

NATIONAL TRANSPORTATION SAFETY BOARD

Reporting Statistics—Airlines

AGENCY: National Transportation Safety Board.

ACTION: Notice of statistical reporting changes.

SUMMARY: On January 7, 1997, the NTSB adopted a system for classifying airline accidents by their severity. This system is a minor revision of a proposal published in the Federal Register on December 5, 1996. An improved classification system providing more meaningful measures of the level of safety of airline transportation was required by the FAA Reauthorization Act of 1996. This notice describes changes in the adopted version from the proposed classification system and additional accident parameters, many focusing on passenger injuries. The NTSB will remain open to suggestions for improving the content and format of its statistics.

DATES: The NTSB adopted the new classification system on January 7, 1997.

ADDRESSES: Comments and suggestions may be submitted to: Analysis and Data Division (RE-50), ATTN: Airline Statistics, National Transportation Safety Board, 490 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20594-2000.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Stan Smith (202) 314-6550.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The Safety Board retained its proposed four-category system but re-designated the second category "Serious" rather than "Severe." A cautionary note was added to the list of accidents in which one or more passengers received fatal injuries. That note reads:

The NTSB wishes to make clear to all users of the following list of accidents that the information it contains cannot, by itself, be used to compare the safety either of operators or of aircraft types. Airlines that have operated the greatest number of flights and flight hours could be expected to have suffered the greatest number of fatal-to-passenger accidents (assuming that such accidents are random events, and not the result of some systematic deficiency). Similarly, the most used aircraft types would tend to be involved in such accidents more than lesser used types. The NTSB also cautions the user to bear in mind when attempting to compare today's airline system to prior years that airline activity (and hence exposure to risk) has risen by almost 100% from the first year depicted to the last.

Issued in Washington, DC on this 13th day of February, 1997.

Jim Hall,

Chairman.

[FR Doc. 97-4159 Filed 2-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7533-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. STN 50-454, STN 50-455, STN 50-456 and STN 50-457]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed no Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-37, NPF-66, NPF-72, and NPF-77 issued to Commonwealth Edison for operation of the Byron Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Ogle County, Illinois and Braidwood Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Will County, Illinois.

The proposed amendments would relocate certain cycle-specific parameter limits from the Technical Specifications to the Operating Limits Report (ORL).

Before issuance of the proposed license amendments, the Commission will have made findings as required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed Technical Specification changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The relocation of the cycle-specific core operating limits from the Technical Specifications has no influence or impact on the probability or consequences of any accident previously evaluated. The Technical Specifications will continue to require

operation within the analyzed core operating limits and the appropriate actions will be taken if the limits are exceeded. The cycle specific limits within the OLR will be implemented and controlled by plant procedures. Any needed revisions of the limit values in the OLR will be performed based on NRC approved methodology as delineated in TS 6.9.1.9. Each accident analysis addressed in the Byron and Braidwood Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) will be examined with respect to changes in cycle dependent parameters. These parameters are obtained from the application of NRC approved reload design methodologies, to ensure that the transient evaluation of new reloads are bounded by previously accepted analysis. This examination, which will be performed under the requirements of 10 CFR 50.59 process, ensures that future reloads will not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The relocation of the cycle specific variables has no influence or impact, nor does it contribute in any way to the probability or consequences of any new or different kind of accident. No safety related equipment, safety function or plant operations will be altered as a result of this proposed change. The cycle specific variables are calculated using NRC approved methods and submitted to the NRC for their review to allow the Staff to continue to trend the values of these limits. The Technical Specifications will continue to require operation within the analyzed core operating limits and appropriate actions will be taken, when, or if, the limits are exceeded.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not in any way create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

3. The proposed change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety for the following reasons:

The margin of safety is not affected by the relocation of cycle specific core operating limits from the Technical Specifications. The margin of safety presently provided by current Technical Specifications remains unchanged. Appropriate measures exist to control the values of these cycle specific limits. The proposed amendment continues to require operation within the core limits as obtained from the NRC approved reload design and safety analysis methodologies. Appropriate actions are required to be taken, when, or if, these limits are exceeded.

