

“Environmental Standard Review Plan.” This plan guides the NRC staff in reviewing an application for an early site permit, construction permit, or combined operating license. However, the guidance is general and not binding.

On July 18, 2001, the Nuclear Energy Institute submitted two petitions for rulemaking (Docket Nos. PRM-52-1, PRM-52-2). Among other things, PRM-52-1 requested that the NRC treat as resolved certain information (including siting information) for a proposed nuclear power plant to be built on a site of an existing licensed plant. PRM-52-2 requested elimination of the requirement to consider alternative sites for nuclear power plants. The NRC published a notice of receipt and request for comment in the **Federal Register** on September 24, 2001 (66 FR 48828). A decision on this petition has not yet been issued by the NRC.

Meeting Topics

The discussions will include the topics discussed below.

(1) Regulatory options:

(a) Maintain the status quo. In this case, the suitability of the candidate site and whether an “obviously superior” alternative site exists would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis, using the current Standard Review Plan as a source of general and non-binding guidance.

(b) Conduct rulemaking to specifically define the criteria for candidate and alternative site reviews. In this case, specific and binding criteria would be developed and implemented.

(c) Issue revised guidance, such as a revised Standard Review Plan. In this case, specific criteria might be developed, but they would not be binding.

(2) Criteria for candidate and alternative site reviews might take one of two broad forms. One type of criterion would focus on the sites selected by the applicant. The other type would focus on the applicant’s site-selection process.

(3) The region of interest is the area from which an applicant may select candidate and alternative sites. In the past, likely areas were the State in which the applicant would locate the proposed site or the applicant’s service area. Now, deregulation of the electric utility industry might affect the region of interest. In a deregulated industry, the power purchase agreements of a merchant power producer could have considerable reach. It may not be reasonable, however, to expand the region of interest to include areas at great distance from the proposed site.

(4) The review of alternative sites might be subject to a numerical limit. The 1980 proposed rule would have restricted the review to four sites (the proposed site and three alternative sites).

(5) In the past, the NRC has employed an “obviously superior” standard. Some of the ideas that have been suggested for making a determination on whether an alternative site is obviously superior are the following:

(a) If the proposed site is the site of an existing nuclear power plant, the search for reasonable alternatives may be restricted because it is unlikely that an alternative site would be obviously superior.

(b) If the proposed site is the site of an existing nuclear power plant and no potentially disqualifying factors are identified, no review of alternative sites should be required.

(c) The 1980 proposed rule would have indicated that the NRC would use a sequential two-part analytical test. The first part would give primary consideration to hydrology, water quality, aquatic biological resources, terrestrial resources, water and land use, socioeconomic, and population to determine whether any alternative sites are environmentally preferred to the proposed site. If such an environmentally preferred site exists, the second part would overlay consideration of project economics, technology, and institutional factors to determine whether such a site is in fact an obviously superior site.

(6) Emergency preparedness is essentially a safety topic, rather than an environmental protection consideration. However, in some circumstances emergency preparedness considerations might have an effect on the determination of whether an alternative site is obviously superior to the proposed site. For example, there might be physical characteristics unique to an alternative site that could pose a significant impediment to the development of emergency plans. Accordingly, an applicant might be required to identify any physical characteristics unique to an alternative site, such as egress limitations from the area surrounding the site, that could pose a significant impediment to the development of emergency plans, *i.e.*, similar to what is currently required for an early site permit under 10 CFR part 52.

(7) Other topics may be introduced by the participants.

The agenda schedule is as follows:

9–9:30 a.m.: Introductory Remarks
9–12 p.m.: Background and Discussion of Issues

12–1:30 p.m.: Break

1:30–5 p.m. Discussion Continued and Concluding Remarks*

*The meeting may end earlier if a full day is not needed to discuss the issues.

The Environmental Standard Review Plan, discussed above, 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. It is also accessible from the Agencywide Documents Assess and Management Systems (ADAMS) Public Electronic Reading Room on the Internet at the NRC Web site, <http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/adams.html> under the following ADAMS accession number: ML003702134. If you do not have access to ADAMS or if you have problems in accessing the document in Adams, contact the NRC Public Document Room (PDR) Reference Staff at 1–800–397–4209, 301–415–4737 or by e-mail to pdr@nrc.gov. You may obtain single copies of the document from the contact listed above under the heading **FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT**.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 20th day of December, 2002.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

Brian E. Thomas,

Acting Program Director, Policy and Rulemaking Program, Division of Regulatory Improvement Programs, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 02–32697 Filed 12–26–02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590–01–P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittee on Reliability and Probabilistic Risk Assessment; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Reliability and Probabilistic Risk Assessment will hold a meeting on January 22, 2003, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows: *Wednesday, January 22, 2003—8:30 a.m. until 10 a.m.*

The Subcommittee will review the draft Plan for achieving coherence in regulatory safety arena. The Plan would provide an approach in which reactor regulations, staff programs, and processes are built on a unified safety concept and are properly integrated so that they complement one another. The purpose of this meeting is to gather

information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify one of the staff engineers named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittee will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and other interested persons regarding these matters.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, and the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the Designated Federal Official, Mr. Sam Duraiswamy (telephone: 301-415-7364) or Mr. Michael R. Snodderly, Cognizant Staff Engineer, (telephone: 301-415-6927) between 7:30 a.m. and 4:15 p.m. (EST). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact one of the above named individuals at least two working days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda.

Dated: December 20, 2002.

Sher Bahadur,

Associate Director, for Technical Support, ACRS/ACNW.

[FR Doc. 02-32692 Filed 12-26-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Joint Meeting of the ACRS Subcommittees on Reliability and Probabilistic Risk Assessment and on Plant Operations; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittees on Reliability and Probabilistic Risk Assessment and on Plant Operations will hold a joint meeting on January 21,

2003, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Tuesday, January 21, 2003—8:30 a.m. Until the Conclusion of Business

The Subcommittee will continue its discussion of activities associated with the Reactor Oversight Process (ROP), specifically staff activities to address the issues in the Staff Requirements Memorandum of December 20, 2001, in which the Commission directed that the NRC staff, with input from ACRS, should provide recommendations for resolving in a transparent manner, apparent conflicts and discrepancies between aspects of the revised ROP process that are risk-informed (e.g., significance determination process) and those that are performance based (e.g., performance indicators). The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman and written statements will be accepted and made available to the Subcommittees, their consultants, and staff. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Designated Federal Official named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittees, along with any of their consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

The Subcommittees will then hear presentations by and hold discussions with representatives of the NRC staff and other interested persons regarding matters scheduled for this meeting.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, and the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the Designated Federal Official, Ms. Maggalean W. Weston (telephone: 301-415-3151) between 8 a.m. and 5:30 p.m. (EST). Persons planning to attend this meeting are urged to contact the above named individual at least two working

days prior to the meeting to be advised of any potential changes to the agenda that may have occurred.

Dated: December 20, 2002.

Sher Bahadur,

Associate Director for Technical Support, ACRS/ACNW.

[FR Doc. 02-32693 Filed 12-26-02; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-P

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Subcommittee Meeting on Safety Research Program; Notice of Meeting

The ACRS Subcommittee on Safety Research Program will hold a meeting on January 22, 2003, Room T-2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland.

The entire meeting will be open to public attendance.

The agenda for the subject meeting shall be as follows:

Wednesday, January 22, 2003—10 a.m. Until the Conclusion of Business

The Subcommittee will continue to discuss the ACRS 2003 report on the NRC-sponsored research programs. The purpose of this meeting is to gather information, analyze relevant issues and facts, and formulate proposed positions and actions, as appropriate, for deliberation by the full Committee.

Oral statements may be presented by members of the public with the concurrence of the Subcommittee Chairman; written statements will be accepted and made available to the Committee. Persons desiring to make oral statements should notify the Designated Federal Official named below five days prior to the meeting, if possible, so that appropriate arrangements can be made. Electronic recordings will be permitted only during those portions of the meeting that are open to the public.

During the initial portion of the meeting, the Subcommittee, along with any of its consultants who may be present, may exchange preliminary views regarding matters to be considered during the balance of the meeting.

Further information regarding topics to be discussed, whether the meeting has been canceled or rescheduled, and the Chairman's ruling on requests for the opportunity to present oral statements and the time allotted therefor can be obtained by contacting the Designated Federal Official, Dr. Richard P. Savio (telephone 301/415-7363)