

NRC/AS Working Group on Event Reporting
Summary of Conference Call
May 23, 2000
2 - 4 pm EDT
Room T8C5

Participants:

Bob Dansereau, NY (OAS Co-Chair)
Harriet Karagiannis, RES
Kevin Ramsey, NMSS (NRC Co-Chair)
Agi Seaton, CSC
Mark Sitek, NMSS
Helen Watkins, TX

Approval of Charter:

The participants discussed the issues raised by upper management when the working group charter was submitted to the Director of NMSS for final approval. The charter must be approved by the Director of NMSS and the Director of STP. Marty Virgilio, NMSS Deputy Director, has requested a briefing on what has changed since the 1999 self-assessment report (SECY-99-005). In addition, he would like to better understand why "NMSS believes a significant amount of Agreement State event information is missing or incomplete," and the relationship to IMPEP reviews.

A briefing is scheduled for Friday, May 26. Fred Combs, STP Deputy Director, will attend. We believe there is a concern that Task 4 implies Agreement State reports are bad and NRC reports are good. This is not the intent. Task 4 could be revised to simply state the belief that a significant amount of event information is missing or incomplete in NMED, and delete the references to Agreement State information.

There has also been a suggestion that Task 5 should be deleted because no specific problem has been identified with the guidance provided to licensees, and we should concentrate on the known problem areas. Any licensee guidance issues could be addressed under Task 4. However, it was noted that Agreement States are sensitive to having their issues lumped together with licensee issues. Addressing regulatory agency submittals (to NMED) and licensee submittals (to regulatory agencies) under separate tasks avoids the impression that we are treating Agreement States like licensees. Some participants believe that we should keep Task 5 to address the impact inspectors can make on educating licensees and maintaining their awareness of reporting requirements.

Status of Teams:

1. Communications Team - It was agreed that Bob Dansereau should take the lead for this team because he can prepare a description of the event review program from an Agreement State perspective. Flow charts of the event review processes in Texas, New York, and NRC were reviewed. Bob Dansereau (with input from Helen Watkins) will prepare an Agreement State version of the NRC flow chart. We intend to attach this flow chart to the questionnaire and ask Agreement States if it accurately reflects their program (if not, describe differences). Bob will start drafting answers to the questions in the "topics" area of Task 1 also.
2. Lessons Learned Team - It was agreed that Kevin Ramsey should take the lead for this team because of experience with GAP meetings and procedures. Kevin Ramsey will prepare input for the questionnaire, a flow chart of the "GAP process," and start drafting a discussion of GAP lessons learned. It was suggested that the questionnaire ask for feedback on GAP requests for information and NMSS handling of the information.
3. Software Team - A status report wasn't available. Steve Sandin is out of the office until early June. Mark Sitek agreed (after the meeting) to take the lead for drafting input for the questionnaire based on the tasks in the charter (tracking systems, posting events on the web, etc.). Mark will coordinate with Steve Sandin when he returns.
4. NMED Reporting Team - It was agreed that we should start work on this task and Kevin Hsueh should take the lead for this team because of experience with encouraging Agreement State use of the NMED system. This team should draft input for the questionnaire on NMED reporting issues. GAP requests for additional information should be researched to gather examples of the information most often requested. The NMED contractor should be interviewed on the information most often missing from NMED submittals also. This team should consider how problems obtaining additional information should be recorded for future IMPEP reviews.
5. Licensee Guidance Team - It was agreed that Helen Watkins should take the lead for this team because of inspection and enforcement experience. This team should research enforcement data to identify how often licensees have been cited for failing to report events. This team should draft input for the questionnaire on guidance provided to licensees during licensing and inspection. The questionnaire should solicit inspector feedback on specific reporting requirements where a poor regulation or poor guidance is contributing to inadequate reports from licensees.

Questionnaire Issues - It was agreed that the recipients of the questionnaire should be the Agreement State Program Directors and NRC Regional Management (either Regional Administrator or DNMS Division Director). The sender should be the Director of STP. The turnaround time should be 30 days. Helen Watkins will have the lead for assembling a draft questionnaire that we can finalize at the June meeting. Questionnaire input should be provided to Helen by June 2.

June Meeting in Austin - Travel arrangements have been made by the participants. Individuals will travel to Austin, TX on Monday, June 19. A block of rooms at the government rate (\$80) is being held at the AmeriSuites Hotel (contact Dana Upton at 512-231-8491). The agenda will consist of reports from each team and finalizing the questionnaire. We want to gather enough information before the meeting to allow us to start a rough draft of the report. We plan to work two full days only (June 20 - 21). We plan to work late on Tuesday if additional time is needed. Return travel can be scheduled any time on Thursday, June 22.

Future Meetings - It was agreed that after the June meeting, we would conduct a conference call in July. The next meeting should be early September at NRC Headquarters.