

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents, no changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released offsite, and there is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

With regard to potential nonradiological impacts, the proposed action does not have a potential to affect any historic sites. It does not affect nonradiological plant effluents and has no other environmental impact. Therefore, there are no significant nonradiological 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 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 for Waterford 3, dated September 1981.

#### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

On May 11, 2004, the staff consulted with the Louisiana State official, Mr. Prosanta Chowdhury, of the Louisiana Department of Environmental Protection, 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 April 30, 2004 (ADAMS Accession Number ML041250184). 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 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 at Rockville, Maryland, this 25th day of May, 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. 04-12746 Filed 6-4-04; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

## **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

**[Docket Nos. 50-327 and 50-328]**

### **Tennessee Valley Authority, Sequoyah Nuclear Plant; Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering issuance of an exemption from Title 10 of the Code of Federal Regulations (10 CFR) Part 50, Section 68, “Criticality Accident Requirements,” Subsection (b)(1) for Facility Operating License Nos. DPR-77 and DPR-79, issued to Tennessee Valley Authority (the licensee), for operation of the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant (SQN), located in Hamilton County, Tennessee. 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 the licensee from the requirements of 10 CFR 50.68, “Criticality Accident Requirements,” Subsection (b)(1) during the handling and storage of spent nuclear fuel in a 10 CFR Part 72 licensed spent fuel storage container that is in the SQN spent fuel pool.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's application dated February 20, 2004, as supplemented on May 3, 2004. The supplemental letter provided clarifying information that did

not expand the scope of the original request.

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

Under 10 CFR 50.68(b)(1), the Commission sets forth the following requirement that must be met, in lieu of a monitoring system capable of detecting criticality events.

Plant procedures shall prohibit the handling and storage at any one time of more fuel assemblies than have been determined to be safely subcritical under the most adverse moderation conditions feasible by unborated water.

The licensee is on a time-critical path to load spent nuclear fuel into a 10 CFR Part 72 licensed spent fuel storage container in June 2004. Section 50.12(a) allows licensees to apply for an exemption from the requirements of 10 CFR Part 50 if the regulation is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule and other conditions are met. The licensee has stated that compliance with 10 CFR 50.68(b)(1) is not necessary for handling the 10 CFR Part 72 licensed contents of the cask system to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

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

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the exemption described above would continue to satisfy the underlying purpose of 10 CFR 50.68(b)(1). The details of the staff's safety evaluation will be provided with the letter to the licensee approving the exemption to the regulation.

The proposed action will not significantly increase the probability or consequences of accidents. No changes are being made in the types of effluents that may be released off site. There is no significant increase in occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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

Accordingly, the NRC 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 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 for the Sequoyah Nuclear Plant, Units 1 and 2 dated February 13, 1974.

### *Agencies and Persons Consulted*

On April 28, 2004, the staff consulted with the Tennessee State official, Elizabeth Flannagin of the Tennessee Bureau of Radiological 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 February 20, 2004, as supplemented on May 3, 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, 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 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 PDR Reference staff at 1-800-397-4209 or 301-415-4737, or send an e-mail to [pdr@nrc.gov](mailto:pdr@nrc.gov).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 28th day of May, 2004.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.  
**William F. Burton,**  
*Acting Chief, Section 2, Project Directorate II, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*  
 [FR Doc. 04-12748 Filed 6-4-04; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

### **NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION**

#### **Peer Review Committee for Source Term Modeling; Notice of Meeting**

The Peer Review Committee for Source Term Modeling will hold a closed meeting on June 16-18, 2004 at Sandia National Laboratories (SNL), Albuquerque, NM.

The entire meeting will be closed to public attendance to protect information classified as national security information pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 552b(c)(1).

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

*Wednesday, June 16 through Friday, June 18—8:30 a.m. until the conclusion of business.*

The Committee will review Sandia National Laboratories (SNL) activities associated with the development of guidance documents for estimating source terms resulting from sabotage attacks on radioactive material source transportation packages other than spent nuclear fuel and develop a letter report on the radiological assessments for the NRC.

For further information regarding the time of the meeting and possible changes to the starting and ending times and the duration of the meeting, contact: Dr. Andrew L. Bates, (telephone 301-415-1963) or Dr. Charles G. Interrante (telephone 301-415-3967) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (ET)

Dated: June 1, 2004.  
**Andrew L. Bates,**  
*Advisory Committee Management Officer.*  
 [FR Doc. 04-12750 Filed 6-4-04; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

### **RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD**

#### **Agency Forms Submitted for OMB Review**

*Summary:* In accordance with the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 (44 U.S.C. chapter 35), the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) has submitted the following proposal(s) for the collection of information to the Office of Management and Budget for review and approval.

### **Summary of Proposal(s)**

- (1) *Collection title:* Appeal under the Railroad Retirement and Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act.
- (2) *Form(s) submitted:* HA-1.
- (3) *OMB Number:* 3220-0007.
- (4) *Expiration date of current OMB clearance:* 08/31/2004.
- (5) *Type of request:* Extension of a currently approved collection.
- (6) *Respondents:* Individuals or households.
- (7) *Estimated annual number of respondents:* 860.
- (8) *Total annual responses:* 860.
- (9) *Total annual reporting hours:* 285.
- (10) *Collection description:* Under section 7(b)(3) of the Railroad Retirement Act and section 5(c) of the Railroad Unemployment Insurance Act, a person aggrieved by a decision on his or her application for an annuity or other benefit has the right to appeal to the RRB. The collection provides the means for the appeal action.

*Additional Information or Comments:* Copies of the forms and supporting documents can be obtained from Charles Mierzwa, the agency clearance officer (312-751-3363) or [Charles.Mierzwa@rrb.gov](mailto:Charles.Mierzwa@rrb.gov).

Comments regarding the information collection should be addressed to Ronald J. Hodapp, Railroad Retirement Board, 844 North Rush Street, Chicago, Illinois, 60611-2092 or [Ronald.Hodapp@rrb.gov](mailto:Ronald.Hodapp@rrb.gov) and to the OMB Desk Officer for the RRB, at the Office of Management and Budget, Room 10230, New Executive Office Building, Washington, DC 20503.

**Charles Mierzwa,**  
*Clearance Officer.*  
 [FR Doc. 04-12738 Filed 6-4-04; 8:45 am]  
**BILLING CODE 7905-01-P**

### **SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION**

[Release No. 34-49787; File No. PCAOB-2003-08]

#### **Public Company Accounting Oversight Board; Order Approving Proposed Rules Relating to Inspections of Registered Public Accounting Firms**

June 1, 2004.

#### **I. Introduction**

On October 15, 2003, the Public Company Accounting Oversight Board (the “Board” or the “PCAOB”) filed with the Securities and Exchange Commission (the “Commission”) proposed rules pursuant to Section 107 of the Sarbanes-Oxley Act of 2002 (the