



UNITED STATES
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20555-0001

JUN 25 1994

DOCKET: 70-1100

LICENSEE: Combustion Engineering, Inc. (CE)
Windsor, Connecticut

SUBJECT: SAFETY EVALUATION REPORT: AMENDMENT APPLICATION DATED JANUARY 7,
1994, EXEMPTION TO 10 CFR 70.24

Background

By amendment application dated October 21, 1993, and supplement dated December 6, 1993, CE requested an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 70.24 for Buildings 6, 17, and 21. Since the amount of uranium handled and stored in these Buildings has been reduced, removal of the criticality detectors in these Buildings is proposed. After discussions with the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards staff, CE submitted a revised amendment application dated January 7, 1994. The revised application supersedes the earlier submittals.

Discussion

In accordance with 10 CFR 70.24(a), a monitoring system is required to detect a criticality accident in areas where fissile material, having a quantity exceeding 700 grams of uranium-235, is handled, used, or stored. Although the licensee is authorized to possess a total quantity of U-235 in excess of 700 grams, the licensee has restricted the amount of U-235 to a quantity not to exceed 700 grams of U-235 in any given area (i.e., building). Therefore, the staff concludes an exemption is warranted.

Categorical Exclusion

The staff has determined that this change in process operations meets the following conditions:

1. There is no significant change in the types or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite,
2. There is no significant increase in individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure,
3. There is no significant construction impact, and
4. There is no significant increase in the potential for or consequences from radiological accidents.

9402070063 940125
PDR ADDCK 07001100
C PDR

JAN 25 1994

2

Accordingly, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(c)(11), neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is warranted for this action.

Conclusion

Based on the above discussion, the staff concludes that the proposed amendment can be issued without undue risk to the workers, public, or environment. Therefore, the staff recommends that the amendment be approved.

The Region I Principal Inspector has no objection to this proposed action.

Principal Contributors:

Sean Soong
Mary Adams
Marc Klasky