

an Information Collection Request (ICR) has been forwarded to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) for review and comment. The ICR describes the nature of the information collection and its expected cost and burden.

DATES: Comments must be submitted on or before June 16, 1995.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Susan Green at (202) 632-1509.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Title

Application for Literacy Leader Fellowships which will provide assistance to individuals pursuing careers in adult education or literacy in the areas of instruction, management, research, or innovation and adult new learners. Under the program, career literacy workers and adult learners are applicants for fellowships.

Abstract

The National Literacy Act of 1991 established the National Institute for Literacy and required that the Institute award fellowships to engage in research, education, training, technical assistance, or other activities to advance the field of adult education or literacy, including the training of volunteer literacy providers at the national, State, or local level. Evaluations to determine successful applicants will be made by a panel of literacy experts using the published criteria. The Institute will use this information to make a maximum of four fellowships for a period of no less than 3 nor more than 12 months of full-time activity or the equivalent in less than full-time participation.

Burden Statement: The burden for this collection of information is estimated at 4 hours per response. This estimate includes the time needed to review instructions, complete the form, and review the collection of information.

Respondents: Individuals.

Estimated Number of Respondent: 100.

Estimated number of Responses Per Respondent: 1.

Estimated Total Annual Burden on Respondents: 400 hours.

Frequency of Collection: One time. Send comments regarding the burden estimate, or any other aspect of the information collection, including suggestions for reducing the burden to: Susan Green, National Institute for Literacy, 800 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20006, and Dan Chenok, Office of Management and Budget, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs, 725 17th St., NW, Washington, DC 20503.

Dated: June 2, 1995.

Andrew J. Hartman,

Director, NIFL.

[FR Doc. 95-14068 Filed 6-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6055-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-255]

Consumers Power Company; Palisades Plant Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an exemption from Facility Operating License No. DPR-20, issued to Consumers Power Company, (the licensee), for operation of the Palisades Plant located in Van Buren County, Michigan.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

This Environmental Assessment has been prepared to address potential environmental issues related to the licensee's application of March 17, 1995, as supplemented April 26, 1995. The proposed action would exempt the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix J, Paragraph III.D.1.(a), to the extent that a one-time interval extension for the Type A test (containment integrated leak rate test) by approximately 21 months from the May 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage would be granted.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to permit the licensee to defer the Type A test from the May 1995 refueling outage to the 1997 refueling outage, thereby saving the cost of performing the test and eliminating the test period from the critical path time of the outage.

Environmental Impact of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed one-time exemption would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed and the proposed one-time exemption would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents. The licensee has analyzed the results of previous Type A tests performed at the Palisades Plant to show adequate containment performance and will continue to be required to conduct the Type B and C local leak rate tests which historically

have been shown to be the principal means of detecting containment leakage paths with the Type A tests confirming the Type B and C test results. It is also noted that the licensee, as a condition of the proposed exemption, would perform the visual containment inspection although it is only required by Appendix J to be conducted in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. The change will not increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types or amounts 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 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 NRC 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 Palisades Plant dated June 1972 and its addendum dated February 1978.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 4, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the Michigan State official, Dennis Hahn of the Michigan Department of Public Health, Nuclear Facilities and Environmental Monitoring, 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 letters dated March 17 and April 26, 1995, 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 Van Wylen Library, Hope College, Holland, Michigan 49423.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 31st day of May 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Janet L. Kennedy,

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

[FR Doc. 95-13975 Filed 6-6-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-458]

Entergy Operations, Inc.; River Bend Station, Unit 1; 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. NPF-47, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), for operation of the River Bend Station, Unit 1 (RBS), located in West Feliciana Parish, Louisiana.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated October 24, 1994, 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 picture badges and access control cards 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.

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, employee and contractor identification/access control badges are issued and retrieved on the occasion of each entry to and exit from the protected areas of the River Bend site. Station security personnel are required to maintain control of the badges while the individuals are offsite. Security personnel retain each identification/access control badge when not in use by the authorized individual, within appropriately designed storage receptacles inside a bullet-resistant enclosure. An individual who meets the access authorization requirements is issued the individual picture identification/access control card 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. The individual provides a personal identification number (PIN) to the issuing guard and is screened again by the issuing security officer using the picture identification on the access card. Having received the badge, the individual proceeds to the access portal, inserts the access control card into the card reader, and passes through the turnstile which is unlocked by the access card. Once inside the station, the access card allows entry only to preauthorized areas and the individual's PIN is no longer required.

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

their badge 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 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, 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 issuance, ensuring badge retrieval, and maintaining badges 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 photograph identification badge, 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 access authorization card 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 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 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/