

(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 second 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 the Efficacy of the Overall Reactor Oversight Process (ROP)*

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

(1) 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)?

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

(3) Is the ROP understandable and are the procedures and output products clear and written in plain English?

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

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

(6) Does the ROP enhance public confidence?

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

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

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

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

(11) Does the ROP result in unintended consequences?

##### *Questions Related to Specific ROP Program Areas*

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

(12) Does the ROP take appropriate actions to address performance issues for those licensees that fall outside of the Licensee Response Column of the Action Matrix?

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

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

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

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

(17) 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, the World Association of Nuclear Operations, or the Maintenance Rule?

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

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

(20) Please provide any additional information or comments on other program areas related to the Reactor Oversight Process. Other areas of interest may include the treatment of cross-cutting issues in the ROP, the risk-based evaluation process associated with determining event response, and the reduced subjectivity and elevated threshold for documenting issues in inspection reports.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland, this 15th day of November 2001.

For the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

**Michael R. Johnson,**

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

[FR Doc. 01-29132 Filed 11-20-01; 8:45 am]

**BILLING CODE 7590-01-P**

#### POSTAL SERVICE

##### **United States Postal Service Board of Governors; Sunshine Act Meeting**

##### **Board Votes to Close November 13 and 15, 2001, Meeting**

By telephone vote on November 13 and 15, 2001, the Board of Governors of the United States Postal Service voted unanimously to close to public observation its meeting held in Washington, D.C., via teleconference. The Board determined that prior public notice was not possible.

##### **ITEMS CONSIDERED:**

1. Strategic Planning.
2. Rate Case Update, Docket No.

R2001-1.

**GENERAL COUNSEL CERTIFICATION:** The General Counsel of the United States Postal Service has certified that the meeting was properly closed under the Government in the Sunshine Act.

##### **CONTACT PERSON FOR MORE INFORMATION:**

Requests for information about the meeting should be addressed to the Secretary of the Board, David G. Hunter, at (202) 268-4800.

**David G. Hunter,**

*Secretary.*

[FR Doc. 01-29292 Filed 11-19-01; 2:45 pm]

**BILLING CODE 7710-12-M**

#### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

##### **Proposed Collection; Comment Request**

**SUMMARY:** In accordance with the requirement of section 3506 (c)(2)(A) of the Paperwork Reduction Act of 1995 which provides opportunity for public comment on new or revised data collections, the Railroad Retirement Board (RRB) will public periodic summaries of proposed data collections.

*Comments are invited on:* (a) Whether the proposed information collection is necessary for the proper performance of the functions of the agency, including whether the information has practical utility; (b) the accuracy of the RRB's estimate of the burden of the collection of the information; (c) ways to enhance