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

Dated: October 8, 1996.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–26674 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

[Notice 96–126]

Notice of Prospective Patent License

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of prospective patent license.

SUMMARY: NASA hereby gives notice that SpaceTec, Inc., of Hampton, VA 23666, has applied for a partially exclusive license to practice the invention disclosed in NASA Case No. LAR–15511–1, entitled ''MIR Environmental Effects Payload Handrail Clam/Pointer Device,'' for which a U.S. Patent Application was filed 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 Langley Research Center.

DATE: Responses to this notice must be received by December 16, 1996.

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

Dated: October 8, 1996.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–26676 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

[Notice 96–123]

Notice of Prospective Patent License

AGENCY: National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

ACTION: Notice of prospective patent license.

SUMMARY: NASA hereby gives notice that Tennessee Valley Performance Products, Inc., of Dayton, TN 37321, has applied for a partially exclusive license to practice the inventions described and claimed in NASA Case No. LAR–15205–1–CU, entitled ''Tough, Soluble Aromatic, Thermoplastic Copolyimides''; and NASA Case No. LAR–15205–2, entitled ''Process for Preparing Tough, Soluble, Thermoplastic Copolyimides''; which are all assigned to 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 Langley Research Center.

DATE: Responses to this notice must be received by December 16, 1996.

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

Dated: October 8, 1996.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 96–26673 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–295 and 50–304]

Commonwealth Edison Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendments to Facility Operating Licenses, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–39 and DPR–48 issued to Commonwealth Edison Company (ComEd, the licensee) for operation of the Zion Nuclear Power Station, Units 1 and 2, located in Lake County, Illinois.

The proposed amendments would add a mode of applicability to specification 3.2.3.D, Rod Position Indicator Channels.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendments would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

1. The proposed changes do not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of occurrences of any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed requirements for the Rod Position Indicator Channels being applicable in MODE 1 and MODE 2 are acceptable in that these are the only MODES in which power peaking factors are a concern, and the OPERABILITY of the Rod Position Indicator Channels has the potential to affect the safety of the plant. Control rod alignment limits ensure that power distribution and reactivity limits defined by the design power peaking and shutdown margin limits are preserved. In addition, the Rod Position Indicator Channels are not a precursor to any analyzed accident sequence.

The proposed Required Actions are similar to current Required Actions when the unit is in MODE 1 and MODE 2. In addition, since there is no safety significance for inoperable Rod Position Indicator Channels for shutdown modes, the proposed Required Actions provide appropriate compensatory actions with the unit in MODE 1 and MODE 2. Therefore, the initial conditions and system function assumed in the UFSAR have not changed. As such, the requirement to have OPERABLE control rod position indication for verification of control rod alignment limitations when the reactor is in MODE 1 and MODE 2 does not affect any UFSAR accident analysis.

Therefore, this change does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequence of an accident previously evaluated.

2. The proposed changes do not create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not require a physical alteration of the plant (no new or different equipment will be installed to implement this change.) Control rod alignment limits ensure that power distribution and reactivity limits defined by the design power peaking and shutdown margin limits are preserved. The Technical Specifications will require OPERABLE Rod Position Indicator Channels in MODE 1 and MODE 2 when control rod alignment and insertion limits are required to maintain acceptable power distribution limits and shutdown margin.

3. The proposed changes do not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The requirement to have OPERABLE Rod Position Indicator Channels when required by associated control rod alignment and insertion limits has been clarified. The LCO will continue to require OPERABLE Rod Position Indicator Channels and an associated Required Action to be in a mode where the Rod Position Indicator Channels are not required. Therefore, this change does not involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety.

The NRC staff has reviewed the licensee's analysis and, based on this review, it appears that the three standards of 10 CFR 50.92(c) are satisfied. Therefore, the NRC staff proposes to determine that the amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration.

The Commission is seeking public comments on this proposed determination. Any comments received within 30 days after the date of publication of this notice will be considered in making any final determination.

Normally, the Commission will not issue the amendments until the expiration of the 30-day notice period. However, should circumstances change during the notice period such that failure to act in a timely way would result, for example, in derating or shutdown of the facility, the Commission may issue the license amendments before the expiration of the 30-day notice period, provided that its final determination is that the amendments involve no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will consider all public and State comments received. Should the Commission take this action, it will publish in the Federal Register a notice of issuance and provide for opportunity for a hearing after issuance. The Commission expects that the need to take this action will occur very infrequently.

