

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.

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 this action would be to deny the requested amendments. Such action would not reduce the environmental impacts of plant operations.

#### *Alternative Use of Resources*

This action does not involve the use of resources not previously considered in the "Final Environmental Statement Related to the Operation of Catawba Nuclear Station Units 1 and 2," dated January 1983.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on November 30, 1995, the NRC staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mr. V. Autrey of the Bureau of Radiological Health, Department of Health and Environmental Controls, 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 license amendments.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee's letter dated September 5, 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 York County Library, 138 East Black Street, Rock Hill, South Carolina.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of December 1995.

For The Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Leonard A. Wiens, Acting Director,

*Project Directorate II-2, Division of Reactor Projects - I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 95-31158 Filed 12-21-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **Docket No. 50-344**

#### **Portland General Electric Company; Trojan Nuclear Plant; Notice of Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Final Finding of no Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering approving a Portland General Electric (PGE) proposed decommissioning plan for the Trojan Nuclear Plant (TNP) and issuing an order authorizing decommissioning of the facility.

#### *Description of the Proposed Action*

On January 27, 1993, PGE notified the NRC of their decision to permanently cease power operations after approximately 17 years of operation. The fuel was transferred to the spent fuel pool, and on May 5, 1993, the NRC amended the TNP Facility Operating License (NFP-1) to a Possession Only License, which allows the licensee to maintain but not operate the facility. On January 26, 1995, the licensee submitted an application to terminate the TNP Possession Only License. The application for termination of the TNP license included a proposed decommissioning plan and an supplement to the environmental report. The licensee proposes to decommission the TNP using a dismantlement (DECON) approach as defined in the "Final Generic Environmental Impact Statement on Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities" NUREG-0586, dated August 1988 (GEIS).

The licensee plans to precede the DECON radiological decontamination and dismantlement period with a five-year transition period. Transition period activities include the removal and disposal of selected large components, licensing and construction of an Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation (ISFSI), and transfer of the fuel to the ISFSI. Assessment of the environmental impact associated with the construction and operation of the Trojan ISFSI will be conducted during the licensing of the ISFSI. Radioactive structures, systems, and components that are removed from the facility during decommissioning will be shipped to a licensed burial site for permanent disposal.

#### *Summary of the Environmental Assessment*

The purpose of decommissioning a nuclear facility is to remove the facility safely from service, and to reduce residual radioactivity at the site to levels that permit the release of the property for unrestricted use. Once this state is

reached the license granted by the NRC may be terminated.

The NRC staff has reviewed the PGE decommissioning plan, and supplemental environmental report prepared in accordance with 10 CFR 51.53(b). To document its review, the staff has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) consistent with 10 CFR 51.95(b), which examined decommissioning alternatives, non-radiological and radiological impacts of decommissioning, and effects of postulated radiological accidents during decommissioning. The alternatives available for decommissioning—DECON, ENTOMB, SAFSTOR, and No Action—are evaluated and discussed in the GEIS. Based on its review of the proposed PGE decommissioning plan, the staff has determined that the environmental impacts associated with the decommissioning of TNP in accordance with the plan are either bounded by the impacts evaluated by the GEIS or in the NRC Final Environmental Statement related to Operation of Trojan Nuclear Plant dated August 1973. The staff also finds that the proposed decommissioning of TNP is in compliance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix I annual design objectives for offsite releases or 10 CFR Part 20.

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

The staff has reviewed the proposed decommissioning plan and supplement to the environmental report in accordance with the requirements of 10 CFR Part 51. The staff has concluded that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action and that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, the NRC has determined, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.31, not to prepare an environmental impact statement.

For further details with respect to this action, see the licensee application for termination of license, dated January 26, 1995 and updated November 13, 1995, and the NRC staff Environmental Assessment and Safety Evaluation Report. These documents are available for public inspection at the NRC Public Document Room, Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC, 20555, and at the Local Public Document Room for TNP at the Branford Price Millar Library, Portland State University, Portland, Oregon 97207. Single copies of the NRC staff Environmental Assessment and Safety Evaluation may be obtained from Dr. Michael T. Masnik, Senior Project Manager, Office of Nuclear Reactor