m^3/hr (70,626 ft^3/hr) pump which is modeled explicitly according to manufacturer's drawings.

5.2.1.4 Nuclear Criticality Safety Analyses

Nuclear criticality safety is evaluated for the design features of the plant system or component and for the operating practices that relate to maintaining criticality safety. The evaluation of individual systems or components and their interaction with other systems or components containing enriched uranium is performed to assure the criticality safety criteria are met. The nuclear criticality safety analyses and the safe values in Table 5.1-1, Safe Values for Uniform Aqueous Solution of Enriched UO_2F_2, provide a basis for the plant design and criticality hazards identification performed as part of the Integrated Safety Analysis.

Each portion of the plant, system, or component that may possibly contain enriched uranium is designed with criticality safety as an objective. Table 5.1-2, Safety Criteria for Buildings/ Systems/Components, shows how the safe values of Table 5.1-1, are applied to the facility design to prevent a nuclear criticality event. The NEF is designed and operated in accordance with the parameters provided in Table 5.1-2. The Integrated Safety Analysis reviewed the facility design and operation and identified Items Relied On For Safety to ensure that criticality does not pose an unacceptable risk.

Where there are significant in-process accumulations of enriched uranium as UF_6 the plant design includes multiple features to minimize the possibilities for breakdown of the moderation control limits. These features eliminate direct ingress of water to product cylinders while in process.

5.2.1.5 Additional Nuclear Criticality Safety Analyses

The NEF NCS analyses were performed using the above methodologies and assumptions. Any additional or future analyses will meet the following criteria:

- NCS analyses will be performed using acceptable methodologies.
- Methods will be validated and used only within demonstrated acceptable ranges.
- The analyses will adhere to ANSI/ANS-8.1-1998 (ANSI, 1998a) as it relates to methodologies.
- The intent of the validation report statement in Regulatory Guide 3.71 (NRC, 1998) will be met.
- A specific reference to (including the date and revision number) and summary description of either a manual or a documented, reviewed, and approved validation report for each methodology will be included. Any change in the reference manual or validation report will be reported to the NRC by letter.
- The reference manual and documented reviewed validation report will be kept at the facility.
- The reference manual and validation report will be incorporated into the configuration management program.
- The NCS analyses will be performed in accordance with the methods specified and incorporated in the configuration management program.
- The NCS methodologies and technical practices in NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002), Section 5.4.3.4, will be used to evaluate NCS accident sequences in operations and processes.
- The acceptance criteria in NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002), Section 3.4, as they relate to: identification of NRC accident sequences, consequences of NRC accident sequences, likelihood of NRC accident sequences, and descriptions of IROFS for NRC accident sequences will be met.
- NCS controls and controlled parameters to assure that under normal and credible abnormal conditions, all nuclear processes are subcritical, including use of an approved margin of subcriticality for safety will be used.
- As stated in ANSI/ANS-8.1-1998 (ANSI, 1998a), process specifications will incorporate margins to protect against uncertainties in process variables and against a limit being accidentally exceeded.
- The following national standards, as they relate to these requirements: ANSI/ANS-8.7-1998 (ANSI, 1998b), and ANSI/ANS-8.10-1983 (ANSI, 1983b), as modified by Regulatory Guide 3.71 (NRC, 1986) will be used.

- If administrative k_{eff} margins for normal and credible abnormal conditions are used, NRC pre-approval of the administrative margins will be sought.

- Subcritical limits for k_{eff} calculations such that: k_{eff} subcritical = 1.0 - bias margin, where the margin includes adequate allowance for uncertainty in the methodology, data, and bias to assure subcriticality will be used.

- Studies to correlate the change in a value of a controlled parameter and its k_{eff} value will be performed. The studies will include changing the value of one controlled parameter and determining its effect on another controlled parameter and k_{eff}.

- An NCS program that ensures double contingency protection will be implemented. Double contingency protection will be used in determining NCS controls and IROFS. The double contingency protection will be evaluated considering the contents of ANSI/ANS-8.1-1998 (ANSI, 1998a) and the likelihood discussion contained in NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002) Chapter 3, including consideration of the following guidance:

    - Adherence to double contingency protection: Each process that has accident sequences that could result in an inadvertent nuclear criticality shall have double contingency protection. Double contingency protection may be provided by either: (i) at least two-parameter control (the control of at least two independent process parameters) or (ii) single-parameter control (a system of multiple independent controls on a single process parameter). The first method is the preferred approach because of the difficulty of preventing common-mode failure when controlling only one parameter.

    - As used in double contingency protection, the term "concurrent" means that the effect of the first process change persists until a second change occurs, at which point the process could have an inadvertent nuclear criticality. It does not mean that the two events initiating the change must occur simultaneously. The possibility of an inadvertent nuclear criticality can be markedly reduced if failures of NCS controls are rapidly detected and the processes rendered safe. If not, processes can remain vulnerable to a second failure for extended periods of time.

- The acceptance criteria in NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002) Section 3.4, as they relate to subcriticality of operations and margin of subcriticality for safety, will be met.

5.2.1.6 Nuclear Criticality Safety Evaluations (NCSE)

For any change (i.e., new design or operation, or modification to the facility or to activities of personnel, e.g., site structures, systems, components, computer programs, processes, operating procedures, management measures), that involves or could affect uranium, a NCSE shall be prepared and approved. Prior to implementing the change, it shall be determined that the entire process will be subcritical (with approved margin for safety) under both normal and credible abnormal conditions. If this condition cannot be shown with the NCSE, either a new or revised NCS analysis will be generated that meets the criteria, or the change will not be made.

The NCSE shall determine and explicitly identify the controlled parameters and associated limits upon which NCS depends, assuring that no single inadvertent departure from a procedure could cause an inadvertent nuclear criticality and that the safety basis of the facility will be maintained during the lifetime of the facility. The evaluation ensures that all potentially affected uranic processes are evaluated to determine the effect of the change on the safety basis of the process, including the effect on bounding process assumptions, on the reliability and availability of NCS controls, and on the NCS of connected processes.

The NCSE process involves a review of the proposed change, discussions with the subject matter experts to determine the processes which need to be considered, development of the controls necessary to meet the double contingency principle, and identification of the assumptions and equipment (e.g., physical controls and/or management measures) needed to ensure criticality safety.

Engineering judgment of the criticality safety engineer is used to ascertain the criticality impact of the proposed change. The basis for this judgment is documented with sufficient detail in the NCSE to allow the independent review by a second criticality safety engineer to confirm the conclusions of the judgment of results. Once the NCSE is completed and the independent criticality safety engineer evaluation is performed and documented, the HS&E Manager approves the NCSE. Only criticality safety engineers who have successfully met the requirements specified in the qualification procedure can perform the NCSE and associated independent review.

The above process for NCSEs is in accordance with ANSI/ANS-8.19-1996 (ANSI, 1996).

(This page intentionally left blank)

5.3 CRITICALITY ACCIDENT ALARM SYSTEM (CAAS)

The facility is provided with a Criticality Accident Alarm System (CAAS) as required by 10 CFR 70.24, (CFR, 2003d). Areas where Special Nuclear Material (SNM) is handled, used, or stored in amounts at or above the 10 CFR 70.24 (CFR, 2003d) mass limits are provided with CAAS coverage. Emergency management measures are covered in the facility Emergency Plan.

(This page intentionally left blank)

5.4 REPORTING

The following are NCS Program commitments related to event reporting:

- A program for evaluating the criticality significance of NCS events will be provided and an apparatus will be in place for making the required notification to the NRC Operations Center. Qualified individuals will make the determination of significance of NCS events. The determination of loss or degradation of double contingency protection or IROFS will be made against the license and 10 CFR 70 Appendix A (CFR, 2003f).

