

(1) By delivery to the Docketing and Service Branch of the Office of the Secretary at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852; or

(2) By mail or telegram addressed to the Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555, Attention: Docketing and Service Branch.

Each request for a hearing must also be served, by delivering it personally or by mail to:

(1) The applicant, Rio Algom Mining Corp., P.O. Box 1390, Glenrock, Wyoming 82637;

(2) The NRC staff, by delivery to the Executive Director of Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, or by mail addressed to the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555.

In addition to meeting other applicable requirements of 10 CFR Part 2 of the Commission's regulations, a request for a hearing filed by a person other than an applicant must describe in detail:

(1) The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;

(2) How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing, with particular reference to the factors set out in § 2.1205(g);

(3) the requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

(4) The circumstances establishing that the request for a hearing is timely in accordance with § 2.1205(c).

Any hearing that is requested and granted will be held in accordance with the Commission's Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials Licensing Proceedings in 10 CFR Part 2, Subpart L.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 14th day of March, 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Joseph J. Holonich,

Chief, Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97-7181 Filed 3-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 40-8968]

Hydro Resources, Inc.; Notice of Availability

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SUMMARY: The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), in cooperation with

the U.S. Bureau of Land Management (BLM) and U.S. Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), has published a Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) regarding the proposed construction and operation of an in-situ leach (ISL) project in McKinley County, New Mexico. This FEIS describes and evaluates the potential environmental impacts of granting Hydro Resources, Inc. (HRI) a combined source and 11(e)2 byproduct material license and minerals operating leases for Federal and Indian lands for the ISL project. The FEIS concludes, after reviewing the technical and environmental aspects of the proposed project, and evaluating other associated costs and benefits of the project, that the appropriate action is to issue the requested license and leases authorizing the applicant to proceed with the project as discussed in this FEIS.

ADDRESSES: Copies of this FEIS (NUREG-1508) may be requested by members of the public by writing to the NRC Publications Section, ATTN: Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, P.O. Box 37082, Washington, DC 20013-7082. A copy is also available for inspection and/or copying in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L St. NW, Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Robert D. Carlson, Project Manager, Uranium Recovery Branch, Mail Stop TWFN 7-J9, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone (301) 415-8165.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The NRC, in cooperation with BLM and BIA, has prepared an FEIS regarding the administrative action of authorizing HRI to conduct ISL uranium mining, also known as solution mining, in conjunction with a combined source and 11(e)2 byproduct material license issued by the NRC, and minerals operating leases issued for Federal and Indian lands by BLM and BIA. The license and leases would provide programmatic and regulatory oversight in administrative matters; impose operating restrictions; and specify monitoring, record-keeping, and reporting requirements.

A Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) for the proposed action was prepared by an interagency review group comprising staff from the NRC, BLM, and BIA, which was published for comment in October 1994. After evaluating the environmental impacts of the proposed action in the DEIS, the reviewing agencies concluded

that the appropriate action was to issue the requested license and proposed leases authorizing HRI to proceed with the project. The FEIS reevaluates the proposed licensing action on the basis of written and oral comments received by NRC on the DEIS, and on additional information obtained in 1995 and 1996 from the applicant. The FEIS describes the evaluation conducted by the interagency review group concerning (1) the purpose of and need for the proposed action, evaluated under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 as amended, and the cooperating agencies' implementing regulations; (2) alternatives to the proposed action; (3) the environmental resources that could be affected by the proposed action and alternatives; (4) the potential environmental consequences of the proposed action and alternatives; and (5) the economic costs and benefits associated with the proposed action.

The FEIS evaluates four alternatives. Under Alternative 1 (the proposed action), the NRC would issue HRI a license for the construction and operation of facilities for ISL uranium mining and processing at the Church Rock, Unit 1, and Crownpoint sites as proposed by HRI in its license application and related submittals. Under Alternative 2 (modified action), the NRC would issue HRI a license for the construction and operation of facilities for ISL uranium mining and processing as proposed by HRI, but at alternative sites and/or using alternative liquid waste disposal methods. Under Alternative 3 (the NRC staff-recommended action), the NRC would issue HRI a license for the construction and operation of facilities for ISL uranium mining and processing as proposed by HRI, but with additional measures required and recommended by NRC staff to protect public health and safety, and the environment. Under Alternative 4 (no action), the NRC would not issue HRI a license for the construction and operation of facilities for ISL uranium mining and processing at Church Rock, Unit 1, or Crownpoint sites.

On the basis of its independent review, the NRC staff concludes that the potential impacts of the proposed project can be mitigated, and that HRI should be issued a combined source and 11e(2) byproduct material license from NRC, and minerals operating leases from BLM and BIA. However, the license and leases should be conditioned on the commitments made by HRI in its license application and related submittals, and the various NRC staff mitigation requirements and recommendations discussed in the FEIS.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of March 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Joseph J. Holonich,

Chief, Uranium Recovery Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 97-7182 Filed 3-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[50-282 AND 50-306]

Northern States Power Company; Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to the Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-42 and DPR-60, issued to Northern States Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plants, Unit 1 and 2, respectively, located in Goodhue County, Minnesota.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow license amendments for Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2, that resolve unreviewed safety questions associated with post-seismic cooling water source operations.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendments dated January 29, 1997, as supplemented February 11, 12, March 7, 10, and 11, 1997.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would revise the cooling water system emergency intake design bases. The proposed amendments contain license conditions that provide interim measures to resolve unreviewed safety questions relating to the cooling water system emergency intake line. The interim measures include the use of a dedicated operator to identify a seismic event so that nonessential cooling water loads can be stripped and the cooling water load demand can be reduced to within the capacity of the seismically qualified emergency intake pipe following a design-basis earthquake. The use of the dedicated operator will be eliminated when the licensee is able to provide a seismically qualified cooling water source either through analyses or modifications.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that pursuant to 10 CFR 50.90, the proposed amendments would not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed amendments would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents.

The changes will not significantly 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 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 for the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plants, Units 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on March 18, 1997, the staff consulted with the Minnesota State official, Mr. Michael McCarthy of the Department of Public Services, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had 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 January 29, 1997, as supplemented by letters dated February 11, 12, March 7, 10, and 11, 1997, 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 Minneapolis Public Library, Technology and Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, Minnesota 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of March 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Beth Wetzel,

Project Manager, Project Directorate III-1, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 97-7318 Filed 3-20-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of meeting.

The Nuclear Safety Research Review Committee (NSRRC) will hold its next meeting on April 3-4, 1997 in Room T-10A1, Two White Flint North (TWFN) Building, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD, from 9:00 a.m.—5:00 p.m. both days.

The meeting will be held in accordance with the requirements of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) and will be open to public attendance. The NSRRC provides advice to the Director of the Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research (RES) on matters of overall management importance in the direction of the NRC's program of nuclear safety research. The main purpose of this meeting will be: (1) to review the reports of the PRA/I&C and Human Factors joint Subcommittee meeting, the Accident Analysis Subcommittee meeting, and the Materials and Engineering Subcommittee meeting; (2) discuss research core competencies; and (3) review Advisory Committee effectiveness.

Participants in parts of the discussion will include senior NRC staff and other RES technical staff as necessary.

Members of the public may file written statements regarding any matter