

provides approximately 30 flight opportunities per year to space scientists involved in research relating to the upper atmosphere, plasma, physics, solar physics, planetary atmospheres, galactic astronomy, high energy astrophysics, and microgravity. The launch vehicles used are relatively small.

The proposed action and NASA's preferred alternative is the continued operation of the NASA SRP as presently managed. The DSEIS focuses on programmatic changes in the NASA SRP that have taken place since the original FEIS was issued in 1973 by deleting launch vehicles that are no longer used, adding new launch vehicles and systems currently being used, and reflecting changes in Federal and state environmental laws and regulations. The DSEIS addresses both the overall programmatic environmental impacts of the SRP and the site-specific environmental impacts at and in the area of the three principal domestic sounding rocket sites: Goddard Space Flight Center/Wallops Flight Facility, Wallops Island, Virginia; Poker Flat Research Range, Fairbanks, Alaska; and White Sands Missile Range, White Sands, New Mexico.

Benita A. Cooper,

Associate Administrator for Management Systems and Facilities.

[FR Doc. 95-14362 Filed 6-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

[Notice 95-037]

Intent To Grant a Partially Exclusive License

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of intent to grant a patent license.

SUMMARY: NASA hereby gives notice of intent to grant DuPont Advanced Composites, P.O. Box 6108, Newark, DE 19714, a partially exclusive license to practice the inventions described in U.S. Patent Application Numbers 08/209,512 entitled "Phenylethynyl Terminated Imide Oligomers," which was filed on March 3, 1994; and 08/330,773 entitled "Imide Oligomers Endcapped with Phenylethynyl Phthalic Anhydrides and Polymers Therefrom," which was filed on October 28, 1994, both of which are assigned to the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The partially exclusive license will contain appropriate terms and conditions to be negotiated in

accordance with the Department of Commerce Licensing Regulations (37 CFR part 404). NASA will negotiate the final terms and conditions and grant the license unless, within 60 days of the date of this notice, the Director of Patent Licensing receives written objections to the grant, together with supporting documentation. The Director of Patent Licensing will review all written responses to the notice and then recommend to the Associate General Counsel (Intellectual Property) whether to grant the license.

DATES: Comments to the notice must be received by August 11, 1995.

ADDRESSES: National Aeronautics and Space Administration, Code GP, Washington, DC 20546.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Harry Lupuloff, NASA, Director of Patent Licensing at (202) 358-2041.

Dated: June 2, 1995.

Edward A. Frankle,
General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 95-14312 Filed 6-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-395]

South Carolina Electric & Gas Company; South Carolina Public Service Authority; Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1; 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. NPF-12, issued to South Carolina Electric & Gas Company and South Carolina Public Service Authority, (the licensee), for operation of the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit No. 1, located in Fairfield County, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow the licensee to discontinue the seismic monitoring program (which includes a network of seismometers near the Monticello Reservoir) that was put in place to monitor the seismic activity associated with the impoundment of the Monticello Reservoir. The monitoring program is currently funded by the licensee and operated and maintained by the University of South Carolina.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for

amendment dated March 6, 1955, as supplemented May 5, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action was requested because the licensee believes that the burden and costs of the seismic monitoring program for reservoir induced seismicity are no longer justified.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The licensee's proposal will allow the seismic monitoring equipment to be permanently removed from current locations. This equipment is portable and is located around the Monticello Reservoir. The equipment is used solely for monitoring seismic activity around the reservoir and is not used for the operation of the plant. Based on the licensee's submittals and the discussions with other agencies and persons, the staff found that the removal of this equipment will have no significant impact on the environment.

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 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 since the proposed amendment will allow the licensee to remove the seismic monitoring equipment and the licensee's present license condition does not prohibit the licensee from removing and relocating the seismic monitoring equipment from

current locations. Thus, the current license condition already allows the licensee to permanently abandon the current monitoring sites (as long as alternate sites are selected).

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the Virgil C. Summer Nuclear Station, Unit 1.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

On April 14, 1995, the staff consulted with Mr. John Sims, Deputy of External Research, U.S. Geological Survey regarding the type of equipment used for seismic monitoring networks. Mr. Sims commented that the equipment was generally compact; therefore, he judged that there were no significant environmental impacts associated with the removal of the equipment and abandonment of the sites.

