SUMMARY: NASA hereby gives notice that Phoenix Systems International, Inc., of Ashtabula, OH, has applied for an exclusive patent license to practice the invention described in NASA Case No. KSC–12235–1, entitled High Temperature Decomposition of Hydrogen Peroxide,'' which is 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 Randy Heald, Patent Counsel, John F. Kennedy Space Center, Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899.

DATE(S): Responses to this notice must be received by July 30, 2001.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Melanie Chan, Licensing Commercialization Manager, John F. Kennedy Space Center, Mail Code YA–C1, Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899, *melanie.chan-1@ksc.nasa.gov*, telephone (321) 867–6367.

Dated: May 22, 2001.

Edward A. Frankle,

General Counsel.

[FR Doc. 01–13396 Filed 5–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7510–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50–445 and 50–446]

TXU Electric; Notice of Consideration of Issuance of Amendment to Facility Operating License and Opportunity for a Hearing

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Facility Operating License Nos. NPF–87 and NPF–89, issued to TXU Electric (TXU or the licensee), for operation of the Comanche Peak Steam Electric Station (CPSES), Units 1 and 2, respectively. The facilities are located in Somervell and Hood Counties, Texas.

The proposed amendment would incorporate changes into the CPSES, Units 1 and 2, Operating Licenses and Technical Specifications. These changes, which would reflect a proposed increase in the licensed power for operation of both CPSES, Units 1 and 2, to 3458 MWt, represent an increase of approximately 1.4 percent of the currently licensed power level for CPSES, Unit 1, and an increase of approximately 0.4 percent for CPSES, Unit 2. In addition, the licensee requests that Texas Municipal Power Agency (TMPA) be removed from both CPSES, Units 1 and 2, licenses since transfer of ownership from TMPA to TXU was completed.

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.

By June 28, 2001, the licensee may file a request for a hearing with respect to issuance of the amendment to the subject facility operating licenses, 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 petitions 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, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and is accessible electronically through the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/CFR/index.html). 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 (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 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 must 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 a 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 that may be entered in the proceeding on the petitioner's interest. The petition must 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 that must include a list of the contentions that the petitioner seeks to have litigated in the hearing. 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 each contention and a concise statement of the alleged facts or expert opinion that 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. The 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 amendment under consideration. The contention must be one that, if proven, would entitle the petitioner to relief. A petitioner who fails to file such a supplement that 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.

Requests for a hearing and petitions for leave to intervene must be filed with the Secretary of the Commission, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, Attention: Rulemakings and Adjudications Staff, or may be delivered to the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, by the above date. A copy of the request for a hearing and the petition should also be sent to the Office of the General Counsel, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555–0001, and to George L. Edgar, Esq., Morgan, Lewis and Bockius, 1800 M Street, NW., Washington, DC 20036, attorney for the licensee.

Nontimely filings of petitions for leave to intervene, amended petitions, supplemental petitions, and/or requests

for a hearing will not be entertained absent a determination by the Commission, the presiding officer, or the 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).

If a request for a hearing is received, the Commission's staff may issue the amendment after it completes its technical review and prior to the completion of any required hearing if it publishes a further notice for public comment of its proposed finding of no significant hazards consideration in accordance with 10 CFR 50.91 and 10 CFR 50.92.

For further details with respect to this action, see the application for amendment dated April 5, 2001, which is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and accessible electronically through the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room link at the NRC Web site (http://www.nrc.gov). If there are problems accessing the document located in ADAMS, contact the PDR Reference staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737, or send an email to pdr@nrc.gov.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 11th day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

David H. Jaffe,

Senior Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate IV & Decommissioning Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–13398 Filed 5–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 30–595]

South Carolina Electric & Gas; V.C. Summer Nuclear Station, Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from 10 CFR 55.59 for Facility Operating License No. NPF–12, issued to South Carolina Electric & Gas Company (SCE&G, the licensee), for operation of the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station, located in Jenkinsville, South Carolina.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would allow the licensed operator requalification examinations for the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station to be rescheduled. The requested exemption would extend the completion date for the examinations from May 31, 2001, to August 31, 2001.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for exemption dated January 12, 2001.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action would extend the current V.C. Summer Nuclear Station requalification program from May 31, 2001, to August 31, 2001. On October 13, 2000, during routine shutdown inspections, SCE&G discovered a leak in a weld in the reactor coolant system. Activities to determine the root cause and extent of condition and to repair the leak extended through the end of February 2001, months beyond the original scheduled plant restart. To provide the necessary level of licensed operator support to ensure safety throughout the extended plant outage, SCE&G postponed the training and other requalification program activities originally planned during that time.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes, as set forth below, that there are no environmental impacts associated with the extension of the operator requalification examinations from May 31, 2001, to August 31, 2001. The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types or amounts of any effluents that may be released off site, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not involve any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC concludes that there are no significant environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Alternatives to the Proposed Action

As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the proposed action (i.e., the ''no-action'' alternative). 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 any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for the V.C. Summer Nuclear Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on May 18, 2001, the staff consulted with the South Carolina State official, Henry Porter of the Division of Waste Management, regarding the environmental impact of the proposed action. The State official had no comments.

Finding of No Significant Impact

On the basis of the environmental assessment, the NRC concludes that the proposed action will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC 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 letter dated January 12, 2001. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http:www.nrc.gov* (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 22nd day of May 2001.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Karen R. Cotton,

Project Manager, Section 1, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 01–13399 Filed 5–25–01; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Proposed Collection; Comment Request

Upon Written Request, Copies Available From: Securities and