Federal Advisory Committee Act (FACA) (Pub. L. 82–463). Pursuant to Section 10(a) of FACA, this is to announce that the Task Force will meet at the time and place shown below.

TIME AND PLACE: The meeting will be held on Thursday, June 22, 1995, from approximately 9 a.m. to 4 p.m. and on Friday, June 23, 1995, from approximately 9 a.m. to 3 p.m. in Conference Room N–3437 B–D in the Department of Labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Washington, DC.

Agenda

At this meeting, the Task Force intends to hear testimony on and discuss the following topics, among others: (1) Effects on finance, budget, and pension trends on labor-management-cooperation and (2) experiences of state or local elected officials in implementing workplace changes through labor-management cooperation.

Public Participation

The meeting will be open to the pubic. Seating will be available on a first-come, first-served basis. Individuals with disabilities wishing to attend should contact the Task Force if special accommodations are necessary. Individuals or organizations wishing to submit written statements should send 20 copies on or before June 14 to Mr. Charles A. Richards, Designated Federal Official, Secretary of Labor's Task Force on Excellence in State and Local Government through Labor-Management Cooperation, U.S. Department of labor, 200 Constitution Avenue, NW, Room S–2203, Washington, DC 20210. These statements will be thoroughly reviewed and become part of the record.

For the purposes of this meeting, the Task Force is primarily interested in statements that address the topics mentioned above under the heading ''Agenda.'' However, the Task Force continues to welcome submissions that address the questions in the mission statement and the following eight general areas: (1) Finding Models, Ingredients, and Barriers to Service Excellence and Labor-Management Cooperation and, as the following relate to promotion workplace cooperation and excellence; (2) Bargaining and Related Institutions and Practices; (3) Conflict Resolution Skills, Practices, and Institutions; (4) Legal and Regulatory Issues; (5) Effects of Civil Service; (6) Ensuring a High-Performance Work Environment; (7) Political and Electoral Considerations and Relationships; and (8) Financial Background, Financial Security, and Budget Systems.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Charles A. Richards, Designated Federal Official, Secretary of Labor's Task Force on Excellence in State and Local Government through Labor-Management Cooperation, U.S. Department of labor, Room S–2203, Washington, DC 20210, (202) 219–6231.

Signed at Washington, DC, this 22nd day of May 1995.

Robert B. Reich,

Secretary of Labor.

[FR Doc. 95–12961 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 4510–86–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–334 and 50–412]

Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

In the matter of Duquesne Light Company; Ohio Edison Company; Pennsylvania Power Company; The Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company; and The Toledo Edison Company.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from certain requirements of its regulations to Facility Operating Licenses No. DPR–66 and NPF–73, issued to Duquesne Light Company, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Beaver Valley Power Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Beaver County, Pennsylvania.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated February 8, 1995, for exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 73.55, ''Requirements for physical protection of licensed activities in nuclear power reactors against radiological sabotage.'' The exemption would allow implementation of a hand geometry biometric system for site access control such that combined picture badges/keycards for certain non-employees can be taken offsite.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Pursuant to 10 CFR 73.55, paragraph (a), the licensee shall establish and maintain an onsite physical protection system and security organization.

Paragraph (1) of 10 CFR 73.55(d), ''Access Requirements,'' specifies that ''licensee shall control all points of personnel and vehicle access into a protected area.'' Paragraph (5) of 10 CFR 73.55(d) specifies that ''A numbered picture badge identification system shall be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escort.'' Paragraph (5) of 10 CFR 73.55(d) also states that an individual not employed by the licensee (i.e., contractors) may be authorized access to protected areas without escort provided the individual ''receives a picture badge upon entrance into the protected area which must be returned upon exit from the protected area * * *.''

