Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA 23681–0001; telephone (757) 864–9260; fax (757) 864–9190.

Dated: July 10, 1996.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–18410 Filed 7–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

[Notice (96–076)]

Notice of Prospective Patent License

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of prospective patent license.

SUMMARY: NASA hereby gives notice that Staged Vibration Corporation, of Norfolk, Virginia 23508, has applied for a partially exclusive license to practice the invention disclosed in NASA Case No. LAR–15348–1, entitled THIN-LAYER COMPOSITE-UNIMORPH PIEZOELECTRIC DRIVER AND SENSOR, ''THUNDER,'' for which a U.S. Patent Application was filed on April 4, 1995, by the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Written objections to the proposective grant of a license should be sent to Mr. George F. Helfrich, Patent Counsel, Langley Research Center.

DATES: Responses to this notice must be received by September 17, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. George F. Helfrich, Patent Counsel, Langley Research Center, Hampton, VA 23681–0001; telephone (757) 864–9260; fax (757) 864–9190.

Dated: July 10, 1996.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–18409 Filed 7–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

[Notice 96–075]

Notice of prospective patent license

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of Prospective Patent License.

SUMMARY: NASA hereby gives notice that Synkinetics, Inc., of Bedford, Massachusetts 01730, has applied for a partially exclusive license to practice the invention disclosed in NASA Case No. LAR–15348–1, entitled THIN-LAYER COMPOSITE-UNIMORPH PIEZOELECTRIC DRIVER AND SENSOR, ''THUNDER,'' for which a U.S. Patent Application was filed on April 4, 1995, by the United States of America as represented by the Administrator of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration. Written objections to the prospective grant of a license should be sent to Mr. George F. Helfrich, Patent Counsel, Langley Research Center.

DATES: Responses to this notice must be received by September 17, 1996.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. George F. Helfrich, Patent Counsel, Langley Research Center, Mail Code 212, Hampton, VA 23681–0001; telephone (757) 864–9260; fax (757) 864–9190.

Dated: July 10, 1996.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–18408 Filed 7–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NATIONAL CREDIT UNION ADMINISTRATION

Sunshine Act Meetings

TIME AND DATE: 12:30 p.m., Wednesday, July 24, 1996.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–3428.

STATUS: Open.

BOARD BRIEFING:

1. Insurance Fund Report.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Open Meeting.
2. Midsession Budget Review.
3. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Expand its Community Charter.
4. Request from a Federal Credit Union to Convert to a Community Charter.
5. Final Rule: Amendment to Sections 701.12 and 701.13, NCUA's Rules and Regulations, Supervisory Committee Audits and Verifications.
6. Final Rule: Amendment to Part 760, NCUA's Rules and Regulations, Flood Insurance.
7. Requests from Corporate Credit Unions for Field of Membership Amendments.
8. Request from Corporate Federal Credit Union for a Bylaw Amendment.
9. Delegations of Authority.
10. General Indemnification Policy for NCUA Employees.

TIME AND DATE: 11:00 a.m., Wednesday, July 24, 1996.

PLACE: Board Room, 7th Floor, Room 7047, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314–3428.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED:

1. Approval of Minutes of Previous Closed Meetings.
2. Personnel Action(s). Closed pursuant to exemptions (2) and (6).

RECESS: 11:30 a.m.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Becky Baker, Secretary of the Board, Telephone (703) 518–6304.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 96–18534 Filed 7–17–96; 2:31 pm]

BILLING CODE 7535–01–M

NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Sunshine Act Meeting: Regular Meeting of the Board of Directors

TIME AND DATE: 2:30 p.m., Wednesday, July 31, 1996.

PLACE: Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, 1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 800, Board Room, Washington, D.C. 20005.

STATUS: Open.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Jeffrey T. Bryson, General Counsel/Secretary, 202/376–2441.

AGENDA:

I. Call to Order
II. Approval of Minutes: May 17, 1996, Eighteenth Annual Meeting
III. Resolution of Appreciation
IV. Budget Committee Report: July 22, 1996, Meeting
  a. Proposed FY 1996 Request for Budget Revision
  b. Proposed FY 1997 Budget Request
  c. Proposed Revised FY 1998 Budget Submission to OMB
V. Treasurer's Report
VI. Executive Director's Quarterly Management Report
VII. Adjourn

Jeffrey T. Bryson,

General Counsel/Secretary.

[FR Doc. 96–18496 Filed 7–17–96; 2:23 pm]

BILLING CODE 7570–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 040–0017]

DOW Chemical Company; Environmental Statement

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Notice of Environmental Assessment, Finding of No Significant

Impact, and Opportunity for Hearing Related to Amendment of Materials License No. STB–527 for the Dow Chemical Company, Midland, Michigan.