- The reporting criteria of 10 CFR 70 Appendix A and the report content requirements of 10 CFR 70.50 (CFR, 2003g) will be incorporated into the facility emergency procedures.

- The necessary report based on whether the IROFS credited were lost, irrespective of whether the safety limits of the associated parameters were actually exceeded will be issued.

- If it cannot be ascertained within one hour of whether the criteria of 10 CFR 70 Appendix A (CFR, 2003f) Paragraph (a) or (b) apply, the event will be treated as a one-hour reportable event.

(This page intentionally left blank)

5.5 REFERENCES

ANSI, 1998a. Nuclear Criticality Safety in Operations with Fissionable Materials Outside Reactors, ANSI/ANS-8.1-1998, American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society, 1998.

ANSI, 1998b. Guide for Nuclear Criticality Safety in the Storage of Fissile Materials, ANSI/ANS-8.7-1998, American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society, 1998.

ANSI, 1983. Criteria for Nuclear Criticality Safety Controls in Operations with Shielding and Confinement, ANSI/ANS-8.10-1983, American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society, 1983.

ANSI, 1991. Nuclear Criticality Safety Training, ANSI/ANS-8.20-1991, American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society, 1991.

ANSI, 1997. Nuclear Criticality Safety Based on Limiting and Controlling Moderators, ANSI/ANS-8.22-1997, American National Standards Institute/American Nuclear Society, 1997.

AREVA, 2004. MONK8A Validation and Verification, AREVA, April 16, 2004.

CFR, 2003a. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 70, Domestic Licensing of Special Nuclear Material, 2003.

CFR, 2003b. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.61, Performance requirements, 2003.

CFR, 2003c. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.64, Requirements for new facilities or new processes at existing facilities, 2003.

CFR, 2003d. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.24, Criticality accident requirements, 2003.

CFR, 2003e. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.72, Facility changes and change process, 2003.

CFR, 2003f. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Part 70, Appendix A, Reportable Safety Events, 2003.

CFR, 2003g. Title 10, Code of Federal Regulations, Section 70.50, Reporting requirements, 2003.

Lychev, 1990. Crystalline Hydrates of Uranyl Fluoride at 20°C, Lychev, Mikhalev and Suglobov. Journal of Soviet Radiochemistry, Vol 32, 1990.

NEA, 2002. International Handbook of Evaluated Criticality Safety Benchmark Experiments, NEA/NSC/DOC(95)03, Nuclear Energy Agency, September 2002 Edition.

NRC, 1998. Nuclear Criticality Safety Standards for Fuels and Materials Facilities, Regulatory Guide 3.71, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, August 1998.

NRC, 2001. Guide for Validation of Nuclear Criticality Safety Calculational Methodology, NUREG/CR-6698, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, January 2001.

NRC, 2002. Standard Review Plan for the Review of a License Application for a Fuel Cycle Facility, NUREG-1520, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, March 2002.

NSE, 1962. The Measurement of Σta and Other Nuclear Properties of ^{233}U and ^{235}U in Critical Aqueous Solutions, R. Gwin and D. W. Magnuson, Nuclear Science and Engineering, Volume 12, 1962.

SA, 2001. Serco Assurance, ANSWERS Software Service, "Users Guide for Version 8 ANSWERS/MONK(98) 6," 1987-2001.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

6.2 CHEMICAL PROCESS INFORMATION

This section characterizes chemical reactions between chemicals of concern and interaction chemicals and other substances as applicable. This section also provides a basic discussion of the chemical processes associated with UF_6 process systems.

6.2.1 Chemistry and Chemical Reactions

Although the separation of isotopes is a physical rather than chemical process, chemical principles play an important role in the design of the facility. The phase behavior of UF_6 is critical to the design of all aspects of the plant. UF_6 has a high affinity for water and will react exothermically with water and water vapor in the air. The products of UF_6 hydrolysis, solid UO_2F_2 and gaseous HF, are both toxic. HF is also corrosive, particularly in the presence of water vapor. Because this chemical reaction results in undesirable by-products, UF_6 is isolated from moisture in the air through proper design of primary containment (i.e., piping, components, and cylinders).

Other chemical reactions occur in systems that decontaminate equipment, remove contaminants from effluent streams, and as part of lubricant recovery or other cleansing processes. Side reactions can include the corrosion and deterioration of construction materials, which influences their specification. These reactions are further described below.

6.2.1.1 UF_6 and Water

Liquid and gaseous UF_6 react rapidly with water and water vapor as does the exposed surface of solid UF_6. UF_6 reacts with water so rapidly that the HF formed is always anhydrous when in the presence of UF_6, significantly reducing its corrosive potential in cylinders, piping, and equipment. The reaction of gaseous UF_6 with water vapor at elevated temperatures is shown in Equation 6.2-1.

$$\underset{\text{(gas)}}{UF_6} + \underset{\text{(vapor)}}{2\,H_2O} \Rightarrow \underset{\text{(solid)}}{UO_2F_2} + \underset{\text{(gas)}}{4HF} + \text{heat} \qquad \text{(Eq. 6.2-1)}$$

At room temperature, depending on the relative humidity of the air, the products of this reaction are UO_2F_2 hydrates and HF- H_2O fog, which will be seen as a white cloud. A typical reaction with excess water is given in Equation 6.2-2.

$$\underset{\text{(gas)}}{UF_6} + \underset{\text{(vapor)}}{(2+4x)H_2O} \Rightarrow \underset{\text{(solid)}}{UO_2F_2 * 2\,H_2O} + \underset{\text{(fog)}}{4HF * x\,H_2O} + \text{heat} \qquad \text{(Eq. 6.2-2)}$$

If, because of extremely low humidity, the HF- H_2O fog is not formed, the finely divided uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2) causes only a faint haze. UO_2F_2 is a water-soluble, yellow solid whose exact coloring depends on the degree of hydration as well as the particle size.

The heat release for the reaction in Equation 1 is 288.4 kJ/kg (124 BTU/lbm) of UF_6 gas reacted. The heat release is much larger if the UO_2F_2 is hydrated and HF-H_2O fog is formed with a heat release of 2,459 kJ/kg (1057 BTU/lbm) of UF_6 vapor.

These reactions, if occurring in the gaseous phase at ambient or higher temperatures, are very rapid, near instantaneous. Continuing reactions between solid UF_6 and excess water vapor occur more slowly as a uranyl fluoride layer will form on surface of the solid UF_6 which inhibits the rate of chemical reaction.

UF_6 reactions with interaction chemicals are discussed below. These include chemical reactions associated with lubricants and other chemicals directly exposed to UF_6, as well as chemicals used to recover contaminants from used lubricating oils, and capture trace UF_6, uranium compounds, and HF from effluent streams. UF_6 reactions with materials of construction are addressed in Section 6.2.1.3, UF_6 and Construction Material.

6.2.1.2 UF_6 and Interaction Chemicals

The chemistry of UF_6 is significantly affected by its fluorination and oxidation potential. Many of the chemical properties of UF_6 are attributable to the stability of the UO_2++ ion, which permits reactions with water, oxides, and salts containing oxygen-bearing anions such as SO_4--, NO_3--, and CO_3-- without liberation of the O_2 molecule.

The following subsection describes potential chemical interactions between the UF_6 process streams and interaction chemicals.

6.2.1.2.1 PFPE (Fomblin) Oil

The reaction of UF_6 with hydrocarbons is undesirable and can be violent. Gaseous UF_6 reacts with hydrocarbons to form a black residue of uranium-carbon compounds. Hydrocarbons can be explosively oxidized if they are mixed with UF_6 in the liquid phase or at elevated temperatures. It is for this reason that non-fluorinated hydrocarbon lubricants are not utilized in any UF_6 system at the NEF.

