### IV

For the foregoing reasons, pursuant to 10 CFR 73.55, the NRC staff has determined that the proposed alternative measures for protection against radiological sabotage meet "the same high assurance objective," and "the general performance requirements" of the regulation and that "the overall level of system performance provides protection against radiological sabotage equivalent" to that which would be provided by the regulation.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined that, pursuant to 10 CFR 73.5, this exemption is authorized by law and will not endanger life or property or common defense and security, and is otherwise in the public interest. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants the requested exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) to allow individuals not employed by SNC (i.e., contractors) to take their photo identification badges offsite in conjunction with the use of hand geometry biometrics system to control access into protected areas at the Farley Nuclear plant.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will not result in any significant adverse environmental impact (60 FR 29718).

For further details with respect to this action, see the request for exemption dated April 3, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the Houston-Love Memorial Library, 212 W. Burnshaw Street, Post Office Box 1369 Dothan, Alabama.

This exemption is effective upon issuance and is expected to be implemented when modifications, procedures, and training are completed.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of June 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Steven A. Varga,

Director, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation. [FR Doc. 95–14408 Filed 6–12–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

### [Docket No. 50-382]

## Entergy Operations Inc.; Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. NPF– 38, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc., (the licensee), for operation of the Waterford Steam Electric Station, Unit 3, located in St. Charles Parish, Louisiana.

### **Environmental Assessment**

#### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would change the technical specifications (TSs) to increase the maximum enrichment for the spent fuel pool and containment temporary storage rack from 4.1 to 4.9 weight percent U–235 when fuel assemblies contain fixed poisons.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated January 27, 1995.

## The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed so that the licensee can use higher fuel enrichment to meet cycle energy requirements and to permit future operation with longer fuel cycles.

# Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revisions to the TSs. The proposed revisions would permit storage of fuel enriched to a nominal 4.9 weight percent U-235. The safety considerations associated with storing new and spent fuel of a higher enrichment have been evaluated by the NRC staff. The staff has concluded that such changes would not adversely affect plant safety. The proposed changes have no adverse effect on the probability of any accident. No changes are being made in the types or amounts of any radiological effluents that may be released offsite. There is no significant increase in the allowable individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposure.

The environmental impacts of transportation resulting from the use of higher enrichment fuel and extended irradiation (an enveloping case for Waterford Unit 3) were published and discussed in the staff assessment entitled, "NRC Assessment of the **Environmental Effects of Transportation Resulting from Extended Fuel** Enrichment and Irradiation," dated July 7, 1988, and published in the Federal Register (53 FR 30355) on August 11, 1988, as corrected on August 24, 1988 (53 FR 32322) in connection with Shearon Harris Nuclear Power Plant, Unit 1, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact. As indicated therein, the environmental cost contribution of the proposed increase in the fuel enrichment and irradiation limits are either unchanged

or may, in fact, be reduced from those summarized in Table S–4 as set forth in 10 CFR 51.52(c). Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action involves 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 Waterford Unit 3.

### Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 23, 1995, the staff consulted with the Louisiana State official, Prosanta Chowdhury of the Louisiana Radiation Protection Division, 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 27, 1995, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, and at the local public document room located at the University of New Orleans Library,