5. Amax Coal Company and Clipmate Corporation

[Docket No. M–95–156–C]

Amax Coal Company and Clipmate Corporation, 16 S. Pennsylvania, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73106 have filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 75.1303(y) (1) and (2) to its Chinook Mine (I.D. No. 12–00322) located in Clay County, Indiana. The petitioner proposes to use a protected Rozdet open circuit detonator system at its Chinook Mine instead of shunted electrical detonators; to package and store the detonator at the mine in accordance with the U.S. Department of transportation Report, Reference Number EX–9309092; and to provide instructions in each Rozdet package on the proper use of the Rozdet. The petitioner asserts that application of the standard would result in a diminution of safety to the miners under certain conditions. In addition, the petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same measure of protection as would the mandatory standard.

6. Sunshine Precious Metals, Inc.

[Docket No. M–95–11–M]

Sunshine Precious Metals, Inc., P.O. Box 1080, Kellogg, Idaho 83837–1080 has filed a petition to modify the application of 30 CFR 57.11055 (inclined escapeways) to its Sunshine Mine (I.D. No. 10–00089) located in Shoshone County, Idaho. The petitioner requests a modification of the requirement for an emergency hoisting facility. The Petitioner states that a portion of the West Chance orebody between the 2700 and 3100 foot levels of the mine is being developed for mining; that no mining has taken place in recent years; and that the 2700 foot level is only accessible from the Jewell Shaft. The petitioner proposes to establish a second escapeway to the 3100 foot level which would provide access to the adjoining Silver Summit Mine; to have a borehole at a 5-foot diameter raise lined with steel in order to establish a 4-foot diameter opening for ventilation from the 2700 foot to the 3100 foot level; and to have a suitable ladderway for safe travel in an emergency. The petitioner states that application of the standard would result in a diminution of safety to the miners. In addition, the petitioner asserts that the proposed alternative method would provide at least the same measure of protection as would the mandatory standard.

Request for Comments

Persons interested in these petitions may furnish written comments. These comments must be filed with the Office of Standards, Regulations, and Variances, Mine Safety and Health Administration, Room 627, 4015 Wilson Boulevard, Arlington, Virginia 22203. All comments must be postmarked or received in that office on or before December 13, 1995. Copies of these petitions are available for inspection at that address.

Dated: November 1, 1995.

Patricia W. Silvey,

Director, Office of Standards, Regulations and Variances.

[FR Doc. 95–27872 Filed 11–9–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–13–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–155]

Consumers Power Company, Big Rock Point Nuclear Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.2(b)(i), concerning testing of the escape air lock, to the Consumers Power Company (CPCo or the licensee), for operation of the Big Rock Point Plant (BRP), located in Charlevoix County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow an exemption from the requirement of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.2(b)(i), to test air locks at an internal pressure not less than P_a. This requires the emergency (or escape) air lock at Big Rock Point to be tested at 23 psig, the calculated peak pressure (P_a) for Big Rock Point. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated October 4, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated September 27, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The regulation, as set forth in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, paragraph III.D.2(b)(i), requires that Big Rock Point's containment emergency air lock be tested at an internal pressure not less than P_a, which is 23 psig for Big Rock Point. Currently, the containment escape air lock at Big Rock Point is tested at a pressure of 2 psig. Therefore, the explicit requirement of paragraph III.D.2(b)(i) of Appendix J is not met. The requested exemption is required because of the emergency air lock manufacturer's restrictions on internal pressurization and the Big Rock Point design which necessitates frequent personnel entries. The licensee stated that the escape air lock internal pressurization is limited by the manufacturer to 2 psig without a strongback and 5 psig with a strongback in place, thereby making pressurization to peak pressure impossible for local leak rate tests. In addition, the licensee stated that the required use of a strongback for the 5-psig test and its positioning on the inside of the lock which tends to assist the door in sealing is less conservative than the 2-psig test for the inner door. Therefore, the 5-psig test has no significant increase in value. The licensee believes that the escape air lock's performance is demonstrated with the local leak rate test at 2 psig.