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission is considering a license amendment request, submitted by The Dow Chemical Company (Dow). The proposed action is the removal of thorium contaminated slag storage piles at Dow's Midland and Bay City, Michigan, plant sites, and the disposal of the thorium-contaminated material at the Envirocare of Utah, Inc. (Envirocare) low-level radioactive waste disposal facility.

Summary of the Environmental Assessment

Dow submitted its current plans for the removal of its thorium material by letters dated October 12, 1995; December 6, 1995; March 11, 1996; and May 24, 1996. Dow will start the removal project by excavating and transporting, by truck, the contaminated material from the Midland facility to the Bay City facility. The thorium-contaminated material from both facilities will then be transported by rail for burial at the Envirocare facility.

The proposed action is necessary so that Dow can permanently remove and dispose of the large volume of thorium-contaminated material stored at the Midland and Bay City sites. These actions will facilitate both remediation of the current storage areas for release for unrestricted use and the termination of Dow's license.

Based on NRC staff's evaluation of Dow's removal plan, it was determined that the proposal complies with NRC's public and occupational dose and effluent limits, and that authorizing the license amendment would not be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. The NRC staff concludes that a finding of no significant impact is justified and appropriate and that an environmental impact statement is not required.

The staff-identified alternatives for the disposal of Dow's thorium-contaminated waste material are: (1) No action; (2) excavation and disposal of the material at the Barnwell, South Carolina, low-level radioactive waste disposal facility; and (3) excavation and reclamation of the thorium in the waste material by chemical extraction or soil washing. In addition, the licensee had previously identified disposal in a hazardous waste design cell at Dow's Salzburg Landfill as a possible alternative.

Both licensed disposal sites eligible to receive Dow's waste (Envirocare and Barnwell) are regulated under rules for land disposal of radioactive wastes, which provide for long-term institutional control and minimize the potential for human intrusion. However, the Barnwell alternative would be considerably more expensive, with very little, if any, reduction of dose to the public. Likewise, the Salzburg Landfill would not be cost effective even if sufficient institutional controls were placed on the site. The chemical extraction/soil washing alternative does not guarantee success, and may produce more and different kinds of waste than exist now. The no-action alternative runs counter to the goals of 10 CFR Part 40 and protecting public health and safety and the environment.

The staff believes that disposing of Dow's thorium wastes at the Envirocare facility will not cause any significant impacts on the human environment and is acceptable. The conditions and restrictions placed on the Envirocare facility, combined with the facility design provisions and its location, provide the optimum level of protection of human health and safety and the environment among the various alternatives for disposal of this waste.

Finding of No Significant Impact

Based on the findings in the environmental assessment the NRC staff has determined that, under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, and NRC's regulations in 10 CFR Part 51, authorizing this license amendment would not be a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, and therefore an environmental impact statement is not required. The NRC staff concludes that a finding of no significant impact is justified and appropriate.

The staff believes that disposing of Dow's thorium wastes at the Envirocare facility will not cause any significant impacts on the human environment and is acceptable. The conditions and restrictions placed on the Envirocare facility, combined with the facility design provisions and its location, provide the optimum level of protection of human health and safety and the environment among the various alternatives for disposal of this waste.

Further Information

For additional information with respect to the proposed action, see the licensee's request for license amendment dated October 12, 1995, and supplementary information, the safety evaluation report, and the environmental assessment which are available for inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC.

For further information contact Jack D. Parrott, Division of Waste Management, USNRC, Mailstop T–8F37, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Telephone: (301) 415–6700.

Opportunity for a Hearing

The NRC hereby provides notice that this is a proceeding on an application for a license amendment falling within the scope of Subpart L, Informal Hearing Procedures for Adjudications in Materials Licensing Proceedings, of the NRC's rules of practice for domestic licensing proceedings in 10 CFR Part 2. Pursuant to § 2.1205(a), any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding may file a request for a hearing in accordance with § 2.1205(c). A request for a hearing must be filed within thirty (30) days of the date of publication of this Federal Register notice.

The request for a hearing must be filed with the Office of the Secretary either:

1. By hand delivery to: Docketing and Service Branch, Office of the Secretary, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, between 7:45 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays; or

2. By mail or telegram to: Secretary, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch.

In addition to meeting other applicable requirements of 10 CFR Part 2 of the NRC's regulations, a request for a hearing filed by a person other than an applicant must describe in detail:

1. The interest of the requestor in the proceeding;

2. How that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding, including the reasons why the requestor should be permitted a hearing, with particular reference to the factors set out in § 2.1205(g);

3. The requestor's areas of concern about the licensing activity that is the subject matter of the proceeding; and

4. The circumstances establishing that the request for a hearing is timely in accordance with § 2.1205(c).

Each request for a hearing must also be served, by delivering it personally or by mail to:

