

summarized by NASA and addressed in the Final EIS.

**Olga M. Dominguez,**

*Deputy Assistant Administrator for Institutional and Corporate Management.*

[FR Doc. 04-17264 Filed 7-28-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7510-01-P**

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 04-093]

### Government-Owned Inventions, Available for Licensing

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of prospective patent license.

**SUMMARY:** NASA hereby gives notice that Phoenix Systems International, Inc. of McDonald, OH, has applied for an exclusive worldwide (excluding the United States) license to practice the invention described and claimed in PCT Case No. KSC-12518-2-PCT entitled "Hydrogen Peroxide Catalytic Decomposition," 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 an exclusive license to Phoenix Systems International, Inc. should be sent to Office of the Chief Counsel, John F. Kennedy Space Center, Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899.

**DATES:** Responses to this notice must be received by August 13, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Randy Heald, Patent Counsel/Assistant Chief Counsel, NASA, Office of the Chief Counsel, John F. Kennedy Space Center, Mail Code CC-A, Kennedy Space Center, FL 32899; telephone (321) 867-7214.

Dated: July 21, 2004.

**Keith T. Sefton,**

*Deputy General Counsel (Administration and Management).*

[FR Doc. 04-17265 Filed 7-28-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7510-01-P**

## NATIONAL AERONAUTICS AND SPACE ADMINISTRATION

[Notice 04-094]

### Notice of Prospective Patent License

**AGENCY:** National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

**ACTION:** Notice of prospective patent license.

**SUMMARY:** NASA hereby gives notice that PAC Materials, L.L.C., of Huntsville, Alabama, has applied for an exclusive license to practice the invention MFS-31828-1-PCT in Taiwan entitled "High-Strength Aluminum Alloy for High Temperature Applications," 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 Mr. James J. McGroary, Chief Patent Counsel/LS01, Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, AL 35812. NASA has not yet made a determination to grant the requested license and may deny the requested license even if no objections are submitted within the comment period.

**DATES:** Responses to this notice must be received by August 13, 2004.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Sammy A. Nabors, Technology Transfer Department/CD30, Marshall Space Flight Center, Huntsville, AL 35812, (256) 544-5226.

Dated: July 21, 2004.

**Keith T. Sefton,**

*Deputy General Counsel (Administration and Management).*

[FR Doc. 04-17266 Filed 7-28-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7510-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket Nos. 50-498 and 50-499]

### South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company; South Texas Project Electric Generating Station, Unit Nos. 1 and 2; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of exemptions from title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) part 50, section 50.44, section 50.46, and Appendix K, for Facility Operating License Nos. NPF-76 and NPF-80, issued to South Texas Project Nuclear Operating Company (the licensee), for operation of South Texas Project Electric Generating Station (STPEGS), Units 1 and 2, located in Matagorda County, Texas. Therefore, as required by 10 CFR 51.21, the NRC is issuing this environmental assessment and finding of no significant impact.

#### Environmental Assessment

##### Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would exempt STPEGS, Units 1 and 2, from the

requirements of 10 CFR part 50, section 50.44, section 50.46 and Appendix K, to allow the use of up to eight Lead Test Assemblies (LTAs) fabricated with Optimized ZIRLO™, a cladding material that contains a nominally lower tin content than previously approved cladding materials.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated May 27, 2004.

##### The Need for the Proposed Action

As the nuclear industry pursues longer operating cycles with increased fuel discharge burnups and more aggressive fuel management, the corrosion performance specifications for the nuclear fuel cladding become more demanding. Industry data indicates that corrosion resistance improves for cladding with a lower tin content. The optimum tin level provides a reduced corrosion rate while maintaining the benefits of mechanical strengthening and resistance to accelerated corrosion from abnormal chemistry conditions. In addition, fuel rod internal pressures (resulting from the increased fuel duty, use of integral fuel burnable absorbers, and corrosion/temperature feedback effects) have become more limiting with respect to fuel rod design criteria. By reducing the associated corrosion buildup, and thus, minimizing temperature feedback effects, additional margin to fuel rod internal pressure design criteria is obtained.

As part of a program to address these issues, the Westinghouse Electric Company has developed an LTA program, in cooperation with the licensee, that includes a fuel cladding with a tin content lower than the currently licensed range for ZIRLO™. The NRC's regulations in 10 CFR part 50, section 50.44, section 50.46, and Appendix K, make no provision for use of fuel rods clad in a material other than Zircalloy or ZIRLO™. The licensee has requested the use of up to eight LTAs with a tin composition that is less than that specified in the licensing basis for ZIRLO™, as defined in Westinghouse design specifications. Therefore, use of the LTAs calls for exemptions from 10 CFR part 50, section 50.44, section 50.46, and Appendix K.

##### Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC staff has completed its safety evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed exemptions would not increase the probability or consequences of accidents previously analyzed, and would not affect facility radiation levels or facility radiological effluents that may be released offsite.

There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action. The details of the staff's safety evaluation will be provided in the exemption that will be issued as part of the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation.

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

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

#### *Environmental Impacts of the Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

As an alternative to the proposed action, the NRC 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*

The action does not involve the use of any different resources than those previously considered in the "Final Environmental Statement related to the Operation of South Texas Project Units 1 and 2," NUREG-1171, dated August 1986.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

On June 23, 2004, the staff consulted with the Texas State official, Mr. William Silva, Bureau of Radiation Control of the Texas Department of Health, 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 May 27, 2004. Documents may be examined, and/or copied for a fee, at the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR), located at One White Flint North, Public

File Area O1 F21, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Persons who do not have access to ADAMS, or who encounter problems in accessing the documents located in ADAMS, should contact the NRC's PDR Reference staff by telephone at 1-800-397-4209 or (301) 415-4737, or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 19th day of July, 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,  
**Robert A. Gramm,**

*Chief, Section 1, Project Directorate IV,  
Division of Licensing Project Management,  
Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 04-17260 Filed 7-28-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

---

## **POSTAL RATE COMMISSION**

[Docket No. MC2004-5; Order No. 1413]

### **Repositionable Notes Market Test**

**AGENCY:** Postal Rate Commission.

**ACTION:** Notice and order.

**SUMMARY:** This document establishes a formal docket for consideration of a proposed one-year market test of a supplemental service feature for bulk First-Class Mail, Standard Mail, and Periodicals. Conducting the test would allow the Service to collect data and information on customer response and related matters, and thereby determine whether it should seek to establish these services as permanent offerings.

**DATES:** See **SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION** for dates.

**ADDRESSES:** Submit comments electronically via the Commission's Filing Online system at <http://www.prc.gov>.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:**

Stephen L. Sharfman, general counsel, at 202-789-6818.

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** Notice is hereby given that on July 16, 2004, the Postal Service filed a request with the Postal Rate Commission pursuant to section 3623 of the Postal Reorganization Act, 39 U.S.C. 101 *et seq.*, for a recommended decision on a proposed market test of a supplemental service feature for bulk First-Class Mail, Standard Mail, and Periodicals that would allow "repositionable notes" to be attached to such mail. The Postal

Service proposes to implement the market test through additions to the Domestic Mail Classification Schedule (DMCS) and associated new surcharges. The request includes attachments and is supported by the testimony of two witnesses and a library reference. It is on file in the Commission's docket room for inspection during regular business hours and is available on the Commission's home page at [www.prc.gov](http://www.prc.gov).

**Description of the request.** For a period of one year, the Postal Service proposes to charge mailers for attaching a "Repositional Note" (RPN) to mailpieces of certain subclasses. According to the Postal Service, an RPN is a Post-it-type self-adhesive note that mailers can affix to the outside of a mailpiece. Because eligible RPNs are mechanically applied using air pressure, and have an adhesive strip that is wider than on notes used in typical office settings, they are unlikely to become detached from the mailpiece during handling. They are typically used to display advertising messages that encourage recipients to open, read, and respond to the internal contents of the mailpiece. They can be removed by the recipient and re-attached to computers, refrigerators, or similar objects as reminders that extend the life of the commercial message. They can also be used as a simple way to correct minor errors in catalogues. USPS-T-1 (Direct Testimony of USPS witness Holland) at 1.

The Postal Service states that RPNs have been available nationally for bulk letter mail for approximately a year, and that there have been no operational problems or costs to the Postal Service associated with their use over that time. It states that Domestic Mail Manual provisions authorizing RPNs for bulk letter mail are currently in place. Its proposed market test, therefore, is not expected to alter the *status quo*, except to allow bulk flat mail to carry RPNs, and to charge fees for their use. *Id.* at 2-3.

**Motion for a stand-alone market test.** The Postal Service proposes that portions of rules 54, 64, and 161 be waived in this case. To the extent that rules 161(a) and 162 require the filing of a contemporaneous request for a permanent classification change as a prerequisite for a market test, the Postal Service asks for a waiver of that requirement. The Commission has determined that the Postal Service's RPN proposal is not appropriately filed under its market test rules. It is, however, treating this proposal as if filed pursuant to its provisional service change rules. See 39 CFR 3001, subpart