appearance of Washington, DC including buildings, memorials parks, etc.; also matters of design referred by other agencies of the government.

Inquiries regarding the agenda and requests to submit written or oral statements should be addressed to Charles H. Atherton, Secretary, Commission of Fine Arts, at the above address or call the above number.

Dated in Washington, DC, 30 January 1995.

Charles H. Atherton,

Secretary.

[FR Doc. 95–3042 Filed 2–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 6330–01–M

NATIONAL SCIENCE FOUNDATION

Environmental Assessment and Request for Comments; Notice

AGENCY: National Science Foundation.

ACTION: Notice of environmental assessment and request for comments.

SUMMARY: The National Science Foundation (NSF) has prepared an Environmental Assessment for the construction and operation of a Laser Interferometer Gravitational-Wave Observatory (LIGO) facility at a Louisiana State University site in Livingston Parish, Louisiana. LIGO is a scientific research program for the detection and study of cosmic gravitational waves. The program shall enhance our understanding of the nature of gravity and expand our knowledge of astrophysics. Possible effects of the project on wetlands have been mitigated by the acquisition and restoration of 39 acres of wetlands at the Cypress Island Nature Preserve. NSF is inviting public comment on the Environmental Assessment.

DATES: The NSF welcomes any comments on the environmental assessment. In order to be assured consideration comments must be received no later than March 10, 1995.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be addressed to Dr. David Berley, Program Manager for LIGO, National Science Foundation, 4201 Wilson Boulevard, Room 1015, Arlington, Virginia, 22230.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Dr. David Berley, 703–306–1892.

Dated: February 3, 1995.

Lawrence Rudolph,

Acting General Counsel, National Science Foundation.

[FR Doc. 95–3093 Filed 2–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7555–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50–213]

Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company; Haddam Neck Plant; 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. DPR–61, issued to Connecticut Yankee Atomic Power Company (CYAPCO, the licensee), for operation of the Haddam Neck Plant, located in Middlesex County, Connecticut.

Environmental Assessment

Identificatjon of the Proposed Action

CYAPCO has proposed to revise Technical Specification (TS) 3/4.4.9, ''Pressure Temperature Limits, Reactor Coolant System,'' Figures 3.4–3, 4, and 5, and the associated Bases section. The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's amendment request dated April 7, 1994, as supplemented November 4, 1994.

The Need for the Proposed Action

NRC Information Notice 93–58, ''Nonconservatism in Low-Temperature Overpressure Protection for Pressurized-Water Reactors,'' alerted licensees of potential nonconservatisms associated with the Low Temperature Overpressurization Protection (LTOP) system resulting from pressure drop across the core. Upon review of this information, the Haddam Neck Plant adopted a conservative set of curves until new curves could be developed for the plant. These TS changes reflect the analysis performed to evaluate the brittle fracture requirements of 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G and the ASME XI Code.

These changes will ensure that the desired margins of safety against nonductile failure of the reactor vessel are maintained through all modes of operation, especially when the reactor coolant system (RCS) is at low temperatures.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed revision to the TS. The staff has concluded that the proposed TS changes involving the changes in TS 3/4.4.9, ''Pressure/Temperature Limits, Reactor Coolant System,'' Figures 3.4–3, 4, and 5, and the associated Bases Section adequately address the non-conservatisms identified in NRC Information Notice 93–58 and will ensure compliance with the 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix G requirements during normal modes of operation. The staff made this determination by reviewing the plant specific analysis to assure that the proposed heatup, cooldown, and hydrostatic test, pressure/temperature limit curves have been chosen to ensure the plant is operated safely. In addition, the new P/T curves are more restrictive and conservative than the current curves.

The proposed TS 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 this proposed TS amendment.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed amendment does involve 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 amendment.

Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no significant radiological or nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed amendment.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Since the Commission has concluded there is no measurable environmental impact associated with the proposed amendment, 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.

Alternative Use of Resources

This action does not involve the use of resources not considered previously in the Final Environmental Statement for the Haddam Neck Plant.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, the staff consulted with the Connecticut State official 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 amendment.

