

evacuation of the area. In addition, the Petitioners requested that the NRC take prompt action to permanently retire the facility if, after conducting a full review of the facility's vulnerabilities, security measures, and evacuation plans, the NRC finds that the IP facility cannot be adequately protected against terrorist threats. Further, separately from the above issues, the Petitioners requested that the NRC order the licensee to undertake the immediate conversion of the current water-cooled spent fuel storage system to a dry-cask system.

As the basis for the November 8, 2001, request, the Petitioners stated that: (1) The IP facility is a plausible target of future terrorist actions, (2) actual threats against nuclear power plants have been documented, (3) IP is currently vulnerable to a catastrophic terrorist attack, (4) a terrorist attack on IP2 and 3 would have significant public health, environmental, and economic impacts, and (5) the Westchester County's RERP is inadequate because it is based on erroneous assumptions.

The NRC sent a copy of the proposed Director's Decision to the Petitioners and to the licensee for comment on May 16, 2002. The Petitioners responded with comments on August 9, 2002, and the licensee had no comments. The Petitioners' comments and the NRC staff's response to them are included with the Director's Decision.

The Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has determined that the request to order the licensee to suspend operations, revoke the operating license, or adopt other measures resulting in a temporary shutdown of IP2 and 3, be denied. The reasons for this decision, along with the reasons for decisions regarding the remaining Petitioners' requests, are explained in the Director's Decision pursuant to 10 CFR 2.206 (DD 02-06), the complete text of which is available in the Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) for inspection at the Commission's Public Document Room, located at One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville Pike (first floor), Rockville, Maryland, and from the NRC Web site (<http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html>).

As stated in its letter to the Petitioners on December 20, 2001, the NRC has, in effect, partially granted the Petitioners' request for an immediate security upgrade at IP2 and 3. On September 11, 2001, the NRC took action to enhance security at all nuclear facilities, including IP2 and 3. Immediately after the attacks, the NRC advised all nuclear power plants to go to the highest level of security, which they promptly did. These facilities have remained at a

heightened security level since that time. The NRC continues to work with other Federal agencies and is monitoring relevant information it receives on security matters at nuclear facilities. The NRC is prepared to make immediate adjustments as necessary to ensure adequate protection of the public.

The NRC issued Orders on February 25, 2002, to all commercial nuclear power plants to implement interim compensatory security measures for the current threat environment. Some of the requirements made mandatory by the Orders formalized the security measures that NRC licensees had taken in response to advisories issued by the NRC in the aftermath of the September 11 terrorist attacks. The Orders also imposed additional security enhancements, which have emerged based on the NRC's assessment of the current threat environment and its ongoing security review. The requirements will remain in effect until the NRC determines that the level of threat has diminished, or that other security changes are needed. The specific actions are sensitive, but include increased patrols, augmented security forces and capabilities, additional security posts, installation of additional physical barriers, vehicle checks at greater stand-off distances, enhanced coordination with law enforcement and military authorities and more restrictive site access controls for all personnel. Regarding the Petitioners' request for specific information about the security measures, the NRC's policy is to not release safeguards information to the public. Thus, this request is denied.

The NRC in its February 25, 2002, Orders also directed licensees to evaluate and address potential vulnerabilities to maintain or restore cooling to the core, containment, and spent fuel pool and to develop specific guidance and strategies to respond to an event that damages large areas of the plant due to explosions or fires. These strategies are intended to help licensees to identify and utilize any remaining onsite or offsite equipment and capabilities. If NRC's ongoing security review recommends any other security measures, the NRC will take appropriate action.

The NRC denies the Petitioners' request to mandate certain security measures, as specified by the Petitioners, for the protection of the facility, such as a system to defend a no-fly zone. The NRC considers that the collective measures taken since September 11, 2001, provide adequate protection of public health and safety.

