



**~~\*\*OFFICIAL USE ONLY\*\*~~**  
**~~SENSITIVE INTERNAL INFORMATION~~**  
**~~LIMITED TO THE NRC UNLESS THE~~**  
**~~COMMISSION DETERMINES OTHERWISE~~**

## **POLICY ISSUE**

### **(Notation Vote)**

November 30, 2020

SECY-20-0109

**FOR:** The Commissioners

**FROM:** Margaret M. Doane  
Executive Director for Operations

**SUBJECT:** PETITION FOR RULEMAKING AND RULEMAKING PLAN ON  
IMMEDIATE NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR NONEMERGENCY  
EVENTS (PRM-50-116; NRC-2018-0201)

#### **PURPOSE:**

The purpose of this paper is to request Commission approval to consider in the rulemaking process a petition for rulemaking (PRM) to amend the immediate notification requirements for nonemergency events in Title 10 of the *Code of Federal Regulations* (10 CFR) 50.72, "Immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power reactors." A rulemaking plan is included in this paper.

#### **SUMMARY:**

The U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) received a PRM under 10 CFR 2.802, "Petition for rulemaking—requirements for filing," dated August 2, 2018 (Agencywide Documents Access and Management System (ADAMS) Accession No. ML18247A204), submitted by Mr. Bill Pitesa on behalf of the Nuclear Energy Institute (NEI). The petition requested that the NRC amend 10 CFR 50.72 to remove all nonemergency notification requirements. In accordance with 10 CFR 2.803, "Petition for rulemaking—NRC action," the staff docketed the petition as PRM-50-116 and reviewed the petition under 10 CFR 2.803(h)(1). The staff recommends evaluating within the NRC's rulemaking process the nonemergency

**CONTACTS:** Daniel I. Doyle, NMSS/REFS  
301-415-3748

Catherine E. Nolan, NRR/DRO  
301-415-1535

Enclosure 3 transmitted herewith contains  
Official Use Only – Sensitive Internal  
Information. When separated from the  
enclosure, this paper is decontrolled.

**~~\*\*OFFICIAL USE ONLY\*\*~~**  
**~~SENSITIVE INTERNAL INFORMATION~~**  
**~~LIMITED TO THE NRC UNLESS THE~~**  
**~~COMMISSION DETERMINES OTHERWISE~~**

reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 with the goal of reducing unnecessary reporting burden. The staff considers this to be an opportunity to align the nonemergency reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 with safety and risk significance while taking advantage of advances in technology to improve the flow of information. The staff notes that eliminating some nonemergency event notification requirements could unacceptably degrade the NRC's ability to maintain situational awareness of significant events at nuclear power plants and reduce the visibility and openness of these events to public stakeholders. In addition, shifting the burden of managing the flow of voluntary reports to resident inspectors, as referenced in the petition, may not provide the optimal use of agency resources. However, updating the immediate nonemergency reporting requirements could aid both the NRC and licensees by improving the efficiency of the reporting process while reducing unnecessary burden. Staff will weigh these considerations carefully through the rulemaking process.

#### BACKGROUND:

The petitioner requests that the NRC amend 10 CFR 50.72 to remove the requirements for licensees to immediately report nonemergency events that occur at operating nuclear power plants. The petitioner contends that removing these requirements would eliminate duplicative notifications to the NRC and reduce unnecessary burden to licensees without added risk to public health and safety.

The NRC published a notice of docketing and request for comment in the *Federal Register* on November 20, 2018 (83 FR 58509), and the comment period ended on February 4, 2019. The NRC posed five specific questions to the public to gain a better understanding of the scope and basis for the issues raised by the petitioner. The NRC received 16 public comments. Eleven submissions (from NEI and nuclear power reactor licensees) supported the petition, one submission (from two private citizens) partially supported the petition, two submissions (from a private citizen and a nongovernmental organization) opposed the petition, and two submissions (from private citizens) were out of scope.

For the reasons discussed in this paper and in greater detail in the *Federal Register* notice (Enclosure 1), the staff requests approval to initiate a rulemaking to evaluate nonemergency reporting criteria and amend, as appropriate, the immediate notification requirements for nonemergency events in 10 CFR 50.72.

#### DISCUSSION:

The staff considered the petitioner's request based on information provided by the petitioner, public comments in response to the notice of docketing, staff experience, operating experience, and literature searches conducted by the staff. The staff recommends addressing the petition by initiating a rulemaking to evaluate the current nonemergency reporting requirements and guidance with the goal of reducing unnecessary reporting burden. Reduction of burden could include options such as eliminating or modifying some or all reporting requirements. Deliberate and systematic evaluation of the PRM through rulemaking is warranted because staff experience and recent technology advances may enable some reduction in reporting burden; however, the staff may also determine that elimination of certain requirements may unacceptably degrade the NRC's ability to maintain situational awareness and provide effective oversight and would therefore recommend retaining those requirements. Additionally, elimination of existing notification requirements could potentially reduce the visibility and openness of information regarding such events to public stakeholders.

