

**NRC/AS Working Group on Event Reporting  
TELECONFERENCE SUMMARY  
November 20, 2000  
2 - 4 pm EDT**

**Participants**

Robert Dansereau*	NYS/DOH	518-402-7590	red07@health.state.ny.us
Kevin Hsueh	NRC/STP	301-415-2598	kph@nrc.gov
Pat Larkins	NRC/STP	301-415-2309	pml@nrc.gov
Mark Sitek	NRC/NMSS	301-415-5799	mas3@nrc.gov
Helen Watkins	TX/BRC	512-834-6688	helen.watkins@tdh.state.tx.us

Note: Agi Seaton\*\* was unavailable.

\* Co-Chairman

\*\* Facilitator

**General Discussions**

The discussions centered around the draft report. Specific attention was given to whether the report addresses the items in the charter. Those tasks that do not have adequate information for the group to make informed recommendations will be addressed by the respective task leaders. Limited discussions on recommendations also took place. In general, the working group concluded that a lot of the problems associated with event reporting could be greatly mollified by amending the regulations to make them clearer and more consistent.

**Status of Specific Tasks of the Draft Report:**

1. *Comparison of Strategic Plan and Reporting Requirements*

The working group did not discuss the status of the two tables because the respective task leaders were not able to attend the meeting. Harriet Karagiannis reported prior to the meeting that she would not be able to attend due to higher priority work. Furthermore, she indicated that her higher priority work will occupy her time until January. She indicated that her management may allow her to attend the working group meeting in December, however. The working group suggested identifying any rulemaking activities that will be required as result of our recommendations and/or analyses under this task.

2. *Licensee Guidance*

Helen Watkins presented this section of the draft report. She reiterated that the discussion of guidance will not be a large part of the final report and the working group concurred. The working group came to the consensus that the guidance that is available is adequate, just not easily accessible, and as a result, licensees are not aware of it. The recommendations in the draft report address ways of making guidance more accessible to licensees (i.e., establishing more visible links on web pages, consolidating and indexing reporting requirements etc.). Helen committed to formatting this section of the report to include identifiable headings that address the charter items.

### 3. *Enhance NMED Reporting*

Kevin Hsueh presented the draft for this section of the report. He presented statistics on the number of NMED records for the year 1999 still needing additional information as of June and November 2000, along with the types of information needed. Furthermore, he provided the numbers of additional information requests for each NRC reporting requirement. The two requirements with the most requests were an immediate and a 24-hour report. Recommendations on how to improve the quality and consistency centered around NMSS and STP periodically reviewing NMED reporting statistics. Kevin also provided specific examples in the regulations where NMED record information is not specifically requested by the regulations or not consistently nor clearly requested. As a result, the working group suggested that this task also identify any rulemaking activities that may result from the recommendations and/or analyses from this task. Finally, data on the number of NRC and AS reportable events were presented for 1998 and 1999. The working group recognized that about 3.6% of NRC licensees had reportable events to about 1.7% of AS licensees. The working group did not have an intuitive feeling if this difference was significant. Kevin will develop the recommendations on how to improve the quantity of the data.

#### 4a. *Improve Stakeholder Understanding*

Bob Dansereau reported that he consolidated the AS and NRC regional responses of the questionnaire into one document. He agreed to augment this section of the report (consistent with the charter) to address the need to assess events for various stakeholders. The working group expanded the stakeholders identified in the charter to include addressing the need to assess events in order to provide feedback to the public. Bob also reiterated that the AS handbook needs to be modified to provide more information as to why event information is needed.

#### 4b. *NMSS Generic Issues Program Review*

The working group felt this section of the report was very thoroughly written. A working group member pointed out that at the most recent Op Events briefing that it was mentioned that the working group will provide recommendations on how to improve and/or modify the Op Events briefings. A suggestion to only address potential AOs and generic issues at the briefings was proposed.

### 5. *Computer System Review*

Mark Sitek presented this section of the report. He incorporated input from Steve Sandin on the EN system. All of the software systems are described in this section and are broken down by category (notification, tracking, and archive). A table which characterizes and summarizes the various software was developed. Recommendations on the four specific issues were presented. The group discussed the issue of allowing the public to access NMED. The general consensus was that allowing the public to view NMED quarterly reports and trend analyses performed on the data was preferred to allowing the public to access and manipulate the raw data. Mark committed to ensuring that the charter items are addressed in this section of the report.

Next Steps:

Provide revised text (WordPerfect files) to Kevin Ramsey by Tuesday, 11/28.

Draft report provided to Steering Committee by 11/30.

Provide briefing slides to Kevin Ramsey by 12/6.

Brief Steering Committee 12/11.

WG meeting in Rockville, MD on 12/13 - 12/14 (Wed/Thu).