positions until a satisfactory solution to the problem can be achieved.

Based on a review of Petitioner's request and supplemental submission, the Licensee's responses dated October 12, 1993, August 4, 1994, and March 15, 1995, the report of NRC's Office of Investigations (OI Report No. 1–93–044), and the decisions of the Department of Labor on complaints filed by the Petitioner in these cases, the Director, Office of Enforcement, has denied these Petitions. The reasons for the denial are explained in the "Director's Decision under 10 CFR 2.206" (DD-95-17) which is available for public inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW, Washington, DC

A copy of this Decision will be filed with the Secretary for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206. As provided by this regulation, the Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of issuance of the Decision unless the Commission on its own motion institutes a review of the Decision within that time.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Dated at Rockville, MD, this 2nd day of August, 1995.

James Lieberman, Director,

Office of Enforcement. [FR Doc. 95–19636 Filed 8–8–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 50-245]

Northeast Nuclear Energy Co.; (Millstone Nuclear Power Station, Unit 1) (License No. DRP–21); Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

Notice is hereby given that the Director, Office of Enforcement, has issued a decision concerning the Petition filed by Mr. Clarence O. Reynolds (Petitioner) dated August 22, 1993, as supplemented by letters dated October 19, 1993, June 29, 1994, and August 17, 1994. The Petition requested that the Executive Director for Operations take immediate escalated enforcement action with regard to Millstone Nuclear Power Station Unit 1. Specifically, Mr. Reynolds requested that multiple Severity Level II and III violations be issued against the Millstone Unit 1 Maintenance Department, that suspensions of Maintenance Department Management be instituted pending a complete investigation, and that the Executive Director for Operations' (EDO's) office insist that Mr. Reynolds be immediately

reinstated as maintenance mechanics pending this investigation.

Based on a review of Petitioner's request and supplemental submission, the Licnesee's responses dated October 25, 1993, August 16, 1964, and January 27 and March 16, 1995, the report officer of investigations (OI Report No. 1-93-047R), and the decision of the Department of Labor on Petitioner's complaint, the Director, Office of Enforcement, has denied these Petitions. The reasons for the denial are explained in the "Director' Decision under 10 CFR 2.206" (DD-95-16) which is available for public inspection in the Commission's Public Document Room at 2120 L Street, NW., Washington, DC

A copy of this Decision will be filled with the Secretary for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206. As provided by this regulation, the Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of issuance of the Decision unless the Commission on its own motion institutes a review of the Decision within that time.

Dated at Rockville, MD this 2nd day of August 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

James Lieberman.

Director, Office of Enforcement. [FR Doc. 95–19635 Filed 8–8–95; 8:45 am] BILLING CODE 7590–01–M

[Docket No. 72-9 (50-267)]

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

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory
Commission (the Commission) has
issued Amendment No. 1 to Materials
License No. SNM–2504 held by the
Public Service Company of Colorado
(PSC) for the receipt, possession,
storage, and transfer of spent fuel at the
Fort St. Vrain (FSV) Nuclear Power
Plant site in an Independent Spent Fuel
Storage Installation (ISFSI), located on
the high plains in Weld County,
Colorado, 55 kilometers (35 miles) north
of Denver, Colorado. The amendment is
effective as of the date of issuance.

By applications dated July 21, and August 24, 1994, PSC requested amendments to its license for the ISFSI to allow (1) the construction of new gas lines for the purpose of repowering the FSV power station and (2) the drilling of new gas wells near the ISFSI. These amendments are required by ISFSI License Condition 16, which states:

—No new gas or oil pipelines shall be installed within one-half mile of the ISFSI without prior approval as evidenced by a license amendment." Therefore, this amendment allows construction of gas pipelines and new wells as described in the PSC applications dated July 21, and August 24, 1994.

A safety evaluation report prepared by NRC staff concludes that there is reasonable assurance that the public health and safety will remain protected by activities authorized by this license amendment and that the environmental impact will remain insignificant.

The Commission has determined that the amendment applications comply 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 Chap. I, which are set forth in the license amendment.

The Commission has determined that the amendment does not involve significant new safety information of a type that differs from any evaluated by previous Commission safety review. It does not involve a significant increase in the probability or consequences of an accident. It does not involve a significant decrease in a safety margin. Thus, it does not involve a significant hazards consideration. Therefore, the Commission has determined that the amendment does not present a genuine issue as to whether the health and safety of the public will be significantly affected and that prior public notice of the amendment is not required under 10 CFR 72.46(b)(2). 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 also determined that the issuance of the amendment will not result in any significant environmental impact and that, pursuant to 10 CFR 51.21, an environmental assessment need not be prepared in connection with issuance of the amendment. In support thereof, the Commission has concluded that this revision of the Materials License does not involve any changes in the scope or type of operations presently authorized by the license. Further, the Commission notes that (1) the integrity of the ISFSI is not threatened as a result of the activities to be conducted under the amendment, and (2) the work authorized under the amendment is to take place within the owner-controlled area, an area previously disturbed as part of construction and subsequent