On April 24, 1995, the staff consulted with Dr. Pradeep Talwani, of the University of South Carolina (USC) regarding the planned disposition of the network monitoring sites if the licensee stops funding the program. Dr. Talwani maintains the seismic monitoring system for the licensee. Dr. Talwani stated that if the licensee stops funding the network, all but one of the monitoring sites will be abandoned (i.e., the equipment will be removed). Dr. Talwani also stated that the monitors were solar powered with battery backups. Therefore, he judged that there were no significant environmental impacts associated with the removal of the equipment and abandonment of the sites.

In accordance with its stated policy, on April 24, 1995, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Mr. Virgil Autry of the Bureau of Solid and Hazardous Waste Management, Department of Health and Environmental 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 letters dated March 6, 1995, and May 5, 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 Fairfield County Library, 300 Washington Street, Winnsboro, SC.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of June 1995.

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. 95-14300 Filed 6-9-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket Nos. 50-424 and 50-425]

Georgia Power Company, Et Al.; (Vogtle Electric Generating Plant, Units 1 and 2)

Exemption

I

Georgia Power Company, et al. (the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License Nos. NPR-68 and NPF-81, which authorize operation of the Vogtle Electric Generating Plant (VEGP), Units 1 and 2, respectively. The licenses provide, among other things, that the licensee is subject to all rules, regulations, and orders of the Commission now or hereafter in effect.

The facilities consist of two pressurized water reactors, VEGP Units 1 and 2, at the licensee's site located near Waynesboro, Georgia.

II

Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR), § 50.60, "Acceptance Criteria for Fracture Prevention Measures for Light-Water Nuclear Power Reactors for Normal Operation," states that all light-water nuclear power reactors must meet the fracture toughness and material surveillance program requirements for the reactor coolant pressure boundary as set forth in Appendices G and H to 10 CFR part 50. Appendix G to 10 CFR part 50 defines pressure/temperature (P/T) limits during any condition of normal operation, including anticipated operational occurrences and system hydrostatic tests to which the pressure boundary may be subjected over its service lifetime. Section 50.60 (b) specifies that alternatives to the described requirements in Appendices G and H to 10 CFR part 50 may be used when an exemption is granted by the Commission under 10 CFR 50.12.

To prevent low temperature overpressure transients that would produce pressure excursions exceeding the Appendix G P/T limits while the

reactor is operating at low temperatures, the licensee installed a low temperature overpressure (LTOP) system. The system includes pressure-relieving devices called Power-Operated Relief Valves (PORVs). The PORVs are set at a pressure low enough so that if an LTOP transient occurred, the mitigation system would prevent the pressure in the reactor vessel from exceeding the Appendix G P/T limits. To prevent the PORVs from lifting as a result of normal operating pressure surges (e.g., reactor coolant pump starting, and shifting operating charging pumps) with the reactor coolant system in a water solid condition, the operating pressure must be maintained below the PORV setpoint. In addition, in order to prevent cavitation of a reactor coolant pump, the operator must maintain a differential pressure across the reactor coolant pump seals. Hence, the licensee must operate the plant in a pressure window that is defined as the difference between the minimum required pressure to start a reactor coolant pump and the operating margin to prevent lifting of the PORVs due to normal operating pressure surges. The licensee's proposed LTOP analysis includes changes to account for the non-conservatism identified in Westinghouse Nuclear Safety Advisory Letter 93005A and NRC Information Notice 93-58. The new analysis accounts for the static head due to evaluation differences and the dynamic head effect of four reactor coolant pump (RCP) operation. By including these factors and using the Appendix G safety margins, the licensee determined that the operating margin to the PORV setpoint would be depleted at approximately 120 °F for Unit 1 and 145 °F for Unit 2. Therefore, operating with these limits could result in the lifting of the PORVs and cavitation of the reactor coolant pumps during normal operation.

The licensee proposed that in determining the design setpoint for LTOP events for Vogtle Units 1 and 2, the allowable pressure be determined using the safety margins developed in an alternate methodology in lieu of the safety margins currently required by Appendix G, 10 CFR part 50. Designated Code Case N-514, the proposed alternate methodology is consistent with guidelines developed by the American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Working Group on Operating Plant Criteria to define pressure limits during LTOP events that avoid certain unnecessary operational restrictions, provide adequate margins against failure of the reactor pressure vessel, and reduce the potential for unnecessary activation of pressure-relieving devices