FOIA/PA REQUEST
Case No.: 2014-0280
Date Rec'd: 6/9/14
Specialist:
Related Case:

FOIA Resource

From: David Lochbaum <nobody@www.nrc.gov>
Sent: Monday, June 09, 2014 1:23 PM
To: FOIA Resource
Subject: WWW Form Submission

Below is the result of your feedback form. It was submitted by

David Lochbaum () on Monday, June 09, 2014 at 13:23:06

through the IP (b)(6)

using the form at http://www.nrc.gov/reading-rm/foia/foia-submittal-form.html

and resulted in this email to foia.resource@nrc.gov

Company/Affliation: Union of Concerned Scientists

Address1: PO Box 15316

Address2:

City: Chattanooga

State: TN

Zip: 37415

Country: United_States

Country-Other:

Email: dlochbaum@ucsusa.org

Phone: 423-468-9272

Desc: ADAMS ML101230071 is one of the IOEB Clearinghouse Screening Summaries emailed daily by the NRC's Operating Experience Branch. I note this specific email because it illustrates the records I request. This specific email was sent while I worked for the NRC (my name is listed on its distribution list).

Under the Freedom of Information Act I request all the IOEB Clearinghouse Screening Summary emails between October 1, 2012, and December 31, 2012, inclusive.

As the specific email cited in the first paragraph above indicates, these emails were distributed to dozens of NRC staffers.

I only desire one copy of each email for each day from the requested period.

I do not need drafts of these summaries. And when summaries were re-issued with corrections, I only desire the final corrected version and do not need the original versions.

NRC might not maintain a formal library or collection of these summaries. But I suspect that at least one of the dozens of recipients has a complete collection covering the fourth quarter 2012-particularly the members of the Operating Experience Branch (e.g., Mark King, John Thompson, Eric Thomas, Michael Brown, Russell Haskell, Joseph Giantelli, Rebecca Sigmon, Robert Bernardo, and Jesse Robles.)

FeeCategory: Educational

MediaType:

MediaType_Other_Description:

Expedite_ImminentThreatText:

Expedite_UrgencyToInformText:

Waiver_Purpose: Last year, UCS started a periodic posting of commentary to our allthingsnuclear.org blog under the Nuclear Energy Activist Toolkit (NEAT) label. The NEAT posts are educational in that they strive to help people better understand nuclear technology and the NRC's role. Past NEAT posts have talked about the Event Notifications on the NRC's website and how 10 CFR 50.72/50.73 guides which notifications get followed up by written Licensee Event Reports. With the requested records, the publicly available operating data reports for the 4th quarter 2012 (ML13071A632), the publicly available Event Notifications that quarter, and the publicly available LERs for that period (obtained using the online search tool at https://lersearch.inl.gov/Entry.aspx), I will draft a post for the NEAT series illustrating how events happen at plants (from the operating data reports) some of which require informing the NRC (from the Event Notifications) of which some require written followups (from the LERs). The requested records supplement the information database of problems during the 4th quarter 2012 and will aid in the selection of events that best reflect the hierarchy of reporting (i.e., what gets reported to the NRC when and by what means).

Waiver_ExtentToExtractAnalyze: As indicated in the response to Question 1 above, I will review the requested records along with information already publicly available in order to identify types of events that happen at nuclear plants, the subset of such events that entail NRC notification, and the subset of notifications that require LER followups.

Waiver_SpecificActivityQuals: A recurring theme or topic that I hear from people around the country involves why Company X didn't tell the NRC about a problem at a nuclear plant. The objective of the planned NEAT post is to try to convey the dividing lines between events handled in-house and those events involving NRC notification.

Waiver_ImpactPublicUnderstanding: In addition to the communications objective outlined in the response to Question 3 above, I also plan to include references in the NEAT post to guidance documents such as NRC NUREG-1022 on reportability. The purpose of the planned NEAT post is to increase general familiarity with the reporting requirements and to provide "lifelines" in the form of links to sources of answers for persons with more specific questions.

Waiver_NatureOfPublic: I am queried several times each year from reporters and citizens about the lack of reports to the NRC about plant events. In addition to these people, there are undoubtedly others who wonder about what gets reported and what need not be reported. The hundreds or thousands of people who are likely to read the UCS NEAT post warrant our undertaking the effort to research and post it.

Waiver_MeansOfDissemination: UCS will use its NEAT series of routine posts to our allthingsnuclear.org blog to communicate the reporting requirements, using examples from the requested documents to help illustrate the lines between non-reporting, notifications, and LER submittals.

Waiver_FreeToPublicOrFee: Information posted to the allthingsnuclear.org blog is available for viewing/downloading for free.

Waiver_PrivateCommericalInterest: None.
