

ADDRESSES: Written objections are to be filed with Coastal Systems Station, Dahlgren Div, NSWC, 6703 W. Hwy 98, Code XP01L, Panama City, FL 32407-7001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Harvey A. Gilbert, Counsel, Coastal Systems Station, 6703 W. Hwy 98, Code XP01L, Panama City, FL 32407-7001, telephone (850) 234-4646, fax (850) 235-5497, or E-Mail at gilbertha@ncsc.navy.mil.

Authority: 35 U.S.C. 207, 37 CFR Part 404.

Dated: June 25, 2002.

R.E. Vincent II,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 02-17254 Filed 7-9-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-P

DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE

Department of the Navy

Notice of Intent To Grant Exclusive Patent License; SeliCor, Inc.

AGENCY: Department of the Navy, DOD.

ACTION: Notice.

SUMMARY: The Department of the Navy hereby gives notice of its intent to grant to SeliCor, Inc., a revocable, nonassignable, exclusive license to practice worldwide the Government-owned inventions described in U.S. Patent No. 6,094,599 issued 25 July 2000, entitled "RF Diathermy and Faradic Muscle Stimulation"; in the field of Body-Friendly Radio-Frequency (RF) warming devices.

DATES: Anyone wishing to object to the grant of this license has fifteen (15) days from the date of this notice to file written objections along with supporting evidence, if any.

ADDRESSES: Written objections are to be filed with the Office of Technology Transfer, Naval Medical Research Center, 503 Robert Grant Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20910-7500.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. Charles Schlagel, Director, Office of Technology Transfer, Naval Medical Research Center, 503 Robert Grant Ave., Silver Spring, MD 20910-7500, telephone (301) 319-7428.

Dated: June 20, 2002.

R.E. Vincent II,

Lieutenant Commander, Judge Advocate General's Corps, U.S. Navy, Federal Register Liaison Officer.

[FR Doc. 02-17253 Filed 7-9-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 3810-FF-M

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY

Interim Management of Nuclear Materials

AGENCY: Department of Energy.

ACTION: Supplemental record of decision.

SUMMARY: On December 12, 1995, the U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) issued a Record of Decision (ROD) and Notice of Preferred Alternatives, 60 FR 65300 (December 19, 1995), for the final environmental impact statement, Interim Management of Nuclear Materials (IMNM EIS) (DOE/EIS-0220, October 1995), at the Savannah River Site (SRS), Aiken, South Carolina. As part of that ROD, DOE decided to stabilize plutonium-239 solutions stored in H-Canyon by one of three methods: processing to metal in FB-Line, processing to oxide in H-Area facilities, or vitrification in F-Canyon. In that same ROD, the Department announced that "a subsequent Record of Decision will be issued to specify the final strategy for stabilizing the plutonium-239 solutions" (60 FR 65302). DOE issued a Supplemental ROD on September 6, 1996 (61 FR 48474, September 13, 1996), selecting the Process to Metal alternative for managing the H-Canyon plutonium-239 solutions. DOE subsequently amended this decision (62 FR 61099, November 14, 1997) and instead selected the Process to Oxide alternative for managing these solutions.

Now, after further review of stabilization costs, schedules, and program requirements, DOE has decided to implement the Processing and Storage for Vitrification in the Defense Waste Processing Facility alternative as well as the Process to Oxide alternative previously selected for the management of the H-Canyon plutonium solutions. The environmental impacts of the newly-selected alternative were analyzed in the IMNM EIS. This alternative includes the transfer of the solutions to the SRS high-level waste (HLW) system, vitrification of the liquid HLW in the Defense Waste Processing Facility, and storage of the resultant canisters in appropriate waste storage facilities at the SRS pending disposal in a geologic repository.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION: For further information on the interim management of nuclear materials at the SRS, to receive a copy of the final IMNM EIS or the IMNM ROD(s), contact: Andrew R. Grainger, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Compliance Officer, U.S. Department of Energy, Savannah River Operations Office, Building 730B,

Room 2418, Aiken, South Carolina 29802, (800) 881-7292. Internet: drew.grainger@srs.gov.

For further information on the DOE NEPA process, contact: Carol M. Borgstrom, Director, Office of NEPA Policy and Compliance (EH-42), U.S. Department of Energy, 1000 Independence Avenue, SW., Washington, DC 20585, (202) 586-4600, or leave a message at (800) 472-2756.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Background

NEPA Reviews and Decisions

The U.S. Department of Energy (DOE) prepared a final environmental impact statement, Interim Management of Nuclear Materials (IMNM EIS) (DOE/EIS-0220, October 1995), in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA, and DOE implementing procedures. The IMNM EIS assessed the potential environmental impacts of actions necessary to safely manage nuclear materials at the SRS, near Aiken, South Carolina, until decisions on their future use or ultimate disposition are made and implemented. The IMNM EIS grouped the nuclear materials at the SRS into three categories: Stable, Programmatic (three material types), and Candidates for Stabilization (seven material types). Some of the "Programmatic" and all of the "Candidates for Stabilization" materials could have presented environmental, safety and health vulnerabilities in their then-current storage condition. For materials that could present environmental, safety, or health vulnerabilities within approximately 10 years of the NEPA analysis (performed in 1995), the implementation of the IMNM EIS action alternatives would allow safe storage of plutonium and uranium materials pending decisions and actions on the ultimate disposition of the materials.

The IMNM EIS analyzed several alternatives, including the No Action alternative (Continued Storage), for the interim management of eleven (11) types of nuclear materials at the SRS. All of the alternatives, except No Action, would support DOE's objective of removing nuclear materials from vulnerable conditions and from vulnerable facilities in preparation for facility decontamination and decommissioning. For ten of these material types (all but Stable), DOE evaluated the impacts of the Processing for Storage and Vitrification in the Defense Waste Processing Facility alternative. The previously-issued