The NRC finds that the existing emergency response plans are flexible enough to respond to a wide variety of adverse conditions, including a terrorist attack. The NRC advisories and the Orders issued since September 11, 2001, directed licensees to take specific actions deemed appropriate to ensure continued improvements to existing emergency response plans. The Petitioners' concern that the emergency plans do not contemplate multiple attacks on the infrastructure is alleviated by the fact that the emergency plans are intended to be broad and flexible enough to respond to a wide spectrum of events. Thus, the Petitioners' request that the onsite and offsite emergency plans be revised to account for possible terrorist attacks has been, in part, granted.

The NRC finds that the current spent fuel storage system and the security provisions at IP adequately protect the spent fuel. Thus, the Petitioners' request to order the installation of a dry-cask storage facility is denied. However, the licensee has stated its intention to add such a facility.

A copy of the Director's Decision will be filed with the Secretary of the Commission for the Commission's review in accordance with 10 CFR 2.206 of the Commission's regulations. As provided for by this regulation, the Director's Decision will constitute the final action of the Commission 25 days after the date of the decision, unless the Commission, on its own motion, institutes a review of the Director's Decision in that time.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 18th day of November, 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Samuel J. Collins,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 02-29738 Filed 11-21-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Solicitation of Public Comments on the Third Year of Implementation of the Reactor Oversight Process

AGENCY: Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

ACTION: Request for public comment.

SUMMARY: Nearly 3 years have elapsed since the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) implemented its revised Reactor Oversight Process (ROP). The NRC is currently soliciting comments from members of the public, licensees, and interest groups related to

the implementation of the ROP. This is a followup to the **Federal Register** notice (FRN) issued in November 2001 requesting feedback on the second year of implementation.

DATES: The comment period expires on December 27, 2002. The NRC will consider comments received after this date if it is practical to do so, but is only able to ensure consideration of comments received on or before this date.

ADDRESSES: Comments may be e-mailed to nrcprep@nrc.gov or sent to Michael T. Lesar, Chief, Rules and Directives Branch, Office of Administration (Mail Stop T6-D59), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555-0001. Comments may also be hand-delivered to Mr. Lesar at 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. on Federal workdays.

Documents created or received at the NRC after November 1, 1999, are available electronically through the NRC's Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm.html>. From this site, the public can access the NRC's Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS), which provides text and image files of the NRC's public documents. For more information, contact the NRC's Public Document Room (PDR) reference staff at 301-415-4737 or 800-397-4209, or by e-mail at pdr@nrc.gov.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT: Mr. Michael J. Maley, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (Mail Stop OWFN 7A15), U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington DC 20555-0001. Mr. Maley can also be reached by telephone at 301-415-2919 or by e-mail at mj3@nrc.gov.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION:

Program Overview

The mission of the NRC is to regulate the civilian uses of nuclear materials in the United States to protect the health and safety of the public and the environment, and to promote the common defense and security by preventing the proliferation of nuclear material. The mission is accomplished through the following activities:

- License nuclear facilities and the possession, use, and disposal of nuclear materials.
- Develop and implement requirements governing licensed activities.
- Inspect and enforce licensee activities to ensure compliance with these requirements and the law.

While the NRC's responsibility is to monitor and regulate licensee's performance, the primary responsibility for safe operation and handling of nuclear materials rests with each licensee.

As the nuclear industry in the United States has matured for more than 25 years, the NRC and its licensees have learned much about how to safely operate nuclear facilities and handle nuclear materials. In April 2000, the NRC began to implement more effective and efficient inspection, assessment, and enforcement approaches, which apply insights from these years of regulatory oversight and nuclear facility operation. The NRC has also incorporated risk-informed principles and techniques into its oversight activities. A risk-informed approach to oversight enables the NRC to more appropriately apply its resources to oversight of operational areas that contribute most to safe operation at nuclear facilities.