UF_6 vacuum pumps are lubricated using PFPE (Perfluorinated Polyether) oil which is commonly referred to by a manufacturer's trade name - Fomblin oil. Fomblin oil is inert, fully fluorinated and does not react with UF_6 under any operating conditions.

Small quantities of uranium compounds and traces of hydrocarbons may be contained in the Fomblin oil used in the UF_6 vacuum pumping systems. The UF_6 degrades in the oil or reacts with trace hydrocarbons to form crystalline compounds – primarily uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2) and uranium tetrafluoride (UF_4) particles – that gradually thicken the oil and reduce pump capacity.

Recovery of Fomblin oil for reuse in the system is conducted remotely from the UF_6 process systems. The dissolved uranium compounds are removed in a process of precipitation, centrifugation, and filtration. Anhydrous sodium carbonate (Na_2CO_3) is added to contaminated

6.2.2 Process - General Enrichment Process

Uranium enrichment is the process by which the isotopic composition of uranium is modified. Natural uranium consists of three isotopes, uranium 234 (^{234}U), uranium 235 (^{235}U), and uranium 238 (^{238}U), approximately 0.0058 $^{w}/_{o}$, 0.711 $^{w}/_{o}$ and 99.28 $^{w}/_{o}$ respectively. ^{235}U, unlike ^{238}U, is fissile and can sustain a nuclear chain reaction. Light water nuclear power plants (the type in the United States) normally operate on fuel containing between 2 $^{w}/_{o}$and 5 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U (low-enriched uranium); therefore, before natural uranium is used in uranium fuel for light water reactors it undergoes "enrichment."

In performing this enrichment, the NEF will receive and enrich natural uranium hexafluoride (UF_6) feed. The isotopes are separated in gas centrifuges arranged in arrays called cascades.

This process will result in the natural UF_6 being mechanically separated into two streams: (1) a product stream which is selectable up to a maximum 5 $^{w}/_{o}$ ^{235}U enrichment, and (2) a tails stream which is depleted to low percentages of ^{235}U (0.32 $^{w}/_{o}$ on average). No chemical reaction occurs during enrichment. Other processes at the plant include product blending, homogenizing and liquid sampling to ensure compliance with customer requirements and to ensure a quality product.

The enrichment process is comprised of the following major systems:

- UF_6 Feed System
- Cascade System
- Product Take-Off System
- Tails Take-Off System
- Product Blending System
- Product Liquid Sampling System.

UF_6 is delivered to the plant in ANSI N14.1 (ANSI, applicable version) standard Type 48X or 48Y international transit cylinders, which are placed in a feed station and connected to the plant via a common manifold. Heated air is circulated around the cylinder to sublime UF_6 gas from the solid phase. The gas is flow controlled through a pressure control system for distribution to the cascade system at subatmospheric pressure.

Individual centrifuges are not able to produce the desired product and tails concentration in a single step. They are therefore grouped together in series and in parallel to form arrays known as cascades. A typical cascade is comprised of many centrifuges.

UF_6 is drawn through cascades with vacuum pumps and compressed to a higher subatmospheric pressure at which it can desublime in the receiving cylinders. Highly reliable UF_6 resistant pumps will be used for transferring the process gas.

Tails material and product material are desublimed at separate chilled take-off stations. Tails material is desublimed into 48Y cylinders. Product material is desublimed into either 48Y or smaller 30B cylinders.

With the exception of liquid sampling operations, the entire enrichment process operates at subatmospheric pressure. This safety feature helps ensure that releases of UF_6 or HF are minimized because leakage would typically be inward to the system. During sampling operations, UF_6 is liquefied within an autoclave which provides the heating required to homogenize the material for sampling. The autoclave is a rated pressure vessel which serves as secondary containment for the UF_6 product cylinders while the UF_6 is in a liquid state.

There are numerous subsystems associated with each of the major enrichment process systems as well as other facility support and utility systems. These include systems supporting venting, cooling, electrical power, air and water supply, instrumentation and control and handling functions among others.

6.2.3 Process System Descriptions

Detailed system descriptions and design information for enrichment process and process support systems are provided in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary. These descriptions include information on process technology including materials of construction, process parameters (e.g., flow, temperature, pressure, etc.), key instrumentation and control including alarms/interlocks, and items relied on for safety (IROFS).

6.2.4 Utility and Support System Descriptions

The UF_6 Enrichment Systems also interface with a number of supporting utility systems. Detailed system descriptions and design information for these utility and support systems are provided in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary. These descriptions include information on process technology including materials of construction; process parameters (e.g., flow, temperature, pressure, etc.), key instrumentation and control including alarms/interlocks, and (IROFS).

6.2.5 Safety Features

There are a number of safety features in place to help prevent, detect, and mitigate potential releases of UF_6. Some of these features are classified as (IROFS) as determined in the Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA). A listing of IROFS associated with process, utility and supporting systems as well as those applicable to the facility and its operations (e.g., administrative controls) is presented in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

In addition to IROFS, there are other process system features that are intended to protect systems from damage that would result in an economic loss. Many of these features have a secondary benefit of enhancing safety by detecting, alarming, and/or interlocking process equipment – either prior to or subsequent to failures that result in a release of material.

6.3 CHEMICAL HAZARDS ANALYSIS

6.3.1 Integrated Safety Analysis

LES has prepared an Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA) as required under 10 CFR 70.62 (CFR, 2003c). The ISA:

- Provides a list of the accident sequences which have the potential to result in radiological and non-radiological releases of chemicals of concern
- Provides reasonable estimates for the likelihood and consequences of each accident identified
- Applies acceptable methods to estimate potential impacts of accidental releases.

The ISA also:

- Identifies adequate engineering and/or administrative controls (IROFS) for each accident sequence of significance
- Satisfies principles of the baseline design criteria and performance requirements in 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003b) by applying defense-in-depth to high risk chemical release scenarios
- Assures adequate levels of these controls are provided so those items relied on for safety (IROFS) will satisfactorily perform their safety functions.

The ISA demonstrates that the facility and its operations have adequate engineering and/or administrative controls in place to prevent or mitigate high and intermediate consequences from the accident sequences identified and analyzed.

6.3.2 Consequence Analysis Methodology

This section describes the methodology used to determine chemical exposure/dose and radiochemical exposure/dose criteria used to evaluate potential impact to the workers and the public in the event of material release. This section limits itself to the potential effects associated with accidental release conditions. Potential impacts from chronic (e.g., long-term) discharges from the facility are detailed in the Environmental Report.

6.3.2.1 Defining Consequence Severity Categories

The accident sequences identified by the ISA need to be categorized into one of three consequence categories (high, intermediate, or low) based on their forecast radiological, chemical, and/or environmental impacts. Section 6.1.1, Chemical Screening and Classification, presented the radiological and chemical consequence severity limits defined by 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003b) for the high and intermediate consequence categories.

To quantify criteria of 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003b) for chemical exposure, standards for each applicable hazardous chemical must be applied to determine exposure that could: (a) endanger the life of a worker; (b) lead to irreversible or other serious long-lasting health effects to an individual; and (c) cause mild transient health effects to an individual. Per NUREG-1520 (NRC 2002), acceptable exposure standards include the Emergency Response Planning Guidelines (ERPG) established by the American Industrial Hygiene Association and the Acute Exposure Guideline Levels (AEGL) established by the National Advisory Committee for Acute Guideline Levels for Hazardous Substances. The definitions of various ERPG and AEGL levels are contained in Table 6.3-1, ERPG and AEGL Level Definitions.

The consequence severity limits of 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003b) have been summarized and presented in Table 6.3-2, Licensed Material Chemical Consequence Categories. The severity limits defined in this table are developed against set criteria. Therefore, some of these limits have been further refined so that they are useful for conducting consequence analysis assessment with respect to the total dose (i.e., concentration multiplied by duration of exposure) that could reasonably be received under accident conditions.

These refinements are necessary as the chemical and radiological exposure target values are time dependent. As an example, ERPG and AEGL values for chemical exposure limits assume fixed exposure durations; these values must be appropriately scaled to exposure durations that reflect realistic exposure durations associated with a given accident.

The toxicity of UF_6 is due to its two hydrolysis products, HF and UO_2F_2. The toxicological effects of UF_6 as well as these byproducts were previously described in Section 6.1.2. AEGL and NUREG-1391 (NRC, 1991) values for HF and UF_6 were utilized for evaluation of chemotoxic exposure. Additionally, since the byproduct uranyl fluoride is a soluble uranium compound, the AEGL values were derived for evaluating soluble uranium (U) exposure in terms of both chemical toxicity and radiological dose. In general, the chemotoxicity of uranium inhalation/ingestions is of more significance than radiation dose resulting from internal U exposure. The ERPG and AEGL values for HF are presented in Table 6.3-3, ERPG and AEGL values for Hydrogen Fluoride. The ERPG and AEGL values for UF_6 (as soluble U) are presented in Table 6.3-4, ERPG and AEGL values for Uranium Hexafluoride (as soluble U).

Table 6.3-5, Enhanced Definition of Consequence Severity Categories, represents enhanced derived values as extrapolated from the HF and UF_6 (as soluble U) AEGL and NUREG-1391 (NRC, 1991) values. These enhanced definitions have been applied in order to determine consequence severity as characterized against the criteria of 10 CFR 70 (CFR, 2003a). These enhanced values have been derived using EPA recognized methodologies (NAP, 2004) for normalizing chemical exposure to values appropriate for the time intervals under consideration. The rationale associated with exposure times are further defined below.

6.3.2.1.1 Worker Exposure Assumptions

Any release from UF_6 systems/cylinders at the facility would predominantly consist of HF with some potential entrainment of uranic particulate. An HF release would cause a visible cloud and a pungent odor. The odor threshold for HF is less than 1 ppm and the irritating effects of HF are intolerable at concentrations well below those that could cause permanent injury or which produce escape-impairing symptoms. Employees are trained in proper actions to take in response to a release and it can be confidently predicted that workers will take immediate self-protective action to escape a release area upon detecting any significant HF odor.

For the purposes of evaluating worker exposure in cases where a local worker would be expected to be in the immediate proximity of a release (e.g., connect/disconnect, maintenance, etc.), the values have been normalized to a one minute exposure. In these cases, it has been presumed that the operator will fail to recognize the in-rush of air into the vacuum system and will not begin to back away from the source of the leak until HF is present. It has been pessimistically presumed that the source term of UF_6/HF is released into a hemisphere that reflects the close proximity of the worker's breathing zone and that the worker would remain in this space for a period of 10 seconds before having backed away. Therefore, use of one minute exposure criteria is conservative.

For the purposes of evaluating worker exposures for workers who may be present elsewhere in the room of release, the values in Table 6.3-5, Enhanced Definition of Consequence Severity Categories, have been normalized to 2.5 minute and five minute exposures. Once a release is detected through visual observation and/or odor, it is estimated that it would take a worker no more than 2.5 minutes to evacuate the area of concern. Five minute exposure criteria were used in most seismic event release cases. For a limited number of seismic event release cases, 2.5 minute exposure criteria were used.

Another assumption made in conducting consequence severity analysis is that for releases precipitated by a fire event, only public exposure was considered in determining consequence severity; worker exposures were not considered. Fires of sufficient magnitude to generate chemical/radiological release must either have caused failure of a mechanical system/component or involve substantive combustibles containing uranic content. In either case, the space would be untenable for unprotected workers. Fire brigade/fire department members responding to emergencies are required by emergency response procedure (and regulation) to have suitable respiratory and personal protective equipment.

6.3.2.1.2 Public Exposure Assumptions

Potential exposures to members of the public were also evaluated assuming conservative assumptions for both exposure concentrations and durations. Exposure was evaluated for consequence severity against chemotoxic, radiotoxic, and radiological dose.

Public exposures were estimated to last for a duration of 30 minutes. This is consistent with self-protective criteria for UF_6/HF plumes listed in NUREG-1140 (NRC, 1988).

6.3.2.2 Chemical Release Scenarios

The evaluation level chemical release scenarios based on the criteria applied in the Integrated Safety Analysis are presented in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary. Information on the criteria for the development of these scenarios is also provided in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

6.3.2.3 Source Term

The methodologies used to determine source term are those prescribed in NUREG/CR-6410 (NRC, 1998) and supporting documents.

6.3.2.3.1 Dispersion Methodology

In estimating the dispersion of chemical releases from the facility, conservative dispersion methodologies were utilized. Site boundary atmospheric dispersion factors were generated using a computer code based on Regulatory Guide 1.145 (NRC, 1982) methodology. The code was executed using five years (1987-1991) of meteorological data collected at Midland/Odessa, Texas, which is the closest first order National Weather Service Station to the site. This station was judged to be representative of the NEF site because the Midland Odessa National Weather Service Station site and the NEF site have similar climates and topography.

The specific modeling methods utilized follow consistent and conservative methods for source term determination, release fraction, dispersion factors, and meteorological conditions as prescribed in NRC Regulatory Guide 1.145 (NRC, 1982).

For releases inside of buildings, conservative leak path fractions were assumed as recommended by NUREG/CR-6410 (NRC, 1998) and ventilation on and off cases were evaluated for consideration of volumetric dilution and mixing efficiency prior to release to atmosphere.

6.3.2.4 Chemical Hazard Evaluation

This section is focused on presenting potential deleterious effects that might occur as a result of chemical release from the facility. As required by 10 CFR 70 (CFR, 2003a), the likelihood of these accidental releases fall into either unlikely or highly unlikely categories.

6.3.2.4.1 Potential Effects to Workers/Public

The toxicological properties of potential chemicals of concern were detailed in Section 6.2, Chemical Process Information. The evaluation level accident scenarios identified in the Integrated Safety Analysis and the associated potential consequence severities to facility workers or members of the public are presented in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

All postulated incidents have been determined to present low consequences to the workers/public, or where determined to have the potential for intermediate or high consequences, are protected with IROFS to values less than the likelihood thresholds required by 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003b).

6.3.2.4.2 Potential Effects to Facility

All postulated incidents have been determined to present inherently low consequences to the facility. No individual incident scenarios were identified that propagate additional consequence to the facility process systems or process equipment. The impact of external events on the facility, and their ability to impact process systems or equipment of concern is discussed in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

6.4 CHEMICAL SAFETY ASSURANCE

The facility will be designed, constructed and operated such that injurious chemical release events are prevented. Chemical process safety at the facility is assured by designing the structures, systems and components with safety margins such that safe conditions are maintained under normal and abnormal process conditions and during any credible accident or external event.

6.4.1 Management Structure and Concepts

The criteria used for chemical process safety encompasses principles stated in NUREG-1601, Chemical Process Safety at Fuel Cycle Facilities (NRC, 1997). It is also supported by concepts advocated in 29 CFR 1910.119, Process Safety Management of Highly Hazardous Chemicals (CFR, 2003f), and 40 CFR, 68, Accidental Release Prevention Requirements (CFR, 2003g), although it is noted here that there are no chemicals at this facility which exceed threshold planning quantities of either standard.

The intent of chemical safety management principles is to identify, evaluate, and control the risk of chemical release through engineered, administrative, and related safeguards.

The chemical safety philosophy for the facility is to apply sufficient control to identify, evaluate, and control the risk of accidental chemical releases associated with licensed material production to acceptable levels in accordance with 10 CFR 70.61(b) and (c) (CFR, 2003b).

