

40,000 MWD/MTU, and heat generation of ≤ 0.847 Kw/assembly. This amendment requests the limits be amended to match those approved for the TN-32 storage cask per the Certificate of Compliance (CoC) and Safety Evaluation Report (SER) issued in March 2000. Those approved limits are as follows: initial enrichment of $\leq 4.05\%$ (wt U-235), assembly average burnup $\leq 45,000$ MWD/MTU, and heat generation of ≤ 1.02 Kw/assembly.

Need for the Proposed Action: The proposed action is necessary to allow continued storage of spent fuel in dry casks. Without this amendment Surry will be unable to load spent fuel in TN-32 casks because their remaining fuel has the higher enrichment and burnup. If unable to store spent fuel in TN-32's, Surry will not be able to retain full core offload capability. Surry would eventually have to find an alternate means to store fuel, or shut down.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action: The NRC has completed its evaluation of the proposed action and concludes that granting the request for amendment to allow the storage of spent fuel assemblies with burnup and initial enrichment of up to 45,000 MWD/MTU and 4.05% (wt U-235), respectively, in TN-32 casks used at the Surry ISFSI, will not increase the probability or consequence of accidents beyond that bounded by previous analysis. In March 2000, the NRC issued a CoC and SER for the TN-32 allowing storage of spent fuel in the TN-32 under a general license, with the higher enrichment and burnup, resulting in no significant environmental impact. No changes are being made in the types of any effluents that may be released offsite. With regard to radiological impacts, the addition of higher burnup and initial enrichment spent fuel assemblies was calculated to yield an average surface dose rate of 224 mrem/hour at the TN-32 cask side surface. A reevaluation of occupational doses based on actual operating experience from loading 39 casks, indicates that the overall exposure to workers during cask loading, transport, and emplacement will decrease from the original estimate of 21.2 person-rem to 11.9 person-rem. The dose to the closest real receptor due to Surry ISFSI operations was calculated to be 6×10^{-1} mrem/year. This dose is several orders-of-magnitude below natural background radiation levels and is an insignificant amount when compared to the 10 CFR Part 72.104 whole-body dose limit of 25 mrem/year. The annual whole-body dose to the closest real receptor from all Surry operations is 16 mrem, which is below the 10 CFR Part 72.104 limit.

Based on the occupational and public dose analysis results, there are no significant radiological environmental impacts associated with the proposed action.

The amendment only affects the requirements associated with the content 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 environmental 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: The alternative to the proposed action would be to deny the request for amendment (*i.e.*, the "no-action" alternative). Denial of the proposed action would result in Surry storing spent fuel in the spent fuel pool. Without dry cask storage, Surry would lose the capability to maintain full core offload and eventually would have to shut down due to lack of storage space.

Increased storage in the spent fuel pool could potentially lead to greater occupational exposure than dry cask storage due to the proximity of workers to the fuel. The environmental impacts of the alternative action could be greater than the proposed action.

Given that the alternative action of denying the approval for amendment has no lesser environmental impacts associated with it, and considering that the proposed action would result in storage of fuel in the TN-32 casks at Surry ISFSI as already approved for storage under a general license, the Commission concludes that the preferred alternative is to grant this amendment.

Agencies and Persons Consulted: On August 18, 2000, Mr. Les Foldese of the Virginia Department of Health, Radiological Health Programs, was contacted regarding the proposed action and had no concerns.

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 Environmental Assessment, the Commission finds that the proposed action of granting an amendment to permit the use of the TN-32 dry storage cask to store spent fuel with a higher initial enrichment ($\leq 4.05\%$ wt U-235) and burnup ($\leq 45,000$ MWD/MTU) at the Surry ISFSI will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment. Accordingly, the Commission has determined not to

prepare an environmental impact statement for the proposed exemption.

For further details with respect to this action, see the amendment application dated November 15, 1999, as supplemented. In accordance with 10 CFR 2.790 of the NRC's "Rules of Practice," a copy of the application, as supplemented, will be available electronically for public inspection in the NRC Public Document Room, 2120 L Street NW. (Lower Level), Washington, DC, or from the Publicly Available Records (PARS) components of the NRC's document system (ADAMS). ADAMS is accessible from the NRC Web site at <http://www.nrc.gov/NRC/ADAMS/index.html> (the Public Electronic Reading Room).

