

NOTICE OF OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET ACTION

* A001-2
PDR

TO: BRENDA JO. SHELTON (7714-MNBB)
NRC CLEARANCE OFFICER
U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555
Nuclear Regulatory Commission

ACTION DATE

09/14/92

ON 07/06/92, YOU REQUESTED APPROVAL OF THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION COLLECTION:
TITLE: NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ACQUISITION REGULATION (NRCAR)
48 CFR CHAPTER 20
AGENCY FORM NOS.:

IN ACCORDANCE WITH THE PAPERWORK REDUCTION ACT, WE HAVE TAKEN THE FOLLOWING ACTION ON THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION:

APPROVED FOR USE THROUGH 09/30/95. OMB NO. 3150-0169.
THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET CONTROL NUMBER MUST BE DISPLAYED IN ACCORDANCE WITH 5 CFR 1320. UNLESS OTHERWISE PROVIDED IN "REMARKS," EXPIRATION DATES MUST ALSO BE DISPLAYED AS REQUIRED BY 5 CFR 1320.

EFFECT ON BURDEN:	RESPONSES	REPORTING HOURS
PREVIOUS STATUS	0	0
NEW STATUS	11,270	120,441
DIFFERENCE	11,270	120,441

EXPLANATION OF DIFFERENCE:

ADJUSTMENTS	RESPONSES	REPORTING HOURS
CORRECTION-ERROR	0	0
CORRECTION-REESTIMATE	0	0
CHANGE IN USE	0	0
PROGRAM CHANGES		
INCREASE	11,270	120,441
DECREASE	0	0

REMARKS:

278

ABSTRACT:

THE NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION ACQUISITION REGULATION IS NECESSARY TO IMPLEMENT AND SUPPLEMENT THE GOVERNMENTWIDE FEDERAL ACQUISITION REGULATION AND TO ENSURE THAT THE REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE PROCUREMENT OF GOODS AND SERVICES WITHIN THE NRC SATISFY THE NEEDS OF THE AGENCY. THE AFFECTED PUBLIC ARE OFFERORS, BIDDERS, AND CONTRACTORS FOR NRC PROCUREMENTS.

ALLOWANCE LETTER: NO FUNCTION: 3504(H): NPRM
ON PLAN: NO EXCEED BUDGET: NO REQUEST: NEW
NO. OF FORMS: 1 USE: PUBLIC HOURS: 120,441
RESPONDENTS: 750 RESPONSES: 11,270
AFFECTED PUBLIC: IND/HHLD & STATE/LCL GOV & BUS/INST & NON-PROFIT INST
SMALL BUSINESS: YES ACTIVITY TYPE:
PURPOSE: APPLICATION
FREQUENCY: OCCAS & MTLY
COLLECTION METHOD: MAIL S/A
RETENTION: COLLECTION AGENT: RQSTNG DPT/AGCY CONFIDENTIALITY: NO
COMPULSORY STATUS: REQD FOR BEN
FEDERAL COST: PUBLIC COST:
REVIEWER: Ron Minsk

ACTION !AUTHORIZING OFFICIAL !TITLE: DEPUTY ADMINISTRATOR!DATE
APPROVED BY: !/S/JAMES B. MACRAE FOR !OFFICE OF INFORMATION !09/14/92
 ! !AND REGULATORY AFFAIRS !

IMPORTANT: BECAUSE THIS INFORMATION COLLECTION HAS BEEN APPROVED, PLEASE SEND TO THE O.M.B. AS SOON AS AVAILABLE: ONE COPY OF THE FINAL PRINTED (OR OTHERWISE REPRODUCED) REPORT FORM, OR REPORTING OR RECORDKEEPING REQUIREMENT, TRANSMITTAL LETTER, INSTRUCTIONS, AND ANY DOCUMENT BEING SENT TO EACH RESPONDENT.

Documents Containing Reporting or Recordkeeping Requirements: Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

ACTION: Notice of the OMB review of information collection.

SUMMARY: The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act (44 U.S.C. chapter 35).

