

ongoing Fall 2004 GSS survey, preliminary data indicate that 95% of the institutions are submitting the data on the Web-based data collection system. During the 2003 GSS survey cycle, 87% of the institutions used the Web-based data collection system.

The Fall 2003 GSS achieved a total response rate of 99.4 percent for institutions and 99.0 percent for departments. Response rates are not yet available for the currently ongoing Fall 2004 survey.

*Estimate of Burden:*

*Respondents:* Individuals.

*Estimated Number of Responses:*

12,262.

*Estimated Total Annual burden on Respondents:* 39,235 hours.

*Frequency of Responses:* Annually.

Dated: May 19, 2005.

**Suzanne H. Plimpton,**

*Reports Clearance Officer, National Science Foundation.*

[FR Doc. 05-10315 Filed 5-23-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7555-01-M**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

### Agency Information Collection Activities: Submission for the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Review; Comment Request

**AGENCY:** U. S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC).

**ACTION:** Notice of the OMB review of information collection and solicitation of public comment.

**SUMMARY:** The NRC has recently submitted to OMB for review the following proposal for the collection of information under the provisions of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. Chapter 35). The NRC hereby informs potential respondents that an agency may not conduct or sponsor, and that a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless it displays a currently valid OMB control number.

1. *Type of submission, new, revision, or extension:* Extension.

2. *The title of the information collection:* NRC Form 64, "Travel Voucher" (Part 1); NRC Form 64A, "Travel Voucher" (Part 2); and NRC Form 64B, "Optional Travel Voucher" (Part 2).

3. *The form number if applicable:* NRC Form 64; NRC Form 64A and NRC Form 64B.

4. *How often the collection is required:* On occasion.

5. *Who will be required or asked to report:* Contractors, consultants and

invited NRC travelers who travel in the course of conducting business for the NRC.

6. *An estimate of the number of responses:* 100.

7. *The estimated number of annual respondents:* 100.

8. *An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request:* 100 hours (1 hour for each form).

9. *An indication of whether Section 3507(d), Pub. L. 104-13 applies:* Not applicable.

10. *Abstract:* As a part of completing the travel process, the traveler must file travel reimbursement vouchers and trip reports. The respondent universe for the above forms include consultants and contractors and those who are invited by the NRC to travel, e.g., prospective employees. Travel expenses that are reimbursed are confined to those expenses essential to the transaction of official business for an approved trip.

A copy of the final supporting statement may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike, Room O-1 F23, Rockville, MD 20852. OMB clearance requests are available at the NRC Worldwide Web site: <http://www.nrc.gov/public-involve/doc-comment/omb/index.html>. The document will be available on the NRC home page site for 60 days after the signature date of this notice.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer listed below by June 23, 2005. Comments received after this date will be considered if it is practical to do so, but assurance of consideration cannot be given to comments received after this date.

John A. Asalone, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0192), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments may also be emailed to [John\\_A\\_Asalone@omb.eop.gov](mailto:John_A_Asalone@omb.eop.gov) or submitted by telephone at (202) 395-4650.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of May 2005.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Brenda Jo. Shelton,**

*NRC Clearance Officer, Office of Information Services.*

[FR Doc. E5-2587 Filed 5-23-05; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[IA-05-021; ASLBP No. 05-839-02-EA]

### In The Matter Of Andrew Siemaszko; Establishment Of Atomic Safety And Licensing Board

Pursuant to delegation by the Commission dated December 29, 1972, published in the **Federal Register**, 37 FR 28,710 (1972), and the Commission's regulations, see 10 CFR 2.104, 2.202, 2.300, 2.303, 2.309, 2.311, 2.318, and 2.321, notice is hereby given that an Atomic Safety and Licensing Board is being established to preside over the following proceeding:

#### Andrew Siemaszko (Enforcement Action)

This proceeding concerns a request for hearing submitted on May 11, 2005, by Andrew Siemaszko in response to an April 25, 2005 NRC staff "Order Prohibiting Involvement In NRC-License Activities," 70 FR 22720 (May 2, 2005). Under the terms of that staff order, because of his alleged failure to report the presence of boric acid near the reactor pressure vessel head on a condition report and a work order prepared in connection with a refueling outage at the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station that ended in May 2000, that resulted, in part, in a significant adverse condition going uncorrected, Mr. Siemaszko (1) as of the effective date of the order, is prohibited for five years from engaging in NRC-licensed activities; (2) if currently involved with another licensee in NRC-licensed activities, must immediately cease those activities, inform the NRC of the employer, and provide a copy of the order to the employer; and (3) for a period of five years after the five-year prohibition period has expired, must, within twenty days of accepting his first employment offer involving NRC-licensed activities or his becoming involved in NRC-licensed activities, provide notice to the agency of the employer or the entity where he is, or will be, involved in NRC-licensed activities.

The Board is comprised of the following administrative judges: Lawrence G. McDade, Chair, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; E. Roy Hawkens, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001; Dr. Peter S. Lam, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001.