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

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

E. William Brach,

Director, Spent Fuel Project Office, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards.

[FR Doc. 00-24363 Filed 9-21-00; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

POSTAL RATE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

NAME OF AGENCY: Postal Rate Commission.

TIME AND DATE: Daily, or as needed, starting after 9:30 a.m., from September 25, 2000, through November 8, 2000.

PLACE: Commission conference room, 1333 H Street, NW., Suite 300, Washington, DC 20268-0001.

STATUS: Closed.

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Recommendations in Docket No. R2000-1.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: Stephen L. Sharfman, General Counsel, Postal Rate Commission, Suite 300, 1333 H Street, NW, Washington, DC 20268-0001, 202-789-6820.

Dated: September 19, 2000.

Margaret P. Crenshaw,
Secretary.

[FR Doc. 00-24548 Filed 9-20-00; 12:39 pm]

BILLING CODE 7710-FN-M

POSTAL SERVICE BOARD OF GOVERNORS

Sunshine Act Meeting

TIMES AND DATES: 9 a.m., Monday, October 2, 2000; 8:30 a.m., Tuesday, October 3, 2000.

PLACE: San Diego, California, at the San Diego Marriott Hotel, 333 West Harbor Drive, in the Marina Ballroom D.

STATUS: October 2 (Closed); October 3 (Open).

MATTERS TO BE CONSIDERED: Monday, October 2—9 a.m. (Closed)

1. Finance Performance.
2. Fiscal Year 2001 Integrated Financial Plan.
3. Establish/Deploy Process.
4. Fiscal Year 2001 Economic Value Added (EVA) Variable Pay Program.
5. EEO Settlement Authority.
6. Personnel Matters.
7. Compensation Issues.

Tuesday, October 3—8:30 a.m. (Open)

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting, August 28–29, 2000.
2. Remarks of the Postmaster General and CEO.
3. Board of Governors Calendar Year 2001 Meeting Schedule.
4. Office of the Governors FY 2001 Budget.
5. Preliminary FY 2002 Appropriation Request.
6. Capital Investments.
 - a. Champaign, Illinois, Processing and Distribution Facility Expansion.
 - b. Stamford, Connecticut—New Springdale Station Additional Funding.
7. Report on the San Diego District.
8. Tentative Agenda for the November 13–14, 2000, meeting in Washington, DC.

CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION: David G. Hunter, Secretary of the Board, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, SW., Washington, DC 20260–1000. Telephone (202) 268–4800.

David G. Hunter,
Secretary.

Tentative Agenda

Monday Session, October 2—9 a.m.

(Closed)—San Diego Marriott in Marina Ballroom D

1. Financial Performance. (Mr. Richard Strasser)
2. Fiscal Year 2001 Integrated Financial Plan. (Mr. Richard Strasser)
3. Establish/Deploy Process. (Mr. Patrick Donahoe)
4. Fiscal Year 2001 EVA Variable Pay Program. (Ms. Yvonne Maguire)
5. Overview of the Sales Organization. (Ms. Gail Sonnenberg)
6. Briefing on Advertising. (Mr. Allen Kane)
7. EEO Settlement Authority. (Ms. Mary Anne Gibbons)
8. Personnel Matters.
9. Compensation Issues.

Tuesday Session, October 3—8:30 a.m.

(Open)—San Diego Marriott in Marina Ballroom D

1. Minutes of the Previous Meeting, August 28–29, 2000.
2. Remarks of the Postmaster General and CEO. (Mr. William Henderson)
3. Board of Governors Calendar Year 2001 Budget. (Chairman Dyhrkopp)
4. Office of the Governors FY 2001 Budget.

- (Chairman Dyhrkopp)
 5. Preliminary FY 2002 Appropriation Request. (Mr. Richard Strasser)
 6. Capital Investments.
 - a. Champaign, Illinois, Processing and Distribution Facility Expansion. (Mr. Danny Jackson)
 - b. Stamford, Connecticut—New Springdale Station Additional Funding. (Ms. Diane Van Loozen)
 7. Report on the San Diego District.
 8. Tentative Agenda for the November 13–14, 2000, meeting in Washington, DC
- [FR Doc. 00–24589 Filed 9–20–00; 3:07 pm]
BILLING CODE 7710–12–M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

[Release No. 35–27230]

Filings Under the Public Utility Holding Company Act of 1935, as Amended (“Act”)

September 15, 2000.

Notice is hereby given that the following filing(s) has/have been made with the Commission pursuant to provisions of the Act and rules promulgated under the Act. All interested persons are referred to the application(s) and/or declaration(s) for complete statements of the proposed transaction(s) summarized below. The application(s) and/or declaration(s) and any amendment(s) is/are available for public inspection through the Commission's Branch of Public Reference.

Interested persons wishing to comment or request a hearing on the application(s) and/or declaration(s) should submit their views in writing by October 10, 2000, to the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, Washington, DC 20549–0609, and serve a copy on the relevant applicant(s) and/or declarant(s) at the address(es) specified below. Proof of service (by affidavit or, in the case of an attorney at law, by certificate) should be filed with the request. Any request for hearing should identify specifically the issues of facts or law that are disputed. A person who so requests will be notified of any hearing, if ordered, and will receive a copy of any notice or order issued in the matter. After October 10, 2000, the application(s) and/or declaration(s), as filed or as amended, may be granted and/or permitted to become effective.

Alliant Energy Corporation, et al. (70–9317)

Alliant Energy Corporation (“Alliant Energy”) (formerly, Interstate Energy Corporation), a registered holding company, and its service company subsidiary, Alliant Energy Corporate

Services, Inc. (“Services”), both located at 222 West Washington Avenue, Madison, Wisconsin 53703; and two of its public utility subsidiary companies, IES Utilities, Inc. (“IES”), Alliant Energy Tower, Cedar Rapids, Iowa 52401 and Interstate Power Company (“IPC”), 1000 Main Street S.E., P.O. Box 769, Dubuque, Iowa 52004 (together, “Applicants”), have filed a post-effective amendment under sections 6(a), 7, 9(a), 10, 12(b), 32 and 33 of the Act and rules 43, 45, and 53 under the Act to their application-declaration previously filed under the Act.

By order dated December 18, 1998 (HCAR No. 26956) (“Financing Order”), the Commission authorized, among other things, Alliant Energy to issue and sell from time to time through December 31, 2000, commercial paper and/or notes at market based rates (“Short-Term Debt”) in an aggregate principal amount at any time outstanding of up to \$750 million. The Financing Order authorized Alliant Energy to use \$450 million of the proceeds of the Short-Term Debt to fund its utility subsidiary money pool (“Utility Money Pool”), and to use up to \$300 million of the remaining Short-Term Debt to fund investments in “exempt wholesale generators” (“EWGs”) and “foreign utility companies” (“FUCOs”), as those terms are defined in sections 32 and 33 of the Act. In addition, the Financing Order authorized Alliant Energy's operating company subsidiaries, IES and IPC, to make borrowings under and invest surplus funds in the Utility Money Pool.¹ Finally, the Financing Order authorized Alliant Energy to enter into guarantees, obtain letters of credit, enter into expense agreements or otherwise provide credit support (“Guarantees”) for its nonutility subsidiaries in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$600 million outstanding at any one time.²

The Applicants now request that the Commission modify certain aspects of the Financing Order and extend the authorization period from December 31, 2000 to June 30, 2004 (“Authorization Period”). Specifically, Alliant Energy

¹ The Financing Order limited Utility Money Pool borrowing to annual outstanding amounts of \$150 million for IES and \$72 million for IPC.

² Alliant Energy Resources, Inc. (“AER”), a subsidiary nonutility holding company of Alliant Energy, maintains a separate commercial paper program and bank credit facilities totaling \$600 million to fund a separate nonutility money pool (“Nonutility Money Pool”) maintained for the benefit of Alliant Energy's direct and indirect nonutility subsidiaries other than Services. As noted in the Financing Order, AER's financing arrangements are exempt from Commission review under rule 52(b). Similarly, borrowings by members of the Nonutility Money Pool also are exempt under rule 52(b).