1. Type of submission, new, revision, or extension: New.
2. The title of the information collection: 48 CFR chapter 20, Nuclear Regulatory Commission Acquisition Regulation (NRCAR).
3. The form number if applicable: N/A.
4. How often the collection is required: On occasion; one time.
5. Who will be required or asked to report: Offerors responding to NRC solicitations and contractors receiving contract awards from NRC.
6. An estimate of the number of responses: 11,270.
7. An estimate of the burden per response: 10.7 hours.
8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed to complete the requirement or request: 120,441.
9. An indication of whether section 3504(h), Public Law 96-511 applies: Applicable.
10. Abstract:

The NRCAR is necessary to implement and supplement the government-wide Federal Acquisition Regulation, and to ensure that the regulations governing the procurement of goods and services within the NRC satisfy the needs of the agency.

Copies of the submittal may be inspected or obtained for a fee from the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

Comments and questions can be directed by mail to the OMB reviewer:

Ronald Minsk, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, NEOB-3019, (3150-), Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda [o. Shelton, (301) 492-8132.

Dated at Bethesda, Maryland this 16th day of July 1992.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission
Gerald F. Cranford,
Designated Senior, Official for Information
Resources Management.
[FR Doc. 92-16226 Filed 7-9-92; 8:45 am]
BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-029]

Yankee Atomic Electric Co., Yankee Nuclear Power Station; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from the emergency preparedness requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix E, sections IV.F.2 and IV.F.3. This exemption would be granted to the Yankee Atomic Electric Company (Yankee or the licensee) for the Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Rowe) located in Franklin County, Massachusetts.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would grant a one-time exemption from the annual emergency preparedness requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix E, section IV.F.2 and a permanent exemption from section IV.F.3 which requires a full scale offsite biennial exercise. The licensee requested these exemptions in their letter of May 22, 1992. This request is the proposed action being considered by the NRC.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The licensee's letter of May 22, 1992, stated that the plant has permanently ceased power operation and that all nuclear fuel has been removed from the containment to the spent fuel pool and therefore the requirements of 10 CFR part 50, Appendix E, section IV.F.2, for one time only, and section IV.F.3, are no longer needed as there could not be any possible release of fission products into the environment from reactor system pressure boundary releases.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The proposed exemption does not have any effect on accident risk and the possibility of environmental impact is extremely remote.

The licensee's safety analysis submitted with their May 22, 1992, letter established that in the event a fuel assembly is damaged to such an extent that all fuel pins ruptured and released the entire gap inventory of fission gases to the Spent Fuel Pool Building, the radiological consequences at the

Exclusion Area Boundary would be well below (less than 0.0008 percent) the values specified in 10 CFR part 100. Therefore, this would not represent an undue hazard to the health and safety of the public. Exposures at the Protected Area Fence would be well below (less than 2 percent) the EPA's Protective Action Guidelines (PAGs) and exposures in the Control Room would be a small fraction (less than 4 percent) of the limits in 10 CFR part 50, Appendix A, General Design Criterion 19.

Based on its safety analysis, YAEC has determined that the consequences of accidents which may potentially result in a radiological release are significantly diminished given YNPS's permanently shutdown and defueled status. The safety analysis examined each design basis event described in the PSAR chapter 400, "Transient Analysis," and stated that only the fuel handling accident remains applicable, considering the current status of the plant.

Therefore, the proposed exemption does not increase the probability or consequences of any accidents, no changes are made in the types of any radioactive effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure onsite.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that this proposed action would result in no significant radiological environmental impact.

With regard to potential non-radiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect non-radiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, the Commission concludes that there are no significant non-radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed exemption.

Alternative to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission concluded that there are no significant environmental effects that would result from the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or greater environmental impacts need not be evaluated.

The principal alternative would be to deny the exemption. This would not reduce environmental impacts of the facility and would not enhance the protection of the environment nor public health and safety. However, denial of the exemption would unnecessarily deplete licensee resources.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered