served by the implementation of these Code Cases.

*Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action*

The Commission has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that there are no significant adverse environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

The proposed action will not significantly 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 occupational or public radiation exposure. Therefore, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

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

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

*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*

This action does not involve the use of any resources not previously considered in the Final Environmental Statement for LaSalle County Station, Units 1 and 2.

*Agencies and Persons Consulted*

In accordance with its stated policy, on July 19, 2000, the staff consulted with the Illinois State official, Frank Niziolek of the Illinois Department of Nuclear Safety, 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 Commission 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 29, 2000, which is available for public inspection at the NRC's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically from the ADAMS Public Library component on the NRC Web site, *http:\\www.nrc.gov* (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 5th day of October 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Anthony J. Mendiola,**

*Chief, Section 2, Project Directorate III, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 00–26339 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

**[Docket No. 50–247]**

## Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc.; Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2; Issuance of Director's Decision Under 10 CFR 2.206

By letter dated March 14, 2000, Mr. David A. Lochbaum, on behalf of the Union of Concerned Scientists, the Nuclear Information & Resource Service, the PACE Law School Energy Project, and Public Citizen's Critical Mass Energy Project (Petitioners), pursuant to Section 2.206 of Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR 2.206), requested that the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (Commission or NRC) take action with regard to the Indian Point Nuclear Generating Unit No. 2, (IP2), owned and operated by the Consolidated Edison Company of New York, Inc. (Con Ed). The Petitioners requested that the NRC issue an order to the licensee preventing the restart of IP2, or modifying the license for IP2 to limit it to zero power, until (1) all four steam generators are replaced, (2) the steam generator tube integrity concerns identified in Dr. Joram Hopenfeld's differing professional opinion (DPO) and in Generic Safety Issue 163 (GSI–163) are resolved, and (3) potassium iodide tablets are distributed to residents and businesses within the 10-mile emergency planning zone (EPZ) or stockpiled in the vicinity of IP2. (The DPO process provides for the review of concerns raised by individual NRC employees who disagree with a position adopted by the NRC staff.)

In a letter dated April 5, 2000, the Acting Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation acknowledged receipt of the Petition of March 14, 2000. In the April 5, 2000, letter, the Petitioners were informed that the request concerning replacement of the IP2 steam generators met the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206, but the staff had determined that the request relating to the resolution of the concerns raised in Dr. Hopenfeld's DPO and GSI–163 and distribution or stockpiling of potassium iodide tablets did not meet the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206. The basis for this determination was that they raise generic issues for which the Petitioners had not provided sufficient facts specific to IP2 restart to support their request. However, as a result of information provided at an April 7, 2000, meeting, and a supplement to their Petition dated April 12, 2000, the staff determined that the request that the NRC issue an order to prevent Con Ed from restarting IP2, or modify the license for IP2 to limit it to zero power, until potassium iodide tablets are distributed to people and businesses within the 10-mile EPZ or stockpiled in the vicinity of IP2 met the criteria of 10 CFR 2.206. However, the additional information provided in a supplement dated April 14, 2000, still did not provide plant-specific information necessary to consider Dr. Hopenfeld's DPO under the 2.206 process. The Petitioners were informed of these determinations in a letter dated June 26, 2000. In letters dated June 12, June 29, and July 13, 2000, the Petitioners further supplemented the Petition. In the June 12, 2000, supplement, it was requested that IP2 not be allowed to restart until concerns identified in an internal Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) memorandum dated May 12, 2000, were addressed. In the July 13, 2000, supplement, the Petitioners requested reinstatement of their request that Dr. Hopenfeld's DPO be resolved prior to allowing IP2 to restart. In a letter dated August 31, 2000, the Petitioners were informed that neither of these issues met the criteria for review under 10 CFR 2.206, and indicated the basis for that determination.

In the June 29, 2000, letter, the Petitioners stated that 10 CFR Part 50, Appendix E requires each licensee at each site to conduct a full participation biennial exercise. Since the two nuclear units at the Indian Point site are owned by different licensees, the Petitioners stated that the regulations would require

each licensee to conduct a full-participation exercise every 2 years. This issue was accepted for review under 10 CFR 2.206, as stated in a letter dated August 31, 2000.