The identification and evaluation of chemical release risk has been developed through the conduct of an ISA. The development of these scenarios, and the dispersion analysis and chemical/radiological dose assessment associated with each accident sequence was performed and was conducted in accordance with NUREG/CR-6410, Nuclear Fuel Cycle Facility Accident Analysis Handbook (NRC, 1998) as was described previously in Section 6.3, Chemical Hazards Analysis.

The control of chemical release risk is ensured through numerous features that are described in the following sections.

6.4.2 System Design

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

6.4.2.3 Baseline Design Criteria and Defense-In-Depth

The ISA demonstrates that the design and construction complies with the baseline design criteria (BDC) of 10 CFR 70.64(a) (CFR, 2003d), and the defense-in-depth requirements of 10 CFR 70.64(b) (CFR, 2003d). The design provides for adequate protection against chemical risks produced from licensed material, facility conditions which affect the safety of licensed material, and hazardous chemicals produced from licensed material. The NEF is not proposing any facility-specific or process-specific relaxation or additions to applicable BDC features.

6.4.3 Configuration Management

Configuration management includes those controls which ensure that the facility design basis is thoroughly documented and maintained, and that changes to the design basis are controlled. This includes the following:

A. That management commitment and staffing is appropriate to ensure configuration management is maintained

B. That proper quality assurance (QA) is in place for design control, document control, and records management

C. That all structures, systems, and components, including IROFS, are under appropriate configuration management.

A more detailed description of the configuration management system can be found in Section 11.1, Configuration Management (CM).

6.4.4 Maintenance

The NEF helps maintain chemical process safety through the implementation of administrative controls that ensure that process system integrity is maintained and that IROFS and other engineered controls are available and operate reliably. These controls include planned and scheduled maintenance of equipment and controls so that design features will function when required. Appropriate plant management is responsible for ensuring the operational readiness of IROFS under this control. For this reason, the maintenance function is closely coupled to operations. The maintenance function plans, schedules, tracks, and maintains records for maintenance activities.

Maintenance activities generally fall into the following categories:

A. Surveillance/monitoring

B. Corrective maintenance

C. Preventive maintenance

D. Functional testing.

A more detailed description of the maintenance program and maintenance management system can be found in Section 11.2, Maintenance.

6.4.5 Training

Training in chemical process safety is provided to individuals who handle licensed materials and other chemicals at the facility. The training program is developed and implemented with input from the chemical safety staff, training staff, and management. The program includes the following:

A. Analysis of jobs and tasks to determine what a worker must know to perform tasks efficiently

B. Design and development of learning objectives based upon the analysis of jobs and tasks that reflect the knowledge, skills, and abilities needed by the worker

C. Design and development of qualification requirements for positions where a level of technical capability must be achieved and demonstrated for safe and reliable performance of the job function

D. Development and implementation of standard and temporary operating procedures

E. Development and implementation of proper inspection, test, and maintenance programs and procedures

F. Development of chemical safety awareness throughout the facility so that all individuals know what their roles and responsibilities are in coordinating chemical release mitigation activities - in support of the Emergency Plan - in the event of a severe chemical release

G. Coordination of chemical process safety training curriculum with that of other areas including, radiological safety, criticality safety, facility operations, emergency response, and related areas.

A more detailed description of the training program can be found in Section 11.3, Training and Qualifications.

6.4.6 Procedures

A key element of chemical process safety is the development and implementation of procedures that help ensure reliable and safe operation of chemical process systems.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

7.0 FIRE SAFETY

This chapter documents the National Enrichment Facility (NEF) fire safety program. The fire safety program is intended to reduce the risk of fires and explosions at the facility. The fire safety program documents how the facility administers and ensures fire safety at the facility.

The NEF fire safety program meets the acceptance criteria in Chapter 7 of NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002) and is developed, implemented and maintained in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR 70.62(a) (CFR, 2003a), 10 CFR 70.22 (CFR, 2003b) and 10 CFR 70.65 (CFR, 2003c). In addition, the fire safety program complies with 10 CFR 70.61 (CFR, 2003d), 10 CFR 70.62 (CFR, 2003a) and 10 CFR 70.64 (CFR, 2003e). NUREG/CR-6410 (NRC, 1998), NUREG-1513 (NRC, 2001) NRC Generic Letter 95-01 (NRC, 1995) and NFPA 801 (NFPA, 2003) were utilized as guidance in developing this chapter.

The information provided in this chapter, the corresponding regulatory requirement and the section of NUREG-1520 (NRC, 2002), Chapter 7 in which the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) acceptance criteria are presented is summarized below:

Information Category and Requirement	10 CFR 70 Citation	NUREG-1520 Chapter 7 Reference
Section 7.1 Fire Safety Management Measures	70.62(a), (d) & 70.64(b)	7.4.3.1
Section 7.2 Fire Hazards Analysis	70.61(b), (c) & 70.62(a)&(c)	7.4.3.2
Section 7.3 Facility Design	70.62(a), (c) & 70.64(b)	7.4.3.3
Section 7.4 Process Fire Safety	70.64(b) & 70.64(b)	7.4.3.4
Section 7.5 Fire Protection and Emergency Response	70.62(a), (c) & 70.64(b)	7.4.3.5

(This page intentionally left blank)

7.1 FIRE SAFETY MANAGEMENT MEASURES

Fire safety management measures establish the fire protection policies for the site. The objectives of the fire safety program are to prevent fires from starting and to detect, control, and extinguish those fires that do occur. The fire protection organization and fire protection systems at the NEF provide protection against fires and explosions based on the structures, systems, and components (SSC) and defense-in-depth practices described in this chapter. Fire barriers and administrative controls are considered fire protection items relied on for safety (IROFS).

7.1.1 Fire Protection IROFS

IROFS associated with fire protection are specified in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

7.1.2 Management Policy and Direction

Louisiana Energy Services (LES) is committed to ensuring that the IROFS, as identified in the ISA Summary, are available and reliable, and that the facility maintains fire safety awareness among employees, controls transient ignition sources and combustibles, and maintains a readiness to extinguish or limit the consequences of fire. The facility maintains fire safety awareness among employees through its General Employee Training Program. The training program is described in Chapter 11, Management Measures.

The responsibility for fire protection rests with the Health, Safety & Environment (HS&E) Manager who reports directly to the Plant Manager. The HS&E Manager is assisted by the Industrial Safety Manager, whose direct responsibility is to ensure the day-to-day safe operation of the facility in accordance with occupational safety and health regulations, including the fire safety program. Fire protection engineering support is provided by the engineering manager in Technical Services. The personnel qualification requirements for the HS&E Manager and the Industrial Safety Manager are presented in Chapter 2, Organization and Administration.

The Industrial Safety Manager is assisted by fire safety personnel who are trained in the field of fire protection and have practical day-to-day fire safety experience at nuclear facilities. The fire protection staff is responsible for the following:

- Fire protection program and procedural requirements
- Fire safety considerations
- Maintenance, surveillance, and quality of the facility fire protection features
- Control of design changes as they relate to fire protection
- Documentation and record keeping as they relate to fire protection
- Fire prevention activities (i.e., administrative controls and training)
- Organization and training of the fire brigade
- Pre-fire planning.

The facility maintains a Safety Review Committee (SRC) that reports to the Plant Manager. The SRC performs the function of a fire safety review committee. The SRC provides technical and administrative review and audit of plant operations including facility modifications to ensure that fire safety concerns are addressed.

Engineering review of the fire safety program is accomplished by configuration management and the SRC. Configuration management is discussed in Chapter 11, Management Measures, and the SRC is discussed in Chapter 2, Organization and Administration.

