

from multiple monitoring stations) annual radiation exposure as follows:

Year (FY)	Average readings (mrem)
1994 .....	0.4
1993 .....	0.5
1992 .....	0.2
1991 .....	0.1
1990 .....	0.1
1989 .....	0.2
1988 .....	0.2
1987 .....	1.2
1986 .....	1.8
1985 .....	2.2

Annual airborne effluent releases from the facility are given in the next table. FY 94 is presented in two half years periods because amendments to 10 CFR Part 20 became effective on January 1, 1994, which changed the regulatory limits for release concentrations to the environment for certain radionuclides. Total curies released during FY 94 is comparable to past years. The percent of Regulatory Limit column represents the percent of the regulatory limit for concentration of radionuclides in air after taking into account dilution from the release point.

Year (FY)	Stack release (curies)	% of regulatory limit
1/1/94 to 6/30/94 .....	398	21.7
7/1/93 to 12/31/93 .....	275	4.1
1993 .....	923	6.0
1992 .....	728	4.9
1991 .....	684	4.4
1990 .....	542	3.5
1989 .....	1529	9.8
1988 .....	2627	17
1987 .....	4223	30
1986 .....	3797	26
1985 .....	4076	26

Annual liquid effluent releases are as follows:

Year (FY)	Total activity (curies)
1994 .....	0.025
1993 .....	0.007
1992 .....	0.036
1991 .....	0.121
1990 .....	0.080
1989 .....	0.110
1988 .....	0.072
1987 .....	0.098
1986 .....	0.288
1985 .....	0.099

Low level solid waste shipped from the facility is given in cubic feet and total activity in curies. Increased shipments in FY 1994 and FY 1993 represent an effort by the licensee to

remove solid waste from the facility before waste disposal site closures prevented future shipments of low level solid waste.

Year (FY)	Cubic feet	Total activity (curies)
1994 .....	457	0.925
1993 .....	210	0.218
1992 .....	127	0.011
1991 .....	116	0.125
1990 .....	192	0.035
1989 .....	135	0.053
1988 .....	60	0.003
1987 .....	112	0.082
1986 .....	75	0.097
1985 .....	120	0.067

These releases are well within regulatory limits and will not have a significant impact on the environment. Releases for the proposed license extension are estimated to continue at levels well within regulatory limits.

#### Alternative Use of Resources

One alternative to the proposed amendment request is to deny the request. If the request is denied, the MITR would be shut down or an application for license renewal would be developed and submitted before expiration of the current license on May 7, 1996. Shutting the reactor down would result in the loss of an educational tool for the training of students and the conduct of research in many areas including medical therapy. If the request is denied and the licensee proposes to renew the license, resources would have to be expended on the part of the licensee and the Commission sooner than if the request for license extension is granted. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts.

#### Agencies and Persons Consulted

The NRC staff consulted no other agencies or persons in reviewing the request from the licensee.

#### Finding of No Significant Impact

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action based upon the foregoing environmental assessment. The Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment for the reasons set out above.

For detailed information with respect to this proposed action, see the application for amendment dated March 31, 1994, as supplemented, the Safety Evaluation prepared by the staff, the Negative Declaration Regarding Facility Operating License R-37 for the

Massachusetts Institute of Technology Research Reactor dated July 23, 1975, and the Environmental Impact Appraisal for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology Reactor dated July 23, 1975. These documents are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, D.C. 20555.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Seymour H. Weiss,**

*Director, Non-Power Reactors and Decommissioning Project Directorate, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-3087 Filed 2-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

#### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards; Subcommittee Meeting on Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena

The ACRS Subcommittee on Thermal Hydraulic Phenomena will hold a meeting on February 15 and 16, 1995, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The meeting will be closed to public attendance to discuss Westinghouse proprietary information pursuant to (5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(4)), with the exception of a 1-2 hour session on Thursday, February 16, 1995, that will be open to the public.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, February 15, 1995—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business; and

Thursday, February 16, 1995—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.

The Subcommittee will continue its review of the Westinghouse COBRA/TRAC thermal hydraulic code. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and to formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public, and questions may be asked only by members of the Subcommittee, its consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the cognizant ACRS staff engineer named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made.