

from that information form the basis of NRC decisions and actions concerning the issuance, modification, or revocation of site permits, design certifications, and combined licenses for nuclear power plants.

Copies of the submittal may be inspected or obtained from the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (Lower Level), Washington, DC 20555-0001.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by March 13, 1996: Troy Hillier, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0151), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3084.

The NRC Clearance Officer is Brenda Jo. Shelton, (301) 415-7233.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 2nd day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
Gerald F. Cranford,  
*Designated Senior Official for Information Resources Management.*

[FR Doc. 96-2985 Filed 2-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

### **Notice of Issuance of Amendment to Materials License SNM-2506 Northern States Power Company**

#### **[Docket 72-10]**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) has issued Amendment No. 2 to Materials License No. SNM-2506 held by Northern States Power Company (NSPC) for the receipt and storage of spent fuel at the Prairie Island independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI), located in Goodhue County, Minnesota. The amendment is effective as of the date of issuance.

The amendment request dated October 2, 1995, consists of changes to page 6-1 of Appendix A to the license to correct an inconsistency between the Prairie Island ISFSI Technical Specifications and the Prairie Island Nuclear Generating Plant Technical Specifications. The amendment eliminates the requirements that the ISFSI Annual Radioactive Effluent Release Report be submitted as part of the Nuclear Generating Plant Annual Radioactive Effluent Release Report. The requirement was intended as a convenience since both reports initially had the same due date. Subsequently, the due date for the plant report was extended by a license amendment for the plant technical specifications. However, the ISFSI technical

specifications still require that both reports be submitted by the original earlier date. By separating the due dates for the two reports, the additional time now allowed in the plant technical specifications for the submittal of the plant report can be utilized. These changes do not affect fuel receipt, handling, and storage safety.

The 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 at the Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC 20555, and at the Local Public Document Room at the Minneapolis Public Library, Technology & Science Department, 300 Nicollet Mall, Minneapolis, MN 55401.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland this 1st day of February 1996.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
William D. Travers,  
*Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.*

[FR Doc. 96-2983 Filed 2-9-96; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

#### **[Docket Nos. 50-250 and 50-251]**

### **Florida Power and Light Company Turkey Point Unit Nos. 3 and 4; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to the technical specifications (TS) for

Facility Operating License No. DPR-31 and DPR-41, issued to Florida Power and Light Company (FPL or the licensee) for operation of Turkey Point Unit Nos. 3 and 4 located in Dade County, Florida.

#### **Environmental Assessment**

##### *Identification of the Proposed Action*

The proposed action would modify the Index of the TS to remove reference to the TS Bases pages.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application for amendment dated November 22, 1995.

##### *The Need for the Proposed Action*

The proposed action deletes reference to the TS Bases pages and is in accordance with 10 CFR 50.36(a), which indicates that the Bases shall not become a part of the TS.

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

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the modification to the Index of the TS is administrative in nature.

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 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 action.

##### *Alternatives to the Proposed Action*

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