The subject matter discussed in Section 7.1.2 is essentially the same as the subject matter discussed in the Claiborne Enrichment Center Safety Analysis Report (LES, 1993). The NRC staff previously reviewed the Claiborne Enrichment Center SAR (LES, 1993) relative to Management Policy and Direction (Program Management) and concluded that the descriptions, specifications or analyses provided an adequate basis for safety review of the facility operations and that the construction and operation of the facility would not pose an undue risk to public health and safety. The specific discussion on Management Policy and Direction (Program Management) is discussed in NUREG –1491 (NRC, 1994), Section 4.6.

7.2 FIRE HAZARDS ANALYSIS

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

(This page intentionally left blank)

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

Text removed under 10 CFR 2.390.

7.4 PROCESS FIRE SAFETY

Chapter 6, Chemical Process Safety, describes the chemical classification process, the hazards of chemicals, chemical process interactions affecting licensed material and/or hazardous chemicals produced from licensed material, the methodology for evaluating hazardous chemical consequences, and chemical safety assurance. The only process chemical of concern is uranium hexafluoride (UF_6). UF_6 is not flammable and does not disassociate to flammable constituents under conditions at which it will be handled at the NEF. The two byproducts in the event of a UF_6 release are hydrogen fluoride (HF) and uranyl fluoride (UO_2F_2) and neither presents a process fire safety hazard. The Integrated Safety Analysis has analyzed the hazards associated with the processes performed at the facility. The analysis did not identify any processes which represented a process fire safety hazard.

(This page intentionally left blank)

NATIONAL ENRICHMENT FACILITY

SAFETY ANALYSIS REPORT

VOLUME 3 OF 3

9.2 ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION MEASURES

LES is committed to protecting the public, plant workers, and the environment from the harmful effects of ionizing radiation due to plant operation. Accordingly, LES is firmly committed to the "As Low As Reasonably Achievable," (ALARA) philosophy for all operations involving source, byproduct, and special nuclear material. This commitment is reflected in written procedures and instructions for operations involving potential exposures of personnel to radiation (both internal and external hazards) and the facility design.

Part of LES's environmental protective measures are described in the ER. In particular, Chapter 4 discusses the anticipated results of the radiation protection program with regard to ALARA goals and waste minimization. Chapter 6 discusses the environmental controls and monitoring program.

A detailed description of LES' radiation protection program is included separately in this License Application as Safety Analysis Report (SAR) Chapter 4. Similarly, LES's provisions for a qualified and trained staff, which also is part of the environmental protection measures required, are described separately in the SAR as part of Chapter 11.

9.2.1 Radiation Safety

The four acceptance criteria that describe the facility radiation safety program are divided between two License Application documents. SAR Chapter 4 describes:

- Radiological (ALARA) Goals for Effluent Control
- ALARA Reviews and Reports to Management.

ER Chapter 4, Environmental Impacts, addresses:

- Effluents controls to maintain public doses ALARA, and
- Waste Minimization.

In particular, ER Section 4.12 describes public and occupational health effects from both non-radiological and radiological sources. This section specifically addresses calculated total effective dose equivalent to an average member of critical groups or calculated average annual concentration of radioactive material in gaseous and liquid effluent to maintain compliance with 10 CFR 20 (CFR, 2003a).

ER Section 4.13 contains a discussion on facility waste minimization that identifies process features and systems to reduce or eliminate waste. It also describes methods to minimize the volume of waste.

9.2.2 Effluent and Environmental Controls and Monitoring

LES has designed an environmental monitoring program to provide comprehensive data to monitor the facility's impact on the environment. The preoperational program will focus on collecting data to establish baseline information useful in evaluating changes in potential environmental conditions caused by facility operation. The preoperational program will be initiated at least two years prior to facility operation.

The operational program will monitor to ensure facility emissions are maintained ALARA. Monitoring will be of appropriate pathways up to a 2-mile radius beyond the site boundary.

ER Chapter 6 describes environmental measurement and monitoring programs as they apply to preoperation (baseline), operation, and decommissioning conditions for both the proposed action and each alternative.

9.2.2.1 Effluent Monitoring

ER Section 6.1 presents information relating to the facility radiological monitoring program. This section describes the location and characteristics of radiation sources and radioactive effluent (liquid and gaseous). It also describes the various elements of the monitoring program, including:

- Number and location of sample collection points
- Measuring devices used
- Pathway sampled or measured
- Sample size, collection frequency and duration
- Method and frequency of analysis, including lower limits of detection.

Lastly, this section justifies the choice of sample locations, analyses, frequencies, durations, sizes, and lower limits of detection.

9.2.2.2 Environmental Monitoring

ER Section 6.1 also includes information relating to the facility environmental monitoring program. The information presented is the same as that included in the effluent monitoring program, i.e., number and location of sample collection points, etc.

9.2.3 Integrated Safety Analysis

LES has prepared an integrated safety analysis (ISA) in accordance with 10 CFR 70.60 (CFR, 2003h). The ISA

- Provides a complete list of the accident sequences that if uncontrolled could result in radiological and non-radiological releases to the environment with intermediate or high consequences
- Provides reasonable estimates for the likelihood and consequences of each accident identified

10.1 SITE-SPECIFIC COST ESTIMATE

10.1.1 Cost Estimate Structure

The decommissioning cost estimate is comprised of three basic parts that include:

- A facility description
- The estimated costs (including labor costs, non-labor costs, and a contingency factor)
- Key assumptions.

10.1.2 Facility Description

The NEF is fully described in other sections of this License Application and the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary. Information relating to the following topics can be found in the referenced chapters listed below:

A general description of the facility and plant processes is presented in Chapter 1, General Information. A detailed description of the facility and plant processes is presented in the NEF Integrated Safety Analysis Summary.

A description of the specific quantities and types of licensed materials used at the facility is provided in Chapter 1, Section 1.2, Institutional Information.

A general description of how licensed materials are used at the facility is provided in Chapter 1, General Information.

10.1.3 Decommissioning Cost Estimate

10.1.3.1 Summary of Costs

The decommissioning cost estimate for the NEF is approximately $837 million (January, 2002 dollars). The decommissioning cost estimate and supporting information are presented in Tables 10.1-1A through 10.1-14, consistent with the applicable provisions of NUREG-1757, NMSS Decommissioning Standard Review Plan (NRC, 2003).

More than 97% of the decommissioning costs (except tails disposition costs) for the NEF are attributed to the dismantling, decontamination, processing, and disposal of centrifuges and other equipment in the Separations Building Modules, which are considered classified. Given the classified nature of these buildings, the data presented in the Tables at the end of this chapter has been structured to meet the applicable NUREG-1757 (NRC, 2003) recommendations, to the extent practicable. However, specific information such as numbers of components and unit rates have been intentionally excluded to protect the classified nature of the data.

The remaining 3% of the decommissioning costs are for the remaining systems and components in other buildings. Since these costs are small in relation to the overall cost estimate, the cost data for these systems has also been summarized at the same level of detail as that for the Separations Building Modules.

The decommissioning project schedule is presented in Figure 10.1-1, National Enrichment Facility – Conceptual Decommissioning Schedule. Dismantling and decontamination of the equipment in the three Separations Building Modules will be conducted sequentially (in three phases) over a nine year time frame. Separations Building Module 1 will be decommissioned during the first three-year period, followed by Separations Building Module 2, and then Separations Building Module 3. Termination of Separations Module 3 operations will mark the end of uranium enrichment operations at the NEF. Decommissioning of the remaining plant systems and buildings will begin after Separations Building Module 3 operations have been permanently terminated.

