Submit, by (insert date 60 days after publication in the Federal Register), comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the draft supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC. Members of the public who are in the Washington, DC, area can access this document via modem on the Public Document Room Bulletin Board (NRC's Advance Copy Document Library), NRC subsystem at FedWorld, 703–321–3339. Members of the public who are located outside of the Washington, DC, area can dial FedWorld, 1–800–303–9672, or use the FedWorld Internet address: fedworld.gov (Telnet). The document will be available on the bulletin board for 30 days after the signature date of this notice. If assistance is needed in accessing the document, please contact the FedWorld help desk at 703–487–4608. Additional assistance in locating the document is available from the NRC Public Document Room, nationally at 1–800–397–4209 or, within the Washington, DC area, at 202–634–3273.

Comments and questions may be directed to the NRC Clearance Officer, Brenda Jo. Shelton, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, T–6 F33, Washington, DC, 20555–0001, or by telephone at (301) 415–7233, or by Internet electronic mail at BJS1@NRC.GOV.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of March, 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Gerald F. Cranford,

Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.

[FR Doc. 96–7407 Filed 3–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket No. 72–9 (50–267)]

Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Materials License SNM–2504; Public Service Company of Colorado; Fort St. Vrain Independent Spent Fuel Storage Installation

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment 2 to Materials License No. SNM–2504 held by the Public Service Company of Colorado (PSCo) for the receipt, possession, storage, and transfer of spent fuel at the Fort St. Vrain (FSV) independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI), located in Weld County, Colorado. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

By applications dated July 21 and December 12, 1995, PSC requested amendments to its ISFSI license to (1) incorporate organizational changes, (2) delete reference to the FSV 10 CFR Part 50 ''possession only'' license, and (3) revise the radioactive materials and possession limits to accurately reflect the materials stored at the ISFSI.

This amendment complies with the standards and requirements of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended (the Act), and the Commission's rules and regulations. The Commission has made appropriate findings as required by the Act and the Commission's rules and regulations in 10 CFR Chapter I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

In accordance with 10 CFR 72.46(b)(2), a determination has been made that the amendment does not present a genuine issue as to whether the health and safety of the public will be significantly affected. Therefore, the publication of a notice of proposed action and an opportunity for hearing or a notice of hearing is not warranted. Notice is hereby given of the right of interested persons to request a hearing on whether the action should be rescinded or modified.

The Commission has determined that the issuance of the amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.22(c)(11), an environmental assessment need not be prepared in connection with issuance of the amendment.

Documents related to this action are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room located at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street NW., Washington, DC 20555, and at the Local Public Document Room at the Weld Library District, Lincoln Park Branch, 919 7th Street, Greeley, Colorado 80631.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 21st day of March 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William D. Travers,

Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 96–7414 Filed 3–26–96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

[Docket Nos. 50–266 and 50–30]

Wisconsin Electric Power Company; Point Beach Nuclear Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of amendments to the licenses and Technical Specifications for the Point Beach Nuclear Plant, Unit Nos. 1 and 2, located in Manitowoc County, Wisconsin (Facility Operating License Nos. DPR–24 and DPR–27, respectively, issued to Wisconsin Electric Power Company, the licensee).

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would reflect the change in the name of the licensee from Wisconsin Electric Power Company to Wisconsin Energy Company.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment of the facility operating license dated October 23, 1995.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to properly reflect corporate administrative changes in the license and Technical Specifications.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The proposed action is administrative in nature only and will have no effect on the operation or maintenance of the facility whatsoever. The 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 the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Accordingly, the Commission concludes that there are no