

### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 10, 1997, the staff consulted with the Ohio State official, C. O'Clare of the Ohio Emergency Management Agency, 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 Cleveland Electric Illuminating Company submittal dated December 13, 1996, supplemented by letter dated February 14, 1997, 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 Perry Public Library, 3753 Main Street, Perry, Ohio 44081.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 30th day of April 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Jon B. Hopkins, Sr.**

*Project Manager, Project Directorate III-3, Division of Reactor Projects III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-11855 Filed 5-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-302]

### **Florida Power Corporation; 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 to Facility Operating License No. DPR-72 issued to Florida Power Corporation, (the licensee), for operation of the Crystal River Unit 3 Nuclear Generating Plant (CR3) located in Citrus County, Florida.

### **Environmental Assessment**

#### *Identification of Proposed Action*

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated June 22, as supplemented November 22, 1995 and January 31, 1996 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 exemption would allow implementation of a hand geometry biometric system to the site access control such that photograph identification badges 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.

10 CFR 73.55(d), "Access Requirements," paragraph (1), specifies that "licensee shall control all points of personnel and vehicle access into a protected area." 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) specifies that "A numbered picture badge identification system shall be used for all individuals who are authorized access to protected areas without escort." 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5) 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 CR3 is controlled through the use of a photograph on a badge and a separate keycard (hereafter, these are referred to as "badge"). The security officers at each entrance station use the photograph on the badge to visually identify the individual requesting access. The badges for both licensee employees and contract personnel who have been granted unescorted access are issued upon entrance at each entrance/exit location and are returned upon exit. The badges are stored and are retrievable at each entrance/exit location. In accordance with 10 CFR 73.55(d)(5), contractors are not allowed to take badges offsite. In accordance with the plant's physical security plans, neither licensee employees nor contractors are allowed to take badges offsite.

The licensee proposes to implement an alternative unescorted access control system which would eliminate the need to issue and retrieve badges at each 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 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, 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 badge 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 demonstrated that the proposed hand geometry system would provide enhanced site access control. Since both the badge and hand geometry would be necessary for access into the protected area, the proposed system would provide a positive verification process. Potential loss of a badge by an individual, as a result of taking the badge offsite, would not enable an unauthorized entry into protected areas. The licensee will implement a process for testing the proposed system to ensure a continued overall level of performance equivalent to that specified in the regulation. The Physical Security Plans for the facility 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 offsite.

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 areas.

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 non-radiological impacts, the proposed action involves features located within the restricted area as defined in 10 CFR Part 20. The proposed change 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.

#### *Alternative to the Proposed Action*

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 did not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statements related to operation of CR3, dated May 1973.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 28, 1997 the staff consulted with the Florida State Official, Mr. Mike Stephens of the Florida Department of Health and Rehabilitative Services, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

#### **Finding of No Significant Impact**

The Commission has determined not to prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption. 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.

For further details with respect to this action, see the request for exemption dated June 22, 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 Coastal Region Library, 8619 W. Crystal Street, Crystal River, Florida 32629.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of May 1997.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Frederick J. Hebdon,**

*Director, Project Directorate II-3, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 97-11854 Filed 5-6-97; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

[Docket No. 50-219]

### **GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al. Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station 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. DPR-16, issued to GPU Nuclear Corporation, et al. (the licensee), for operation of the Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station, located in Ocean County, New Jersey.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

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

The proposed action would revise the technical specifications (TSs) to reflect implementation of the revised 10 CFR part 20 which was published in the **Federal Register** on May 21, 1991 (56 FR 23391), and implemented at Oyster Creek on January 1, 1994.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated November 12, 1996, as supplemented November 27, 1996.

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

The proposed action is needed in order to retain operational flexibility consistent with 10 CFR part 50, Appendix I, concurrent with the implementation of the revised 10 CFR part 20.

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

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that implementation of the proposed action, in regards to the actual release rates as referenced in the TSs as a dose rate to the maximally exposed member of the public, will not increase the types or amounts of effluents that may be released offsite. 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 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 Oyster Creek Nuclear Generating Station.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 15, 1997, the staff consulted with the New Jersey State official, Richard Pinney of the State of New Jersey, Department of Environmental Protection 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 November 12, 1996, as supplemented by letter dated November 27, 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 room located at the Ocean County Library, Reference Department, 101 Washington Street, Toms River, NJ 08753.