10.1.3.2 Major Assumptions

Key assumptions underlying the decommissioning cost estimate are listed below:

- Inventories of materials and wastes at the time of decommissioning will be in amounts that are consistent with routine plant operating conditions over time
- Costs are not included for the removal or disposal of non-radioactive structures and materials beyond that necessary to terminate the NRC license
- Credit is not taken for any salvage value that might be realized from the sale of potential assets (e.g., recovered materials or decontaminated equipment) during or after decommissioning
- Decommissioning activities will be performed in accordance with current day regulatory requirements
- LES will be the Decommissioning Operations Contractor (DOC) for all decommissioning operations
- Decommissioning costs are presented in January, 2002 dollars.

10.1.4 Decommissioning Strategy

The plan for decommissioning is to promptly decontaminate or remove all materials from the site which prevent release of the facility for unrestricted use. This approach, referred to in the industry as DECON (i.e., immediate dismantlement), avoids long-term storage and monitoring of wastes on site. The type and volume of wastes produced at the NEF do not warrant delays in waste removal normally associated with the SAFSTOR (i.e., deferred dismantlement) option.

After completion of a modification to a structure, system, or component, the modification Project Manager, or designee, shall ensure that all applicable testing has been completed to ensure correct operation of the system(s) affected by the modification and documentation regarding the modification is complete. In order to ensure operators are able to operate a modified system safely, when a modification is complete, all documents necessary, e.g., the revised process description, checklists for operation and flowsheets are made available to operations and maintenance departments prior to the start-up of the modified system. Appropriate training on the modification is completed before a system is placed in operation. A formal notice of a modification being completed is distributed to all appropriate managers. As-built drawings incorporating the modification are completed in accordance with the design control procedures. These records shall be identifiable and shall be retained in accordance with the records management procedures.

11.1.1.1 Scope of Structures, Systems, and Components

The scope of Structures, Systems, and Components (SSC) under configuration management includes all IROFS identified by the integrated safety analysis of the design bases and any items which may affect the function of the IROFS. Design documents subject to configuration management include calculations, safety analyses, design criteria, engineering drawings, system descriptions, technical documents, and specifications that establish design requirements for IROFS. During the design phase, these design documents are maintained under configuration management when initially approved.

The scope of documents included in the configuration management program expands throughout the design process. As drawings and specification sections related to IROFS or items affecting the functions of IROFS are prepared and issued for procurement, fabrication, or construction, these documents are included in configuration management.

During construction, initial startup, and operations, the scope of documents under configuration management similarly expands to include, as appropriate: vendor data; test data; inspection data; initial startup, test, operating and administrative procedures as applicable to IROFS and nonconformance reports. These documents include documentation related to IROFS that is generated through functional interfaces with QA, maintenance, and training and qualifications of personnel. Configuration management procedures will provide for evaluation, implementation, and tracking of changes to IROFS, and processes, equipment, computer programs, and activities of personnel that impact IROFS.

11.1.1.2 Interfaces with Other Management Measures

Configuration management is implemented through or otherwise related to other management measures. Key interfaces and relationships to other management measures are described below:

- **Quality Assurance** - The QA program establishes the framework for configuration management and other management measures for IROFS and items that affect the function of the IROFS.

- **Records Management** - Records associated with IROFS and items affecting IROFS are generated and processed in accordance with the applicable requirements of the QA Program and provide evidence of the conduct of activities associated with the configuration management of those IROFS.

- **Maintenance** – Maintenance requirements are established as part of the design basis, which is controlled under configuration management. Maintenance records for IROFS and items affecting IROFS provide evidence of compliance with preventative and corrective maintenance schedules.

- **Training and Qualifications** - Training and qualification are controlled in accordance with the applicable provisions of the QA Program. Personnel qualifications and/or training to specific processes and procedures are management measures that support the safe operation, maintenance, or testing of IROFS. Also, work activities that are themselves IROFS, (i.e., administrative controls) are proceduralized, and personnel are trained and qualified to these procedures. Training and qualification requirements and documentation of training may be considered part of the design basis controlled under configuration management. Reference Sections 11.3.2, Analysis and Identification of Functional Areas Requiring Training, and 11.3.3, Position Training Requirements, for interfaces with configuration management.

- **Incident Investigation/Audits and Assessments** - Audits, assessments, and incident investigations are described in Sections 11.5, Audits and Assessments, and 11.6, Incident Investigations and Corrective Action Process. Corrective actions identified as a result of these management measures may result in changes to design features, administrative controls, or other management measures (e.g., operating procedures). The Corrective Action Program (CAP) is described in Section 11.6, "Incident Investigations and Corrective Action Process." Changes are evaluated under the provisions of configuration management through the QA Program and procedures. Periodic assessments of the configuration management program are also conducted in accordance with the audit and assessment program described in Section 11.5.

- **Procedures** - Operating, administrative, maintenance, and emergency procedures are used to conduct various operations associated with IROFS and items affecting IROFS and will be reviewed for potential impacts to the design basis. Also, work activities that are themselves IROFS, (i.e., administrative controls) are contained in procedures.

11.1.1.3 Objectives of Configuration Management

The objectives of configuration management are to ensure design and operation within the design basis of IROFS by: identifying and controlling preparation and review of documentation associated with IROFS; controlling changes to IROFS; and maintaining the physical configuration of the facility consistent with the approved design.

The Urenco technology transfer documentation provides the enrichment plant design, and identifies those safety trips and features credited in the European safety analyses. The ISA of the design bases determines the IROFS and establishes the safety function(s) associated with

INTRODUCTION

Louisiana Energy Services (LES) maintains full responsibility for ensuring that the enrichment facility is designed, constructed, operated, and decommissioned in conformance with applicable regulatory requirements, specified design requirements, applicable industry standards and good engineering practices in a manner to protect the health and safety of the employees and the public. To this end, the LES Quality Assurance Program conforms to the criteria established in Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Quality Assurance Criteria For Nuclear Power Plants and Fuel Reprocessing Plants. The criteria in 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, are met by LES's commitment to follow the guidelines of the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Quality Assurance (QA) standard NQA-1-1994, Quality Assurance Program Requirements for Nuclear Facilities, including supplements as revised by the ASME NQA-1a-1995 Addenda.

The LES QA Program described herein covers design, construction (including pre-operational testing), operation (including testing), maintenance and modification, and decommissioning of the facility. This Quality Assurance Program Description (QAPD) describes the requirements to be applied to those structures, systems and components, and activities that have been designated Quality Assurance (QA) Level 1.

QA Level 1 is applied exclusively to items relied on for safety (IROFS), any items which are determined to affect the function of the IROFS, and, in general, to items required to satisfy regulatory requirements. The development of the IROFS list is a product of the Integrated Safety Analysis (ISA) process. The Integrated Safety Analysis provides the methodology utilized to establish the IROFS list. IROFS are comprised of specific structures, systems and components (SSC) and administrative controls. All sections of this QAPD are applied to IROFS, any SSC and administrative controls which are determined to affect the functions of the IROFS and items required to satisfy regulatory requirements for which QA Level 1 requirements are applied. Application of the QAPD requirements is part of the configuration management system and will be performed in accordance with documented procedures. The LES QA organization reviews and concurs with the selection of the IROFS and the application of QA requirements to the IROFS, any items which are determined to affect the functions of the IROFS and items required to satisfy regulatory requirements for which QA Level 1 requirements are applied.

The QA Level 2 program description is provided in Section 20, Quality Assurance Program for QA Level 2 Activities of this QAPD. These requirements are implemented by LES and LES contractors through the use of approved QA programs and procedures. The Owner defined QA Level 2 SSCs and their associated activities i.e., those SSCs that are not IROFS, provide support of normal operations of the facility, and do not affect the functions of the IROFS (e.g., occupational exposure, radioactive waste management) and SSCs that minimize public, worker, and environmental risks (e.g., physical interaction protection, certain radiation monitors and criticality alarms) are evaluated against the requirements in Section 20, of this QAPD. This evaluation identifies which QA controls are needed to ensure these SSC meet their intended functions and do not affect the functions of the IROFS. This evaluation may also include nuclear industry precedent in the application of augmented QA requirements.

