

**Guthrie, Eugene**

---

**From:** Eugene Guthrie *12*  
**Sent:** Tuesday, January 15, 2008 11:12 AM  
**To:** Christopher Welch; James Reece; John Zeiler  
**Cc:** Daniel Arnett; Jim Dodson; Larry Garner  
**Subject:** Fwd: groundwater reporting requirements

fyi - information provides some insight into reporting expectations for tritium

>>> Brian Bonser 1/15/2008 11:08:46 AM >>>

Useful information of groundwater reporting.

Brian Bonser, Chief  
Plant Support Branch 1  
U.S.NuclearRegulatory Commission  
Region II  
Office: 404-562-4653  
e-mail: brb1@nrc.gov

>>> Adam Nielsen 1/15/2008 10:42:56 AM >>>

I got some clarification from HQ (Steve Garry) on when it is appropriate for licensees to report groundwater events under 10CFR50.72. Steve admitted this was a gray area, but he had some discussion with the creators of NUREG-1022 and basically licensees need to put out a 50.72 report if they communicate with the state and/or local authorities \*and\* the event is expected to generate public interest. The whole point is to keep NRC informed of issues that may generate public interest. So just because they communicate to the state as part of their voluntary groundwater reporting procedures does not automatically trigger a 4-hour 50.72 report. Some good examples: Hatch spilled contaminated groundwater back onto the ground, activates their NEI communications plan and contacts the State, but does not put out a 50.72 report (no public interest). Whereas Brunswick discovers tritium levels of 500,000+pCi/L in an onsite, unlined pond adjacent to the site boundary, they contact the state and proceed with a 50.72 report to the NRC.

Officially, it's up to the licensee to make this call. If there's public interest, then they should. If nobody cares about, then they don't need to. Attached is NUREG-1022 which gives some guidance. Also note that if the licensee does put out a 50.72 report for groundwater issues, they can specifically state that they are doing so voluntarily.

Adam

5-100