Environment Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed exemption will not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has provided an acceptable basis for concluding that the proposed exemption to test the escape air lock at a pressure of 2 psig would maintain the containment leak rates within acceptable limits.

The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does involve features located entirely within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed action, any alternatives with equal or

greater environmental impact need not be evaluated. As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Big Rock Point Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on October 3, 1995, the staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Mr. Dennis Hahn of the Nuclear Facilities and Environmental Monitoring Section, Office of the Department of Public Health, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official has no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the environmental assessment, the Commission concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed action.

For further details with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated October 4, 1994, as supplemented by letter dated September 27, 1995, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC, and at the local public document room located at the North Central Michigan College, 1515 Howard Street, Petoskey, Michigan 49770.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 6th day of November 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John B. Hickman,

Acting Director, Project Directorate III–I, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–27917 Filed 11–9–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

Availability of NRC Iterative Performance Assessment Phase 2: Development of Capabilities for Review of a Performance Assessment for a High-Level Waste Repository

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission is announcing the availability of NUREG–1464, ''NRC Iterative Performance Assessment (IPA) Phase 2: Development of Capabilities for Review of a Performance Assessment for a High-Level Waste Repository.''

ADDRESSES: Copies of NUREG–1464 can be purchased from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013–7082. Copies are also available from the National Technical Information Service, 5285 Port Royal Road, Springfield, VA 22161. A copy of NUREG–1464 is also available for public inspection and/or copying at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street (Lower Level), NW., Washington, DC 20555–0001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Michael P. Lee, Performance Assessment and Hydrology Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, 11545 Rockville Pike, MD 20852–2738. Telephone: (301) 415–6677.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: This report describes the results of the second phase of the development of the NRC staff's capability to review a performance assessment for a geologic repository. This capability, developed with the assistance of its contractor (the Center for Nuclear Waste Regulatory Analyses—the CNWRA), helps the NRC staff assess whether the U.S. Department of Energy's (DOE's) site characterization activities are adequate, during the pre-licensing phase, and, later, will help the staff review a license application for the potential geologic repository for spent nuclear fuel and other high-level radioactive waste (HLW) at Yucca Mountain, NV.

As its name indicates, IPA involves repeated iterations directed at improving both the NRC staff's capability for reviewing DOE's demonstration of repository performance and the staff's understanding of combined systems and events and processes that are key to repository performance. In addition, IPA is intended to support timely feedback to DOE on their licensing strategy, site characterization, and design programs. Performance assessment of a geologic repository, like other systematic safety-assessment methodologies, benefits substantially by being conducted in an iterative manner, primarily because the lessons learned regarding modeling improvements, data needs, and methodology can be addressed in subsequent iterations.

The IPA Phase 2 demonstration made use of the scenario selection procedure developed by Sandia National Laboratories and modified by the NRC staff to provide a set of scenarios, with corresponding probabilities, for use in the consequence analysis of a potential HLW disposal site in unsaturated tuff. Models of release of radionuclides from the waste form and transport in ground water, air and by direct pathways provided preliminary estimates of releases to the accessible environment for a 10,000 year period. The input values of parameters necessary for the consequence models were sampled numerous times using Latin Hypercube Sampling from probability distributions. The results from the consequence models were then used to generate Complementary Cumulative Distribution Functions (CCDFs) for either normalized radionuclide release to the accessible environment or effective dose equivalents to a target population. CCDFs were calculated for probabilistically significant combinations (scenarios) of four disruptive events; exploratory drilling, pluvial climate, seismicity, and magmatism. Sensitivity and uncertainty analyses of the calculated releases and effective dose equivalents were also used to determine the importance of the parameters.

Because of the preliminary nature of the analysis and data base, the results and conclusions presented in NUREG–1464 should be carefully interpreted. They should not be misconstrued to represent the actual performance of the proposed Yucca Mountain repository nor serve as an endorsement of the methods used.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of October 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John H. Austin,

Chief, Performance Assessment and Hydrology Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 95–27918 Filed 11–9–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P