Three QA Levels have been established and apply throughout the life of the facility from licensing and siting through design, construction, operation, and decommissioning. The three levels are defined as follows.

QA LEVEL 1 REQUIREMENTS

The QA Level 1 Program shall conform to the criteria established in 10 CFR 50, Appendix B. These criteria shall be met by commitments to follow the guidelines of ASME NQA-1-1994, including supplements as revised by the ASME NQA-1a-1995 Addenda. The QA Level 1 QA program shall be applied to those structures, systems, components, and administrative controls that have been determined to be IROFS, items that affect the functions of the IROFS, and, in general, to items required to satisfy regulatory requirements.

QA LEVEL 2 REQUIREMENTS

The QA Level 2 program is an owner-defined QA program that uses the ASME NQA-1 standard as guidance. General QA Level 2 requirements are described in Section 20, Quality Assurance Program for QA Level 2 Activities. For contractors, the QA Level 2 program shall be described in documents that must be approved by LES. The QA Level 2 program shall be applied to Owner designated structures, systems, components, and activities. An International Organization for Standardization (ISO) 9000 series QA program may be acceptable for QA Level 2 applications provided it complies with applicable LES QAPD requirements and the QAPD is reviewed and accepted by the LES QA Director.

QA LEVEL 3 REQUIREMENTS

The QA Level 3 program is defined as standard commercial practice. A documented QA Level 3 program is not required. QA Level 3 governs all activities not designated as QA Level 1 or QA Level 2.

As described in Section 19, Provisions for Change, subsequent changes to the LES QA Program shall be incorporated in this QAPD. Any changes that reduce the commitments in the approved QAPD will be submitted to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) for review and approval prior to implementation.

SECTION 2 QUALITY ASSURANCE PROGRAM

The elements of the LES QA Program described in this section and associated QA procedures implement the requirements of Criterion 2, Quality Assurance Program, of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, and the commitment to Basic Requirement 2 and Supplements 2S-1, 2S-2, 2S-3 and 2S-4 of NQA-1-1994 Part I as revised by NQA-1a-1995 Addenda of NQA-1-1994.

PROGRAM BASIS

The LES Quality Assurance Program complies with 10 CFR 50, Appendix B, Quality Assurance Criteria for Nuclear Power Plants and Fuel Reprocessing Plants, and applies to all levels of the organization, including contractors, who perform QA Level 1 activities. Part I and selected sections of Part II of ASME NQA-1-1994, Quality Assurance Requirements for Nuclear Facility Applications, as revised by NQA-1a-1995 Addenda are used in conjunction with 10 CFR 50, Appendix B and provide additional detailed quality assurance guidelines which are committed to in this QAPD. The LES QAPD describes LES's overall compliance with 10 CFR 50, Appendix B and commitments to ASME NQA-1. This document states LES policies, assigns responsibilities and specifies requirements governing implementation of the QA Program to the design, construction, operation and decommissioning of the LES enrichment facility. All 18 criteria of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B have been addressed to identify the scope of QA Program applied to the LES enrichment facility. QA requirements will also apply to contractors as delineated in procurement documents controlled under Section 4, Procurement Document Control, of this QAPD. The necessary management measures to control the quality of subcontracted activities for the LES design, procurement, and installation and testing of QA Level 1 components and activities have been established in this QAPD. The QAPD will be reviewed for needed revisions as described in Section 19, Provisions For Change.

Specific processes and controls, which implement the provisions of 10 CFR 50, Appendix B and the commitment to ASME NQA-1-1994, as specified in this QAPD are delineated in procedures. Development, review, approval and training on procedures shall be performed prior to performance of the activities controlled by the procedures.

The QA Program provides for the planning and accomplishment of activities affecting quality under suitably controlled conditions. Controlled conditions include the use of appropriate equipment, suitable environmental conditions for accomplishing the activity, and assurance that prerequisites for the given activity have been satisfied. The LES QA Program provides for special controls, processes, test equipment, tools and skills to attain the required quality and verification of quality. QA requirements contained in this QAPD are also invoked on LES contractors for their contracted scope of work.

When work cannot be accomplished as specified in implementing QA procedures, or accomplishment of such work would result in an adverse condition, work is stopped until proper corrective action is taken. If procedures cannot be used as written, then work is stopped until the procedures are changed. Requirements for stop work are further discussed in Section 16, Corrective Action.

Flowdown of QA Requirements to Contractors and Suppliers

QA requirements for QA Level 1 activities are imposed on LES contractors and suppliers through the respective procurement documents for the particular scope of work being contracted. Determination of the specific QA requirements, supplier evaluations, and proposal/bid evaluations are in accordance with the requirements of Section 4, Procurement Document Control, and Section 7, Control of Purchased Material, Equipment and Services, of this document. Applicable QA Program elements required for the particular scope of work are identified in procurement documents. Potential contractors/suppliers are required to submit their QA Programs to the LES QA organization for review in accordance with the request for proposal/procurement specification. The LES QA organization performs an audit at the contractor's/supplier's facility of their QA program and its implementation verifying that the contractor's/supplier's QA program meets the requirements established in the request for proposal/procurement specification. If the audit is acceptable then the contractor/supplier is added to the LES ASL and a contract between LES and the contractor/supplier may be issued. For procured items, LES may also require that the LES QA organization perform source inspections or witness tests at the supplier's facility prior to shipment if the equipment/component warrants inspection due to its safety significance and/or complexity. Such requirements are also identified in the procurement documents and/or contract.

Construction contractors for LES QA Program controlled construction activities are required to be placed on the ASL prior to contract award. Construction contractors are required to perform the QA activities required by their QA program including audits of their own activities as well as any required quality control (QC) inspections. The LES QA organization will provide oversight of these contractors in the form of audits and surveillances verifying that each contractor is properly implementing its QA program as approved by LES QA. Contractually contractors will be required to promptly correct LES identified deficiencies and noncomformances.

IDENTIFICATION AND APPLICATION OF QA CONTROLS

QA Level 1 is applied exclusively to IROFS, any items which are determined to affect the function of the IROFS, and, in general, to items required to satisfy regulatory requirements. Since the development of the IROFS list is a product of the ISA process, the applicable QA Level 1 requirements are also applied to this process. The Integrated Safety Analysis provides the methodology utilized to establish the IROFS list. IROFS are comprised of specific structures, systems and components (SSC) and administrative controls. All applicable sections of this QAPD are applied to IROFS, any SSC and administrative controls which are determined to affect the functions of the IROFS and items required to satisfy regulatory requirements for which QA Level 1 requirements are applied. Application of the QAPD requirements is part of the configuration management program used to verify and maintain the facility design basis and will be performed in accordance with documented procedures. Accordingly, as described in Section 1, Organization, the QA organization is responsible for selected reviews and oversight of these processes and programs. In particular, the LES QA organization reviews and concurs with the selection of the IROFS and the application of QA requirements to the IROFS, any items which are determined to affect the functions of the IROFS and items required to satisfy regulatory reqirements for which QA Level 1 requirements are applied.

The QA Level 2 program description is provided in Section 20, Quality Assurance Program for QA Level 2 Activities of this QAPD. These requirements are implemented by LES and LES contractors through the use of approved QA programs and procedures. The Owner defined QA Level 2 SSCs and their associated activities i.e., those SSCs that are not IROFS, provide support of normal operations of the facility, and do not affect the functions of the IROFS (e.g., occupational exposure, radioactive waste management) and SSCs that minimize public, worker,