Written comments may be submitted by mail to the Chief, Rules Review and Directives Branch, Division of Freedom of Information and Publications Services, Office of Administration, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and should cite the publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. Written comments may also be delivered to Room 6D22, Two White Flint North, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, from 7:30 a.m. to 4:15 p.m. Federal workdays. Copies of written comments received may be examined at the NRC Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC.

The filing of requests for hearing and petitions for leave to intervene is discussed below.

By November 18, 1996, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendments to the subject facility operating license and any person whose interest may be affected by this proceeding and who wishes to participate as a party in the proceeding must file a written request for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene. Requests for a hearing and a petition for leave to intervene shall be filed in accordance with the Commission's ''Rules of Practice for Domestic Licensing Proceedings'' in 10 CFR Part 2. Interested persons should consult a current copy of 10 CFR 2.714 which is available 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 Waukegan Public Library, 128 N. County Street, Waukegan, Illinois 60085. If a request for a hearing or petition for leave to intervene is filed by the above date, the Commission or an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board, designated by the Commission or by the Chairman of the Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel, will rule on the request and/or petition; and the Secretary or the designated Atomic Safety and Licensing Board will issue a notice of hearing or an appropriate order.

As required by 10 CFR 2.714, a petition for leave to intervene shall set forth with particularity the interest of the petitioner in the proceeding, and how that interest may be affected by the results of the proceeding. The petition should specifically explain the reasons why intervention should be permitted with particular reference to the following factors: (1) the nature of the petitioner's right under the Act to be made party to the proceeding; (2) the nature and extent of the petitioner's property, financial, or other interest in the proceeding; and (3) the possible effect of any order which may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition should also identify the specific aspect(s) of the subject matter of the proceeding as to which petitioner wishes to intervene. Any person who has filed a petition for leave to intervene or who has been admitted as a party may amend the petition without requesting leave of the Board up to 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, but such an amended petition must satisfy the specificity requirements described above.

Not later than 15 days prior to the first prehearing conference scheduled in the proceeding, a petitioner shall file a supplement to the petition to intervene which must include a list of the contentions which are sought to be litigated in the matter. Each contention must consist of a specific statement of the issue of law or fact to be raised or controverted. In addition, the petitioner shall provide a brief explanation of the bases of the contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion which support the contention and on which the petitioner intends to rely in proving the contention at the hearing. The petitioner must also provide references to those specific sources and documents of which the petitioner is aware and on which the petitioner intends to rely to establish those facts or expert opinion. Petitioner must provide sufficient information to show that a genuine dispute exists with the applicant on a material issue of law or fact. Contentions shall be limited to matters within the scope of the amendments under consideration. The contention must be one which, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement which satisfies these requirements with respect to at least one contention will not be permitted to participate as a party.

Those permitted to intervene become parties to the proceeding, subject to any limitations in the order granting leave to intervene, and have the opportunity to participate fully in the conduct of the hearing, including the opportunity to present evidence and cross-examine witnesses.

If a hearing is requested, the Commission will make a final determination on the issue of no significant hazards consideration. The final determination will serve to decide when the hearing is held.

If the final determination is that the amendments requested involve no significant hazards consideration, the Commission may issue the amendments and make them immediately effective, notwithstanding the request for a hearing. Any hearing held would take place after issuance of the amendments.

If the final determination is that the amendments requested involve a significant hazards consideration, any hearing held would take place before the issuance of any amendment.

A request for a hearing or a petition for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Docketing and Services Branch, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC, by the above date. Where petitions are filed during the last 10 days of the notice period, it is requested that the petitioner promptly so inform the Commission by a toll-free telephone call to Western Union at 1–(800) 248–5100 (in Missouri 1–(800) 342–6700). The Western Union operator should be given Datagram Identification Number N1023 and the following message addressed to Robert A. Capra: petitioner's name and telephone number, date petition was

mailed, plant name, and publication date and page number of this Federal Register notice. A copy of the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to Michael I. Miller, Esquire; Sidley and Austin, One First National Plaza, Chicago, Illinois, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions and/or requests for hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer or the presiding Atomic Safety and Licensing Board that the petition and/or request should be granted based upon a balancing of the factors specified in 10 CFR 2.714(a)(1) (i)–(v) and 2.714(d).

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendments dated October 4, 1996, 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 Waukegan Public Library, 128 N. County Street, Waukegan, Illinois 60085.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 10th day of October 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Donna M. Skay,

Acting Project Manager, Project Directorate III–2, Division of Reactor Projects—III/IV, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 96–26589 Filed 10–16–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 50–245]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Company; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License, Proposed No Significant Hazards Consideration Determination, and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License No. DPR–21 issued to Northeast Nuclear Energy Company (NNECO/the licensee) for operation of the Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1 located in Waterford, Connecticut.

