

lock fails a leakage rate test during a period of frequent opening, the air lock shall be required to pass two consecutive leakage rate tests at a test interval of 72 hours prior to returning to the 30-day interval. Since the Grand Gulf air lock doors have testable seals, testing the seals fulfills the 30-day test requirement. This exemption will continue in effect until startup from RFO 9.

VII

The staff's safety evaluation, which is enclosed and summarized above, concludes that the licensee's proposed extension of Appendix J test intervals is acceptable. This exemption will remain valid until startup following Refueling Outage 9. This approval is based on the assumption that all other aspects of Appendix J testing not explicitly addressed will be conducted in accordance with Appendix J.

Section 50.12 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations, "Specific Exemptions", delineates the conditions which must be satisfied in order for the Commission to grant an exemption from the regulations of 10 CFR Part 50. The proposed exemption must not violate applicable law, it must not "present an undue risk to the public health and safety", and must be "consistent with the common defense and security". The licensee states that it believes these conditions are satisfied. The staff concurs.

In addition, 10 CFR 50.12 states that the Commission will not consider granting an exemption unless special circumstances are present. The licensee, in the August 13, 1993, submittal presented its argument as to why this exemption request meets several of the special circumstances specified in 10 CFR 50.12. It is the staff's opinion that the licensee's proposal satisfies special circumstance 50.12(a)(2)(iv). Special circumstance (iv) states that: The exemption would result in benefit to the public health and safety that compensates for any decrease in safety that may result from the grant of the exemption.

It is the staff's judgment that there is a significant public benefit to be derived from granting the licensee's exemption request to 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J. The licensee's proposal was detailed and well thought-out and thoroughly considered the effect on safety of the proposed changes. Reviewing this exemption request was beneficial to the staff's Appendix J rulemaking effort. Granting the exemption will assist the staff in assessing the process of implementing a performance-based containment leakage rate testing rule

which, in turn, is of a clear benefit to the public. The staff considers any decrease in safety that may result from granting the exemption to be very small. This was confirmed by the risk studies discussed in Section 3 of the safety evaluation on this exemption request.

Accordingly, the Commission has determined, pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a), that this exemption is authorized by law and will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. In addition, the Commission has found special circumstances in that granting of this exemption will result in a benefit to public health and safety that compensates for any decrease in safety that may result from the grant of the exemption. Therefore, the Commission hereby grants the exemption from 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Sections III.D.1(a), III.D.2(a) and III.D.3 and Section III.D.(b)(i) and III.D.2(b)(iii). The specific exemptions are stated as in Sections IV, V, and VI above.

Pursuant to 10 CFR 51.32, the Commission has determined that the granting of this exemption will have no significant impact on the quality of the human environment (60 FR 19791). The exemption is effective upon issuance.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Elinor G. Adensam

Acting Director, Division of Reactor Projects-III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-10887 Filed 5-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-445 and 50-446]

Texas Utilities Electric Co., Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station, 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 exemption from certain requirements of its regulations for Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-87 and NPF-89, issued to Texas Utilities Electric Company (TU Electric, the licensee), for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2, located in Somervell County, Texas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow implementation of a hand geometry biometric system of site access control such that photograph identification badges can be taken off site.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated January 16, 1995 (TXX-95012), as supplemented by letters dated March 1 (TXX-95064), and April 3, 1995 (TXX-95089), for exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 73.55, "Requirements for physical protection of licensed activities in nuclear power plant reactors against radiological sabotage."

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 * * *" It is specified in 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) that "A numbered picture badge identification system shall be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escort." It 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, unescorted access into protected areas of the CPSES is controlled through the use of a photograph on a combination badge and keycard. (Hereafter, these are referred to as badges). The security officers at the entrance station use the photograph on the badge to visually identify the individual requesting access. The badges for both licensee employees and contractor personnel who have been granted unescorted access are issued upon entrance at the entrance/exit location and are returned upon exit. The badges are stored and are retrievable at the entrance/exit location. In accordance with 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5), contractor individuals are not allowed to take badges off site. In accordance with the plant's physical security plans, neither licensee employees nor contractors are allowed to take badges off site.

The licensee proposes to implement an alternative unescorted access control system which would eliminate the need to issue and retrieve badges at the entrance/exit location and would allow all individuals with unescorted access to keep their badges with them when departing the site.

An exemption from 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) is required to permit contractors to take their badges off site

instead of returning them when exiting the site.

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action. Under the proposed system, each individual who is authorized for unescorted entry into protected areas would have the physical characteristics of their hand (hand geometry) registered with their badge number in the access control system. When an individual enters the badge into the card reader and places the hand on the measuring surface, the system would record the individual's hand image. The unique characteristics of the extracted hand image would be compared with the previously stored template to verify authorization for entry. Individuals, including licensee employees and contractors, would be allowed to keep their badges with them when they depart the site.

Based on a Sandia report entitled "A Performance Evaluation of Biometric Identification Devices" (SAND91-0276 UC-906 Unlimited Release, printed June 1991), and on its experience with the current photo-identification system, the licensee stated that the false acceptance rate of the proposed hand geometry system is comparable to that of the current system. The licensee stated that the use of the badges with the hand geometry system would increase the overall level of access control. Since both the badge 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 by an individual, as a result of taking the badge off site, would not enable an unauthorized entry into protected areas. The licensee will implement a process for testing the proposed system to ensure continued overall level of performance equivalent to that specified in the regulation. The Physical Security Plan for CPSES will be revised to include implementation and testing of the hand geometry access control system and to allow licensee employees and contractors to take their badges off site.

The access process will continue to be under the observation of security personnel. A numbered picture badge identification system will continue to be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escorts. Badges will continue to be displayed by all individuals while inside the protected area.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and

concludes that the change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of any effluent that may be released off site, 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 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 CPSES, Units 1 and 2 dated October 1989.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 7, 1995, the staff consulted with Texas State official, Mr. John Haygood of the Texas Department of Health, Bureau of Radiation control, 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 16, 1995 (TXX-95012), as supplemented by letters dated March 1

(TXX-95064), and April 3, 1995 (TXX-95089), 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 University of Texas at Arlington Library, Government Publications/Maps, 702 College, P.O. Box 19497, Arlington, TX 76019.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 27th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Timothy J. Polich,

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

[FR Doc. 95-10888 Filed 5-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

Use of NUMARC/EPRI Report TR-102348 for Analog-to-Digital Replacements; Issued

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of issuance.

SUMMARY: The Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) has issued Generic Letter 95-02 on informing licensees for reactors of the NRC staff's new position on the use of Nuclear Management and Resource Council/Electric Power Research Institute (NUMARC/EPRI) Report TR-102348, "Guideline on Licensing Digital Upgrades," dated December 1993, as acceptable guidance for determining when an analog-to-digital replacement can be performed without prior NRC staff approval under the requirements of § 50.59 of Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations. This generic letter is available in the Public Document Rooms under accession number 9504140227. The resolution of public comments received on this generic letter is discussed in a memorandum which is also available in the Public Document Rooms under accession number 9504260141.

DATES: The generic letter was issued on April 26, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Not applicable.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Paul J. Loeser at (301) 415-2825.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: None.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 26th day of April, 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Boen-Daï Liaw,

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

[FR Doc. 95-10890 Filed 5-2-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M