Currently, employee and contractor combined identification badges/keycards are issued and retrieved on the occasion of each entry to and exit from the protected areas of the Beaver Valley Power Station site. Station security personnel are required to maintain control of the badges while the individuals are offsite. This practice has been in effect at the Beaver Valley Power Station since the operating license was issued. Security personnel retain each identification badge/keycard, when not in use by the authorized individual, within appropriately designed storage receptacles inside a bullet-resistance enclosure. An individual who meets the access authorization requirements is issued an individual picture identification card/keycard which allows entry into preauthorized areas of the station. While entering the plant in the present configuration, an authorized individual is ''screened'' by the required detection equipment and by the issuing security officer. Having received the badge/keycard, the individual proceeds to the access portal, inserts the badge/keycard into the card reader and passes through the turnstile which unlocks if the badge/keycard is valid.

This present procedure is labor intensive since security personnel are required to verify badge/keycard issuance, ensure badge/keycard retrieval, and maintain the badges/keycards in orderly storage until the next entry into the protected area. The regulations permit employees to remove their badges from the site, but an exemption from 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) is required to permit contractors to take their badges offsite instead of returning them when exiting the site.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the licensee's application. Under the proposed system, all individuals authorized to gain unescorted access will have the physical characteristics of their hand (hand geometry) recorded with their badge/keycard number. Since the hand geometry is unique to each individual

and its application in the entry screening function would preclude unauthorized use of a badge/keycard, the requested exemption would allow employees and contractors to keep their badges at the time of exiting the protected area. The process of verifying badge/keycard issuance, ensuring badge/keycard retrieval, and maintaining badges/keycards, could be eliminated while the balance of the access procedure would remain intact. Firearm, explosive, and metal detection equipment and provisions for conducting searches will remain as well. The security officer responsible for the last access control function (controlling admission to the protected area) will also remain isolated within a bullet-resistant structure in order to assure his or her ability to respond or to summon assistance.

Use of a hand geometry biometrics system exceeds the present verification methodology's capability to discern an individual's identity. Unlike the combined photograph identification badge/keycard, hand geometry is nontransferable. During the initial access authorization or registration process, hand measurements are recorded and the template is stored for subsequent use in the identity verification process required for entry into the protected area. Authorized individuals insert their badge/keycard into the card reader and the biometrics system records an image of the hand geometry. The unique features of the newly recorded image are then compared to the template previously stored in the database. Access is ultimately granted based on the degree to which the characteristics of the image match those of the ''signature'' template.

Since both the badge/keycard and hand geometry would be necessary for access into the protected area, the proposed system would provide for a positive verification process. Potential loss of a badge/keycard by an individual, as a result of taking the badge offsite, would not enable an unauthorized entry into protected areas.

The access process will continue to be under the observation of security personnel. The system of identification badges/keycards will continue to be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escorts. Badges/keycards will continue to be displayed by all individuals while inside the protected area. Addition of a hand geometry biometrics system will provide a significant contribution to effective implementation of the security plan at the site.

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 effect 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 Statements for the Beaver Valley Power Station Units Nos. 1 and 2.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 18, 1995, the staff consulted with the Pennsylvania State official, Robert C. Maiers of the Bureau of Radiation Protection. Department of Environmental Resources, 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 February 8, 1995, which is 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 B.F. Jones Memorial Library, 663 Franklin Avenue, Aliquippa, Pennsylvania 15001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

John F. Stolz,

Director, Project Directorate I–2, Division of Reactor Projects–I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–12970 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Supplement 1 to Revision 1 to Generic Letter 92–01, ''Reactor Vessel Structural Integrity''; Issued

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of issuance.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) issued Supplement 1 to Revision 1 to Generic Letter 92–01, ''Reactor Vessel Structural Integrity,'' on May 19, 1995. This generic letter supplement will be available in the NRC Public Document Room under accession number 9505090312. This generic letter supplement was issued on an expedited basis in accordance with NRC procedures. This generic letter supplement is discussed in Commission information paper SECY–95–118 which will also be available in the NRC Public Document Room.

DATES: The generic letter supplement was issued on May 19, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Not applicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Edwin M. Hackett, (301) 415–2751.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: Not applicable.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission

Brian K. Grimes,

Director, Division of Project Support, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–12969 Filed 5–25–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

Uranium Recovery Facilities: Availability of Staff Technical Position on Effluent Disposal at Licensed Uranium Recovery Facilities

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of availability.