The proposed amendment would modify the applicability requirements for certain radiation monitors so that the radiation monitors are required to be operable only when secondary containment integrity is required to be operable; delineate when secondary containment integrity is required; modify standby gas treatment operability requirements; make editorial corrections to clarify the configuration of the radiation monitors; and revise the associated Bases sections.

Before issuance of the proposed license amendment, the Commission will have made findings required by the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act) and the Commission's regulations.

The Commission has made a proposed determination that the amendment request involves no significant hazards consideration. Under the Commission's regulations in 10 CFR 50.92, this means that operation of the facility in accordance with the proposed amendment would not (1) involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated; or (2) create the possibility of a new or different kind of accident from any accident previously evaluated; or (3) involve a significant reduction in a margin of safety. As required by 10 CFR 50.91(a), the licensee has provided its analysis of the issue of no significant hazards consideration, which is presented below:

Pursuant to 10CFR50.92, NNECO has reviewed the proposed changes and concludes that the changes do not involve a significant hazards consideration (SHC) since the proposed change satisfies the criteria in 10CFR50.92(c). That is, the proposed changes do not:

1. Involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident previously evaluated.

The proposed changes do not significantly increase the probability of an accident since these changes only affect operability of equipment used for either identifying or mitigating accident conditions and have no impact on any initiating events for analyzed accidents previously evaluated.

The proposed change to Technical Specification 3.2.E makes the operability requirements of the radiation monitors consistent with operability requirements of the systems they automatically actuate and the Standard Technical Specifications NUREG–1433 (Rev 1) operability requirements for these monitors. The safety function of these radiation monitors is to monitor the reactor building and the steam tunnel ventilation exhaust plenums, and the room air at the refueling floor area to provide prompt indication of a gross release of radioactive material and, if setpoints are exceeded, actuate logic which initiates standby gas treatment and isolates normal ventilation. Conditions which could produce significant radiological releases and necessitate isolation of the reactor building and steam tunnel ventilation systems and initiation of the standby gas treatment system are only permitted to be established when secondary containment integrity is required. Administrative controls are established to ensure that secondary containment integrity is maintained when required to mitigate radiological consequences of postulated accidents. Proper application of procedural administrative controls ensure that evolutions, which may result in significant release of fission products, (including those not specifically delineated in the proposed technical specification) are evaluated to determine if secondary containment is required. When secondary containment integrity is not required, the plant is prohibited from performing activities which may result in a significant radiological release and the potential for an analyzed radiological accident is minimized. Therefore, the need for these radiation monitors to be operable at all times, including those instance when either secondary containment integrity or operability of the standby gas treatment system are not required provides no additional safety benefit and can be eliminated.

The proposed changes also ensure the requirements for the radiation monitors (Section 3.2.E), standby gas treatment system (Section 3.7.B), and secondary containment integrity (Section 3.7.C) are consistent.

The proposed changes to the Technical Specification 3.7.B, ''Standby Gas Treatment System,'' ensure standby gas treatment system operability is required whenever secondary containment integrity is required and ensures the operability requirements for the standby gas treatment system are specified for activities which have a potential of significant release of fission products. It maintains the requirement that standby gas treatment system operability is required whenever secondary containment integrity is not required. If secondary containment integrity cannot be maintained, activities which have the potential of a significant radiological release are immediately suspended and conditions established within 24 hours in which secondary containment integrity is no longer required. Requiring both trains of standby gas treatment system and three power sources (either two onsite and one offsite or one onsite and two offsite) provides adequate AC electrical power during a REFUELING OUTAGE. The operability requirements for the standby gas treatment system and power supplies remain unaltered for the fuel handling accident, the design bases accident during a REFUELING OUTAGE. Therefore, the consequences of the fuel handling accident, as analyzed, remain unaffected and the other less limiting transients remain bounded.

Currently, secondary containment integrity is required even when fuel is removed from the vessel if the control rods are not fully inserted. This requirement is not necessary for safety and can be eliminated. The proposed LIMITING CONDITION FOR OPERATION results in some cases where secondary containment is not required when it would have been previously (e.g., mode switch in REFUEL with no fuel movement or withdrawing a single control rod with the vessel head installed). However, none of these cases would place the plant in a condition which would result in a significant radiological release requiring secondary containment or standby gas treatment system