

7. The estimated number of annual respondents: 1.

8. An estimate of the total number of hours needed annually to complete the requirement or request: 120 (an average of approximately 115 hours per response for applications plus approximately 5 hours per recordkeeper).

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

10. Abstract: 10 CFR part 72 establishes requirements, procedures, and criteria for the issuance of licenses to receive, transfer, and possess power reactor spent fuel and other radioactive materials associated with spent fuel storage in an ISFSI, and requirements for the issuance of licenses to the Department of Energy to receive, transfer, package, and possess power reactor spent fuel and high-level radioactive waste, and other associated radioactive materials, in an MRS. This proposed rulemaking would add the ability for licensees to request a specific license to allow the interim storage of reactor-related GTCC waste within an ISFSI or MRS to 10 CFR part 72. GTCC waste is low-level radioactive waste that exceeds the concentration limits of radionuclides established for Class C waste in 10 CFR 61.55. The information will be used by the NRC staff in the licensing process to review applications requesting storage of GTCC waste within an ISFSI or MRS. This rulemaking does not preclude licensees from licensing the storage of GTCC waste under the existing provisions of 10 CFR parts 30 and/or 70. However, the NRC believes that licensing under 10 CFR part 72 would simplify the licensing process and reduce the potential burden on licensees, the NRC, and Agreement States with no adverse affect on public health and safety, or the environment. The revised estimate of burden reflects the time necessary for licensees to amend application request for storage of spent fuel under 10 CFR part 72 to also include GTCC waste.

Submit, by July 17, 2000, comments that address the following questions:

1. Is the proposed collection of information necessary for the NRC to properly perform its functions? Does the information have practical utility?

2. Is the burden estimate accurate?

3. Is there a way to enhance the quality, utility, and clarity of the information to be collected?

4. How can the burden of the information collection be minimized, including the use of automated collection techniques or other forms of information technology?

A copy of the submittal may be viewed free of charge at the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street, NW (lower level), Washington, DC. The proposed rule indicated in "The title of the information collection" is or has been published in the **Federal Register** within several days of the publication date of this Federal Register Notice. Instructions for accessing the electronic OMB clearance package for the rulemaking have been appended to the electronic rulemaking. Members of the public may access the electronic OMB clearance package by following the directions for electronic access provided in the preamble to the titled rulemaking.

Comments and questions should be directed to the OMB reviewer by July 17, 2000: Erik Godwin, Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs (3150-0132), NEOB-10202, Office of Management and Budget, Washington, DC 20503.

Comments can also be submitted by telephone at (202) 395-3087.

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

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 1st day of June 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.
Brenda Jo. Shelton,

NRC Clearance Officer, Office of the Chief Information Officer.

[FR Doc. 00-15193 Filed 6-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

[Docket No. 50-271]

Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation; Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) is considering amending, pursuant to 10 CFR 20.2002, the previously granted approvals to dispose of slightly contaminated septic waste and cooling tower silt on-site by expanding the allowable waste stream to include slightly contaminated soil generated as a residual by-product of on-site construction activities as requested by Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Corporation (the licensee), for operation of the Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station (Vermont Yankee), located in Windham County, Vermont.

Environmental Assessment

Identification of the Proposed Action

The proposed action would amend the previously granted approvals to dispose of slightly contaminated septic waste and cooling tower silt on-site by expanding the allowable waste stream to include low-levels of radioactively contaminated soil generated as a residual by-product of on-site construction and other activities.

The proposed action is in accordance with the licensee's request dated June 23, 1999, as supplemented on January 4, 2000.

The Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed action is needed to dispose of slightly contaminated soil on-site. The licensee identified 25.5 cubic meters of soil to be disposed of on-site immediately, and approximately 28.3 cubic meters of soil/sand material on an annual basis until the expiration of the plant's operating license in 2013. The 25.5 cubic meters of contaminated soil was generated as a result of on-site construction activities. The anticipated 28.3 cubic meters of soil/sand material will be generated from the annual winter spreading of sand on roads and walkways at the plant site.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action

The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that the proposed action will be bound by the conditions for the on-site disposals previously reviewed and approved by the NRC. The licensee will continue to use the designated and approved areas of their property (approximately 1.9 acres in size) that currently receives the septic waste and cooling tower silts. Determination of the radiological dose impact of the new material has been made based on the same dose assessment models and pathway assumptions used in the previously approved submittals. The licensee's proposal was evaluated against the NRC staff's guidelines for on-site disposal and found to be acceptable. The potential exposure to members of the general public from the radionuclides in material was determined to be less than 1 mrem/year, and meets the NRC staff's guidelines. Accordingly, the potential exposures are acceptable.

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 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 environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

Accordingly, the NRC 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. Denial of the application would result in no change in current environmental impacts. As an additional alternative, the material could be shipped to an off-site low-level radioactive waste disposal facility. The costs associated with off-site disposal greatly exceeds the cost of on-site disposal without a compensating improvement in the environmental impacts. The environmental impacts of the proposed action and the alternative actions 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 Vermont Yankee Nuclear Power Station.

Agencies and Persons Consulted

In accordance with its stated policy, on June 8, 2000, the staff consulted with the Vermont State Official, William Sherman, of the Department of Public Service, 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 June 23, 1999, as supplemented on January 4, 2000, which are available for public inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, The Gelman Building, 2120 L Street, NW., Washington DC. Publicly available records will be accessible electronically

from the ADAMS Public Library component on this NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov> (the Electronic Reading Room).

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 8th day of June 2000.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Richard P. Croteau,

Project Manager, Section 2, Project Directorate I, Division of Licensing Project Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 00-15192 Filed 6-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

PENSION BENEFIT GUARANTY CORPORATION

Interest Assumption for Determining Variable-Rate Premium; 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 (<http://www.pbgc.gov>).

DATES: The interest rate for determining the variable-rate premium under part 4006 applies to premium payment years beginning in June 2000. The interest assumptions for performing multiemployer plan valuations following mass withdrawal under part 4281 apply to valuation dates occurring in July 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 June 2000 is 5.23 percent (i.e., 85 percent of the 6.15 percent yield figure for May 2000).

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

For premium payment years beginning in	The assumed interest rate is
July 1999	5.13
August 1999	5.08
September 1999	5.16
October 1999	5.16
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

Multiemployer Plan Valuations Following Mass Withdrawal

The PBGC's regulation on Duties of Plan Sponsor Following Mass Withdrawal (29 CFR part 4281) prescribes the use of interest assumptions under the PBGC's regulation on Allocation of Assets in Single-employer Plans (29 CFR part 4044). The interest assumptions applicable to valuation dates in July 2000 under part 4044 are contained in an amendment to part 4044 published elsewhere in today's *Federal Register*. Tables showing the assumptions applicable to prior periods are codified in appendix B to 29 CFR part 4044.

Issued in Washington, DC, on this 8th day of June 2000.

David M. Strauss,

Executive Director, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation.

[FR Doc. 00-15119 Filed 6-14-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7708-01-P

RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

Sunshine Act Meeting

Notice is hereby given that the Railroad Retirement Board will hold a