

verification of the hand geometry registered with the badge be performed as discussed above. Thus, the proposed system provides an identity verification process that is equivalent to the existing process.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that the exemption to allow individuals not employed by the licensee to take their picture badges off site will not result in an increase in the risk that an unauthorized individual could potentially enter the protected area. Consequently, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

The proposed exemption 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. The principal alternative to the proposed action would be to deny the requested action. Denial of the requested action would not significantly enhance the environment in that the proposed action will result in a process that is equivalent to the existing identification verification process.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in connection with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's Final Environmental Statement dated December 1972, related to the operation of the Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 15, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Mr. Frank Niziolek; Head, Reactor Safety Section; Division of Engineering; Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety; regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### *Finding of No Significant Impact*

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. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to

prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

For further details with respect to this, see the licensee's letter dated October 25, 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 Waukegan Public Library, 128 N. County Street, Waukegan, Illinois 60085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 13th day of December 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
Robert A. Capra,  
*Director, Project Directorate III-2, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-31157 Filed 12-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **[Docket Nos. 50-413 and 50-414]**

#### **Duke Power Co. et al.; Catawba Nuclear Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2 Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-35 and NPF-52, issued to Duke Power Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Catawba Nuclear Station, Units 1 and 2, located in York County, South Carolina.

#### *Environmental Assessment*

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

By letter dated September 5, 1995, Duke Power Company submitted a proposal for amendments of the Facility Operating Licenses that would allow the Catawba Units 1 and 2 Containment Airborne Particulate Radiation Monitors (CAPRMs, 1/2 EMF38(L)) to be reclassified in the Updated Final Safety Analysis Report (UFSAR) as non-seismic Category I.

The Catawba operating license Safety Evaluation Report (SER, NUREG-0954), Section 5.2.5, states that the CAPRMs are designed to seismic Category I requirements. The basis for this determination was Section 5.2.5 of the Catawba UFSAR, which currently states that the CAPRMs would remain functional during and following a safe shutdown earthquake (SSE) as recommended in Position C.6 of Regulatory Guide (RG) 1.45 "Reactor Coolant Pressure Boundary Leakage Detection Systems."

By letter dated September 8, 1994, the licensee informed the staff that sufficient documentation did not exist

to show that the subject monitors were seismically qualified to withstand the SSE. By letter dated September 5, 1995, the licensee stated that the matter involved an unreviewed safety question and requested amendments to its Facility Operating Licenses including proposed changes to the UFSAR, which would clarify that the CAPRMs are not designed to remain functional following the SSE. The licensee has proposed an alternative to Position C.6 of RG 1.45 by showing that adequate instrumentation and procedures will be available to assess conditions inside containment following a seismic event comparable to an SSE and that, accordingly, the seismic qualification requirement for the CAPRMs may be deleted from the UFSAR.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendments dated September 5, 1995.

#### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action is needed so that the appropriate seismic qualification for the CAPRMs can be reflected in the UFSAR.

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revisions to the UFSAR. The proposed revisions would permit the Containment Airborne Particulate Radiation Monitors (1/2 EMF38(L)) at Catawba Units 1 and 2 to be classified as non-seismic Category I. The safety considerations associated with this re-classification have been evaluated by the NRC staff. The staff has concluded that the licensee has demonstrated an acceptable alternative to Position C.6 of RG 1.45 by showing that adequate instrumentation and procedures will be available to assess conditions inside containment following a seismic event comparable to an SSE. 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.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendments.

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.