All correspondence, documents, and other materials shall be filed with the

administrative judges in accordance with 10 CFR 2.302.

Issued in Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of May 2005.

**G. Paul Bollwerk, III,**

*Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel.*

[FR Doc. E5-2588 Filed 5-23-05; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 72-8]

### Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant; Issuance of Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact Regarding an Amendment

**AGENCY:** Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**ACTION:** Environmental assessment.

#### FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

Joseph M. Sebrosky, Senior Project Manager, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. Telephone: (301) 415-1132; fax number: (301) 425-8555; e-mail: [jms3@nrc.gov](mailto:jms3@nrc.gov).

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:** The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or the Commission) is considering issuance of an amendment to Special Materials License No. 2505 that would add the NUHOMS-32P as an optional design to the existing NUHOMS-24P design for dry storage of spent nuclear fuel. Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant, Inc. (CCNPP) is currently storing spent nuclear fuel at the Calvert Cliffs independent spent fuel storage installation (ISFSI) located in Calvert County, Maryland.

#### Environmental Assessment (EA)

*Identification of Proposed Action:* By letter dated December 12, 2003, as supplemented, CCNPP submitted a request to the NRC to amend the license (SNM-2505) to add the NUHOMS-32P as an optional design to the existing NUHOMS-24P design for dry storage of spent fuel. The NUHOMS-32P design stores eight more spent fuel assemblies than the NUHOMS-24P design.

The proposed action before the NRC is whether to approve the amendment.

*Need for the Proposed Action:* The proposed action would allow CCNPP to optimize its dry spent fuel storage capacity by upgrading portions of its ISFSI to use the NUHOMS-32P dry shielded canister. The proposed action

would allow CCNPP to reduce the minimum number of canister loadings each year from four (using the NUHOMS-24P design) to three (with the NUHOMS-32P design).

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action:* The staff has determined that the proposed action would not endanger life or property. No effluents are released from the ISFSI during operation and the proposed changes have no impact to dry shielded canister loading activities. Therefore, there is no significant change in the type or significant increase in the amounts of any effluents that may be released offsite. There is also no significant increase with regard to individual or cumulative occupational radiation exposures because of the proposed action. The proposed amendment includes a technical specification change that would specify that the current neutron source term technical specification limit of  $\leq 2.23E8$  would apply to the NUHOMS-24P design and that the NUHOMS-32P design would have a neutron source assembly technical specification limit of  $\leq 3.3E8$  neutrons/second/assembly. The contact dose rate for the NUHOMS-32P design in a loss of neutron shielding accident with the revised neutron source term is 1517 mrem/hr. The contact dose rate for the NUHOMS-24P design in a loss of neutron shielding accident is 1126 mrem/hr. The regulatory limit for a design basis accident is 5 rem at 100 meters in accordance with 10 CFR 72.106. When compared to the regulatory limit, the dose rate increase from a loss of neutron shielding for the NUHOMS-32P design would be a minimal change from the dose rate for a loss of neutron shielding accident for a NUHOMS-24P design. All of the other proposed changes have no impact on radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

The amendment only affects the requirements associated with the loading of the casks and does not affect non-radiological plant effluents or any other aspects of the environment. Therefore, there are no significant non-radiological impacts associated with the proposed action.

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

*Alternative to the Proposed Action:* As an alternative to the proposed action, the staff considered denial of the amendment request (i.e., the "no-action" alternative). Approval or denial of the amendment request would result

in minimal change in the environmental impacts. Therefore, the environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative action are similar.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted:* On April 28, 2005, Richard McLean of the State of Maryland was contacted regarding the proposed action and had no concerns. The NRC staff has determined that consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is not required for this specific amendment and will not affect listed species or critical habitat. The NRC staff has also determined that the proposed action is not a type of activity having the potential to cause effects on historic properties. Therefore, no consultation is required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

*Conclusions:* The staff has reviewed the amendment request submitted by CCNPP and has determined that adding the NUHOMS-32P as an optional design to the existing NUHOMS-24P design for dry storage of spent nuclear fuel would have no significant impact on the environment.

#### Finding of No Significant Impact

The environmental impacts of the proposed action have been reviewed in accordance with the requirements set forth in 10 CFR part 51. Based upon the foregoing EA, the NRC finds that the proposed action of approving the amendment to the license will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the NRC has determined that an environmental impact statement for the proposed license amendment is not warranted.

The request for amendment was docketed under 10 CFR part 72, Docket 72-8. For further details with respect to this action, see the proposed license amendment dated December 12, 2003, as supplemented, by a letter dated May 12, 2004. The NRC maintains an Agencywide Documents Access Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of NRC's public documents. These documents may be accessed through the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at: <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html>. Copies of the referenced documents will also be available for review at the NRC Public Document Room (PDR), located at 11555 Rockville Pike, Rockville, MD, 20852. PDR reference staff can be contacted at 1-800-397-4209, 301-415-4737 or by e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov). The PDR reproduction contractor will copy documents for a fee.

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 11th of May, 2005.