After conducting a 6-month pilot program in 1999, assessing the results, and incorporating the lessons learned, the NRC began implementing the revised Reactor Oversight Process (ROP) at all 103 nuclear facilities (except D.C. Cook) on April 2, 2000. Inherent in the ROP are the following key NRC performance goals:

- (1) Maintain safety by establishing and implementing a regulatory oversight process that ensures that plants are operated safely.
- (2) Enhance public confidence by increasing the predictability, consistency, and objectivity of the oversight process; providing timely and understandable information; and providing opportunities for meaningful involvement by the public.
- (3) Improve the effectiveness, efficiency, and realism of the oversight process by implementing a process of continuous improvement.
- (4) Reduce unnecessary regulatory burden through the consistent application of the process and incorporation of lessons learned.

Key elements of the ROP include revised NRC inspection procedures, plant performance indicators, a significance determination process, and an assessment program that incorporates various risk-informed thresholds to help determine the level of NRC oversight and enforcement. Since process development began in 1998, the NRC has frequently communicated with the public by various means. These have included conducting public meetings in the vicinity of each licensed commercial nuclear power plant, issuing FRNs soliciting feedback on the process,

publishing press releases about the new process, conducting multiple public workshops, placing pertinent background information in the NRC's Public Document Room, and establishing an NRC Web site containing easily accessible information about the new program and licensee performance.

NRC Public Stakeholder Comments

The NRC continues to be interested in receiving feedback from members of the public, various public stakeholders, and industry groups on their insights regarding the third year of implementation of the ROP. In particular, the NRC is seeking responses to the questions listed below, which will provide important information that the NRC can use in ongoing program improvement. A summary of the feedback obtained will be provided to the Commission and included in the annual ROP self-assessment report.

Questions

Questions Related to Specific ROP Program Areas

(As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(1) Does the Performance Indicator Program minimize the potential for licensees to take actions that adversely impact plant safety?

(2) Does appropriate overlap exist between the Performance Indicator Program and the Inspection Program?

(3) Do reporting conflicts exist, or is there unnecessary overlap between reporting requirements of the ROP and those associated with the Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO), the World Association of Nuclear Operations (WANO), or the Maintenance Rule?

(4) Does NEI 99-02, "Regulatory Assessment Performance Indicator Guideline" provide clear guidance regarding Performance Indicators?

(5) Is the information in the inspection reports useful to you?

(6) Does the Significance Determination Process yield equivalent results for issues of similar significance in all ROP cornerstones?

(7) Does the NRC take appropriate actions to address performance issues for those licensees outside of the Licensee Response Column of the Action Matrix?

(8) Is the information contained in assessment reports relevant, useful, and written in plain English?

Questions Related to the Efficacy of the Overall Reactor Oversight Process (ROP)

(As appropriate, please provide specific examples and suggestions for improvement.)

(9) Are the ROP oversight activities predictable (*i.e.*, controlled by the process) and objective (*i.e.*, based on supported facts, rather than relying on subjective judgement)?

(10) Is the ROP risk-informed, in that the NRC's actions are graduated on the basis of increased significance?

(11) Is the ROP understandable and are the processes, procedures and products clear and written in plain English?

(12) Does the ROP provide adequate assurance that plants are being operated and maintained safely?

(13) Does the ROP improve the efficiency, effectiveness, and realism of the regulatory process?

(14) Does the ROP enhance public confidence?

(15) Has the public been afforded adequate opportunity to participate in the ROP and to provide inputs and comments?

(16) Has the NRC been responsive to public inputs and comments on the ROP?

(17) Has the NRC implemented the ROP as defined by program documents?

(18) Does the ROP reduce unnecessary regulatory burden on licensees?

(19) Does the ROP result in unintended consequences?

(20) Please provide any additional information or comments on other program areas related to the Reactor Oversight Process.

Dated in Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of November, 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Cynthia A. Carpenter,

Inspection Program Branch, Division of Inspection Program Management, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 02-29736 Filed 11-21-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Issuer Delisting; Notice of Application To Withdraw From Listing and Registration on the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. (Huntsman Polymers Corporation, 11¾% Senior Notes (due 2004)) File No. 1-9988

November 18, 2002.