The development of the limits for future reloads will continue to conform to those methods described in the NRC approved documentation. In addition, each future reload will involve a 10 CFR 50.59 safety review to assure that operation of the Byron and Braidwood units within the cycle specific limits will not involve a reduction in

the margin of safety as defined in the basis for any Technical Specification.

Therefore, the proposed changes do not impact operation of the plant in a manner that involves a significant reduction in the margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By March 24, 1997, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating licenses and

any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's "Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings" in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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: for Byron, the Byron Public Library District, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010; for Braidwood, the Wilmington Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be

litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendments under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

If the final determination is that the amendments requested involve a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendments.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by

a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1-(800) 248-5100 (in Missouri 1-(800) 342-6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Robert A. Capra: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001, and to Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois 60603, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1)(i)-(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated December 21, 1995, as supplemented on October 24, 1996, 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 rooms located at: for Byron, the Byron Public Library District, 109 N. Franklin, P.O. Box 434, Byron, Illinois 61010; for Braidwood, the Wilmington Public Library, 201 S. Kankakee Street, Wilmington, Illinois 60481.

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
George F. Dick, Jr.,

*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-2,
Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-4177 Filed 2-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

[Docket No. 50-348]

Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. Alabama Power Company; Notice of Withdrawal of Application for Amendment to Facility Operating License

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has granted the request of Southern Nuclear Operating Company, Inc. (Southern Nuclear), to withdraw its August 23, 1996, application for proposed

amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF-2 for the Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit 1, located in Houston County, Alabama.

The proposed amendment would have revised the technical specifications by modifying the installation method for previously licensed steam generator tube elevated tubesheet laser welded sleeves in Farley Nuclear Plant, Unit 1.

The Commission had previously issued a Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments published in the Federal Register on September 11, 1996 (61 FR 47982). However, by letter dated February 7, 1997, Southern Nuclear withdrew the proposed change.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated August 23, 1996, and the licensee's letter dated February 7, 1997, which withdrew the application for license amendment. The above documents 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 Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burdeshaw Street, P.O. Box 1369, Dothan, Alabama.

Dated at Rockville, Md., this 13th day of February 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Jacob I. Zimmerman,
*Project Manager, Project Directorate II-2,
Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of
Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-4176 Filed 2-19-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

Proposed Generic Communication; Assurance of Sufficient Net Positive Suction Head for Emergency Core Cooling and Containment Heat Removal Pumps (M96537)

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of opportunity for public comment.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is proposing to issue a generic letter that will request addressees to submit the analysis and pertinent assumptions used to determine the net positive suction head (NPSH) available for emergency core cooling (including core spray and decay heat removal) and containment heat removal pumps. This information will enable the NRC to determine if the NPSH analyses for reactor facilities are consistent with their respective current licensing basis. The NRC is seeking comment from interested parties regarding both the technical and

regulatory aspects of the proposed generic letter presented under the Supplementary Information heading.

The proposed generic letter has been endorsed by the Committee to Review Generic Requirements (CRGR). The relevant information that was sent to the CRGR will be placed in the NRC Public Document Room. The NRC will consider comments received from interested parties in the final evaluation of the proposed generic letter. The NRC's final evaluation will include a review of the technical position and, as appropriate, an analysis of the value/impact on licensees. Should this generic letter be issued by the NRC, it will become available for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room.

DATES: Comment period expires March 24, 1997. Comments submitted after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given except for comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSEES: Submit written comments to Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Mail Stop T-6D-69, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Written comments may also be delivered to 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 am to 4:15 pm, Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, N.W., (Lower Level), Washington, DC.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Howard (Jack) Dawson, (301) 415-3138.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

NRC GENERIC LETTER 97-XX:
ASSURANCE OF SUFFICIENT NET
POSITIVE SUCTION HEAD FOR
EMERGENCY CORE COOLING
AND CONTAINMENT HEAT
REMOVAL PUMPS

Addressees

All holders of operating licenses for nuclear power plants, except those who have certified to a permanent cessation of operations.

Purpose

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is issuing this generic letter (GL) to request that addressees submit the analysis and pertinent assumptions used to determine the net positive suction head (NPSH) available for emergency core cooling (including core spray and decay heat removal) and containment heat removal pumps. This information will enable the NRC to determine if the NPSH analyses for reactor facilities are