The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has addressed the technical concerns provided by the Petitioner. The licensee prepared and submitted to the NRC for staff review an extensive operational assessment. However, since the licensee voluntarily made the decision to replace the IP2 steam generators prior to plant restart, there was no need to complete a review of the ConEd report for the purpose of determining whether the plant could restart and operate with the existing steam generators. Therefore, the intent of this part of the Petition was, in effect, granted. The NRC and Federal Emergency Management Agency have concluded that the onsite and offsite emergency plans for IP2, including the provisions for potassium iodide, provide reasonable assurance that appropriate protective measures can be taken to protect the health and safety of the public in the event of a radiological emergency at the site. Therefore, there is no basis to order the licensee to take additional measures to distribute or stockpile potassium iodide tablets in the vicinity of IP2. Finally, the NRC staff has determined that the full-participation exercise conducted by IP2 on June 24, 1998, met the biennial requirement for both onsite and offsite participation. Therefore, these two requests are not granted. The complete explanation of the staff's conclusions is contained in the ''Director's Decision Pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206'' (DD–00–04).

The complete text of the Director's Decision is available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and will be accessible electronically from the agencywide documents access and management system (ADAMS) public library component on the NRC web site, *http://www.nrc.gov* (the electronic reading room).

A copy of the Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206(c) of the Commission's regulations. As provided for 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, Maryland, this 6th day of October 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Samuel J. Collins,**

*Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.*

[FR Doc. 00–26338 Filed 10–12–00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

## PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

### Interest Assumption for Determining Variable-Rate Premium; Interest on Late Premium Payments; Interest on Underpayments and Overpayments of Single-Employer Plan Termination Liability and Multiemployer Withdrawal Liability; Interest Assumptions for Multiemployer Plan Valuations Following Mass Withdrawal

**AGENCY:** Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

**ACTION:** Notice of interest rates and assumptions.

**SUMMARY:** This notice informs the public of the interest rates and assumptions to be used under certain Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation regulations. These rates and assumptions are published elsewhere (or are derivable from rates published elsewhere), but are collected and published in this notice for the convenience of the public. Interest rates are also published on the PBGC's web site (www.pbgc.gov).

**DATES:** The interest rate for determining the variable-rate premium under part 4006 applies to premium payment years beginning in October 2000. The interest assumptions for performing multiemployer plan valuations following mass withdrawal under part 4281 apply to valuation dates occurring in November 2000. The interest rates for late premium payments under part 4007 and for underpayments and overpayments of single-employer plan termination liability under part 4062 and multiemployer withdrawal liability under part 4219 apply to interest accruing during the fourth quarter (October through December) of 2000.

**FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:** Harold J. Ashner, Assistant General Counsel, Office of the General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, 1200 K Street, NW., Washington, DC 20005, 202–326–4024. (For TTY/TDD users, call the Federal relay service toll-free at 1–800–877–8339 and ask to be connected to 202–326–4024.)

**SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:**

**Variable-Rate Premiums**

Section 4006(a)(3)(E)(iii)(II) of the Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) and § 4006.4(b)(1) of the PBGC's regulation on Premium Rates (29 CFR part 4006) prescribe use of an assumed interest rate in determining a single-employer plan's variable-rate premium. The rate is the ''applicable percentage'' (currently 85 percent) of the annual yield on 30-year Treasury securities for the month preceding the beginning of the plan year for which premiums are being paid (the ''premium payment year''). The yield figure is reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Releases G.13 and H.15.

The assumed interest rate to be used in determining variable-rate premiums for premium payment years beginning in October 2000 is 4.96 percent (*i.e.,* 85 percent of the 5.83 percent yield figure for September 2000).

The following table lists the assumed interest rates to be used in determining variable-rate premiums for premium payment years beginning between November 1999 and October 2000.

| For premium payment years beginning in: | The assumed interest rate is: |
|---|---|
| November 1999 | 5.32 |
| December 1999 | 5.23 |
| January 2000 | 5.40 |
| February 2000 | 5.64 |
| March 2000 | 5.30 |
| April 2000 | 5.14 |
| May 2000 | 4.97 |
| June 2000 | 5.23 |
| July 2000 | 5.04 |
| August 2000 | 4.97 |
| September 2000 | 4.86 |
| October 2000 | 4.96 |

**Late Premium Payments; Underpayments and Overpayments of Single-Employer Plan Termination Liability**

Section 4007(b) of ERISA and § 4007.7(a) of the PBGC's regulation on Payment of Premiums (29 CFR part 4007) require the payment of interest on late premium payments at the rate established under section 6601 of the Internal Revenue Code. Similarly, § 4062.7 of the PBGC's regulation on Liability for Termination of Single-Employer Plans (29 CFR part 4062) requires that interest be charged or credited at the section 6601 rate on underpayments and overpayments of employer liability under section 4062 of ERISA. The section 6601 rate is established periodically (currently quarterly) by the Internal Revenue Service. The rate applicable to the fourth quarter (October through