Huntsman Polymers Corporation, a Delaware corporation ("Issuer"), has filed an application with the Securities and Exchange Commission

("Commission"), pursuant to Section 12(d) of the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 ("Act")¹ and Rule 12d2-2(d) thereunder,² to withdraw its 11¾% Senior Notes (due 2004) ("Security"), from listing and registration on the New York Stock Exchange, Inc. ("NYSE" or "Exchange").

The Issuer stated in its application that it has met the requirements of the NYSE rules governing an issuer's voluntary withdrawal of a security from listing and registration.

The Board of Directors ("Board") of the Issuer approved resolutions on October 15, 2002 to withdraw the Issuer's Security from listing on the NYSE. In making its decision to withdraw the Issuer's Security from the Exchange, the Issuer's Board notes that the debt market for the Security is relatively small and offers significantly less liquidity and price discovery to investors compared to the NYSE equity market. In addition, the Board represents that competitive market forces, influenced both by the costs associated with maintaining the listing and by relative difference in trading volume, have made the over-the-counter markets the dominant venue for trading debt securities. The Issuer states that it is currently seeking quotation of the Security on the over-the-counter markets.

The Issuer's application relates solely to the Security's withdrawal from listing on the NYSE and from registration under Section 12(b) of the Act³ and shall not affect its obligation to be registered under Section 12(g) of the Act.⁴

Any interested person may, on or before December 12, 2002, submit by letter to the Secretary of the Securities and Exchange Commission, 450 Fifth Street, NW., Washington, DC 20549-0609, facts bearing upon whether the application has been made in accordance with the rules of the NYSE and what terms, if any, should be imposed by the Commission for the protection of investors. The Commission, based on the information submitted to it, will issue an order granting the application after the date mentioned above, unless the Commission determines to order a hearing on the matter.

¹ 15 U.S.C. 78l(d).

² 17 CFR 240.12d2-2(d).

³ 15 U.S.C. 78l(b).

⁴ 15 U.S.C. 78l(g).

For the Commission, by the Division of Market Regulation, pursuant to delegated authority.⁵

Jill M. Peterson,

Assistant Secretary.

[FR Doc. 02-29762 Filed 11-21-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 8010-01-P

SECURITIES AND EXCHANGE COMMISSION

Sunshine Act Meetings

Notice is hereby given, pursuant to the provisions of the Government in the Sunshine Act, Pub. L. 94-409, that the Securities and Exchange Commission will hold the following meetings during the week of November 25, 2002:

A closed meeting will be held on Monday, November 25, 2002, at 2:30 p.m., and an open meeting will be held on Tuesday, November 26, 2002, at 10 a.m., in Room 1C30, the William O. Douglas Room.

Commissioners, Counsel to the Commissioners, the Secretary to the Commission, and recording secretaries will attend the closed meeting. Certain staff members who have an interest in the matters may also be present.

The General Counsel of the Commission, or his designee, has certified that, in his opinion, one or more of the exemptions set forth in 5 U.S.C. 552(b)(5), (7), (9)(B) and (10) and 17 CFR 200.402(a)(5), (7), (9)(ii) and (10), permit consideration of the scheduled matters at the closed meeting.

The subject matter of the closed meeting scheduled for Monday, November 25, 2002, will be:

Institution and settlement of administrative proceedings of an enforcement nature; and

Institution and settlement of injunctive actions.

The subject matter of the open meeting scheduled for Tuesday, November 26, 2002, will be:

1. The Commission will consider whether to issue a release proposing amendments to rule 10b-18 (the safe harbor for issuer repurchases), and amendments to regulations S-K and S-B under the Securities and Exchange Act of 1934, Exchange Act forms 10-Q, 10-QSB, 10-K, 10-KSB, and 20-F, and proposed form N-CSR under the Exchange Act and the Investment Company Act of 1940, regarding disclosure of issuer repurchases.

2. The Commission will consider whether to propose new rule 3a-8 under the Investment Company Act of 1940 that would provide a nonexclusive safe

⁵ 17 CFR 200.30-3(a)(1).