For further details with respect to this proposed action, see the licensee's letter dated April 7, 1994, as supplemented November 4, 1994, 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 Russell Library, 123 Broad Street, Middletown, Connecticut 06547.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of February 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Phillip F. McKee,

Director, Project Directorate I–4, Division of Reactor Projects—I/II, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95–3086 Filed 2–7–95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50–20]

Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding Proposed License Amendment; Changing Expiration Date of Amended Facility Operating License No. R–37 Massachusetts Institute of Technology

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of a license amendment extending the expiration date of Amended Facility Operating License No. R–37 (the license) for the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT or the licensee) Research Reactor (MITR) from May 7, 1996, to August 8, 1999. This recaptures construction time between May 7, 1956, the issuance date of Construction Permit No. CPRR–5 and June 9, 1958, the issuance date of the license, and between May 24, 1974, the date reactor operations were terminated to modify the reactor under Construction Permit No. CPRR–118, and July 23, 1975, the date of issuance of Amendment No. 10 to the license which authorized a return to reactor operation.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of Proposed Action

By application dated March 31, 1994, as supplemented on September 29, and November 4, 1994, MIT requested that the expiration date of Amended Facility Operating License No. R–37 be extended from midnight, May, 7, 1996, to midnight, April 24, 2001. MIT has requested that four periods of time be recaptured:

(1) The period from May 7, 1956, the date of issuance of CPRR–5, until June 9, 1958, the issuance date of the license, or July 21, 1958, the date of initial criticality.

(2) The period from July 21, 1958, until June 1, 1959, during which the first reactor (MITR–I) was operated infrequently at low power for startup testing.

(3) From May 24, 1974, the date the reactor was shut down to perform modifications to the facility under Construction Permit No. CPRR–118, (CPRR–118 was issued on April 9, 1973, but component acquisition problems delayed the reactor shut down until May 24, 1974) until August 14, 1975, the date of initial criticality of the modified reactor (MITR–II). The NRC issued Amendment No. 10 to the license on July 23, 1975, which authorized operation of the modified reactor.

(4) The period from August 14, 1975, until April 15, 1976, during which the modified reactor was operated infrequently at low power for startup testing.

The staff has determined that the time between May 7, 1956, the issuance date of Construction Permit No. CPRR–5 and June 9, 1958, the issuance date of the license, and between May 24, 1974, the day reactor operations where terminated to modify the reactor under Construction permit No. CPRR–118, and July 23, 1975, the date of issuance of Amendment No. 10 to the license which authorized a return to reactor operation, represents time that was not available to the licensee due to construction. This period of time is 1188 days, which when added to the expiration date of the Amended Facility Operating License of May 7, 1996, results in a extended expiration date of August 8, 1999.

The staff has also determined that the time (a) between July 9, 1958, the issuance date of the license, through July 21, 1958, the date of initial criticality, to June 1, 1959, the end of low power testing, and (b) between July 23, 1975, the date of issuance of Amendment No. 10, through August 14, 1975, the date of initial criticality for the modified reactor, to April 15, 1976, the end of low power testing, cannot be added to extend the expiration date of the license. This is because this time was authorized by NRC in the license for reactor operation, was available to the licensee for operations and, after initial criticality in both cases, was used by the licensee for low power testing. A license term of 40 years from the date of issuance of the operating license is permitted by NRC regulations, specifically 10 CFR 50.51. Commission approval of the proposed amendment would be consistent with recent NRC actions for nuclear power reactors.

Need for Proposed Action

The granting of this request would allow the licensee to operate the facility for approximately three years and three months beyond the current license expiration date, thus recapturing construction periods. Over 30 similar extensions have been issued to other licensees. Without issuance of the proposed license amendment, an application for license renewal would be required to be developed and submitted before the expiration of the current license on May 7, 1996, or the MITR would be shut down and a decommissioning plan required to be developed and submitted.

Environmental Impact of the proposed Action

The anticipated impact of the facility on the environment was evaluated in the Environmental Impact Appraisal for the MITR dated July 23, 1975. This appraisal was prepared for the issuance of Amendment No. 10 to the license, which authorized a return to operation for the facility at a power level of 5 MW(t), after modifications were completed to the reactor as authorized by construction permit No. CPRR–118. The descriptions in and findings of that appraisal are still valid. That appraisal concluded that there will be no significant environmental impact associated with the licensing of the MITR to be operated at 5 MW(t).

The licensee has not requested any changes to the facility as part of this amendment request. The environmental effects of accidents which were discussed and considered negligible in the 1975 appraisal have not changed.

Operating data is available to replace the estimates of the environmental effects of facility operation in the 1975 appraisal. The actual environmental effects of facility operation from July 1, 1984 (FY 85), to June 30, 1994 (FY 94), were obtained from the licensee.

Environmental surveys within a quarter mile of the facility detected an average (averaged because readings are