1. The applicant, The Dow Chemical Company, Attention: Mr. Larry Giebelhaus, Project Manager, 1261 Building, Midland, MI 48667; and

2. The NRC staff, by delivery to the Executive Director for Operations, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD 20852, or by mail

addressed to the Executive Director for Operations, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of July, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Michael F. Weber,

Chief, Low-Level Waste and Decommissioning Projects Branch, Division of Waste Management, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 96–18372 Filed 7–18–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–368]

Entergy Operations, Inc.; Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2; 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–6, issued to Entergy Operations, Inc. (the licensee), for operation of Arkansas Nuclear One, Unit 2, located in Pope County, Arkansas.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow the licensee to utilize American Society of Mechanical Engineers (ASME) Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (Code) Case N–514, ''Low Temperature Overpressure Protection'' to determine its low temperature overpressure protection (LTOP) setpoints and is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated April 11, 1996. The proposed action requests an exemption from certain requirements of 10 CFR 50.60, ''Acceptance Criteria for Fracture Prevention Measures for Lightwater Nuclear Power Reactors for Normal Operation,'' to allow application of an alternate methodology to determine the LTOP setpoints for ANO–2. The proposed alternate methodology is consistent with guidelines developed by the ASME Working Group on Operating Plant Criteria (WGOPC) 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 used for LTOP. These guidelines have been incorporated into Code Case N–514, ''Low Temperature Overpressure Protection,'' which has been approved by the ASME Code Committee. The content of this Code Case has been incorporated into Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code and published in the 1993 Addenda to Section XI. However, 10 CFR 50.55a, ''Codes and Standards,'' and Regulatory Guide 1.147, ''Inservice Inspection Code Case Acceptability'' have not been updated to reflect the acceptability of Code Case N–514.

The philosophy used to develop Code Case N–514 guidelines is to ensure that the LTOP limits are still below the pressure/temperature (P/T) limits for normal operation, but allow the pressure that may occur with activation of pressure relieving devices to exceed the P/T limits, provided acceptable margins are maintained during these events. This philosophy protects the pressure vessel from LTOP events, and still maintains the Technical Specifications P/T limits applicable for normal heatup and cooldown in accordance with 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G and Sections III and XI of the ASME Code.

The Need for the Proposed Action

Pursuant to 10 CFR 50.60, all lightwater nuclear power reactors must meet the fracture toughness requirements for the reactor coolant pressure boundary as set forth in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, defines 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. It is specified in 10 CFR 50.60(b) that alternatives to the described requirements in 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, may be used when an exemption is granted by the Commission under 10 CFR 50.12.

To prevent transients that would produce excursions exceeding the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, P/T limits while the reactor is operating at low temperatures, the licensee installed an LTOP system. The LTOP system includes pressure relieving devices in the form of relief valves that are set at a pressure below the LTOP enabling temperature that would prevent the pressure in the reactor vessel from exceeding the P/T limits of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. To prevent these valves 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 solid water condition, the operating pressure must be maintained below the relief valve setpoint.

In addition, to prevent damage to reactor coolant pump seals, the operator must maintain a minimum 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 relief valves due to normal operating pressure surges. The 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, safety margin adds instrument uncertainty into the LTOP setpoint. The licensee's current LTOP analysis indicates that using this 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G, safety margin to determine the relief valve setpoint would result in an operating window between the LTOP setpoint and the minimum pressure required for reactor coolant pump seals which is too small to permit continued operation. Operating with these limits could result in the lifting of relief valves or damage to the reactor coolant pump seals during normal operation. Using Code Case N–514 would allow the licensee to recapture most of the operating margin that is lost by factoring in the instrument uncertainties in the determination of the LTOP setpoint. Therefore, the licensee proposed that in determining the relief valve setpoint for LTOP events for ANO–2, the allowable pressure be determined using the safety margins developed in an alternate methodology in lieu of the safety margins required by 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G. The alternate methodology is consistent with ASME Code Case N–514. The content of this Code Case has been incorporated into Appendix G of Section XI of the ASME Code and published in the 1993 Addenda to Section XI.

An exemption from 10 CFR 50.60 is required to use the alternate methodology for calculating the maximum allowable pressure for LTOP considerations. By application dated April 11, 1996, the licensee requested an exemption from 10 CFR 50.60 to allow it to utilize the alternate methodology of Code Case N–514 to compute its LTOP setpoints.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

Appendix G of the ASME Code requires that the P/T limits be calculated: (a) using a safety factor of two on the principal membrane (pressure) stresses, (b) assuming a flaw at the surface with a depth of one quarter (1/4) of the vessel wall thickness and a length of six (6) times its depth, and (c) using a conservative fracture toughness curve that is based on the