On the other hand, there may be safety benefit in focusing licensee reporting of events on those events and conditions that represent greater risk to public health and safety. This could be accomplished in various ways such as reducing overlap of reporting requirements and using technology such as email or web-based applications to improve the flow of information. This could potentially aid in reducing both licensee and NRC burden, and allow more focus of resources on mitigating significant issues.

The NRC described the original intent of the requirements in 10 CFR 50.72 in the final rule dated February 29, 1980 (45 FR 13434), as follows:

The capability of the NRC to make timely decisions and to provide adequate assurances regarding actual or potential threats to public health and safety, depends heavily on the rapidity with which significant events are communicated by nuclear power reactor licensees to NRC. The majority of events occurring throughout the nuclear industry pose little or no serious or immediate threats to the public health and safety; however, certain events do pose such threats or generate fear or unusual concern.

NRC has an important obligation to collect facts quickly and accurately about significant events, assess the facts, take necessary action, and inform the public about the extent of the threat, if any, to public health and safety. Not only must NRC act promptly to prevent or minimize possible injury to the public, it must also take appropriate action to alleviate fear or concern created as a result of such events.

In a final rule published on October 25, 2000 (65 FR 63769), the NRC modified the reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72. These modifications split the reporting requirements into 1-hour, 4-hour, and 8-hour notifications instead of 1-hour and 4-hour reporting requirements to better align the reporting requirements with the NRC's needs for information to carry out its safety mission. The final rule also specified certain system actuations as reportable. Section III, "Discussion," of the 2000 final rule (65 FR at 63778) states the following:

The essential purpose of section 50.72 is "...to provide the Commission with immediate reporting of...significant events where immediate Commission action to protect the public health and safety may be required or where the Commission needs timely and accurate information to respond to heightened public concern." (48 FR 39039; August 29, 1983).

The intent of the 2000 final rule remains valid today because the NRC must make timely decisions and provide reasonable assurance of adequate protection regarding actual or potential threats to public health and safety. The NRC's ability to perform these functions depends heavily on the timely and accurate flow of information about significant events from nuclear power reactor licensees to the NRC; however, there may be other ways to accomplish this goal.

The petitioner claims that the purpose and objectives of 10 CFR 50.72 will continue to be fully met if the requested amendments are made because of the industry's voluntary practice of informing NRC resident inspectors of nonemergency events. The NRC staff agrees that there may be alternatives to the current 10 CFR 50.72 notification process; however, the staff does not consider the industry's voluntary reporting practice as elaborated in the petition to be a sufficient basis for eliminating the 10 CFR 50.72 requirement to notify the NRC Headquarters

Operations Center for nonemergency events. More effort to determine alternatives, benefits, burden, and stakeholder feedback on safety and openness concerns would be addressed in the rulemaking process.

If the NRC relies on voluntary practices alone to maintain awareness of the nonemergency events listed in 10 CFR 50.72(b), there is an increased risk of loss of situational awareness and the ability to make timely decisions with adequate information. Voluntary practices can be changed or eliminated by licensees without NRC awareness or approval, and they cannot be enforced if not carried out in accordance with their original intent. Resident inspectors may receive voluntary reports from licensees but are not always available and are not expected to perform the communication duties assumed by the NRC Headquarters Operations Center. Headquarters Operations Officers are always on call and have special knowledge and communication tools to enable accurate and efficient collection and dissemination of information for all types of facilities. Adding the notification burden to the duties of resident inspectors could impact their ability to provide adequate oversight of the nonemergency event and decrease the speed and quality of information sharing within the NRC and to the public about nonemergency events. Further, reliance on the resident inspectors picking up the reporting requirement undermines the basis for the rule change as it would recognize that the need for the reporting is still necessary, it would simply shift the burden to the NRC, from the licensee.

While the full scope of the petitioner's suggested changes could degrade the NRC's ability to respond to developing events or to respond to heightened public concern about these events, there is the potential for a safety benefit with more focused reporting. Therefore, the staff recommends evaluating within the NRC's rulemaking process the nonemergency reporting requirements in 10 CFR 50.72(b). The petition provides reasonable concepts worthy of further exploration. As described in the rulemaking plan, rulemaking would allow the staff to fully evaluate options to 10 CFR 50.72 requirements while ensuring that the NRC maintains appropriate situational awareness of significant events at nuclear power plants in order to make timely decisions, take necessary action, and inform the public.

#### RULEMAKING PLAN:

##### Title

Reporting Requirements for Nonemergency Events at Operating Nuclear Power Plants

##### Regulation

10 CFR Part 50.72, "Immediate notification requirements for operating nuclear power reactors"

##### Regulatory Issue

The regulatory issue is whether the NRC should revise its immediate notification requirements for nonemergency events. The affected entities are licensees for operating nuclear power plants, the NRC, and others who use the current nonemergency event notifications including the general public, nongovernmental organizations, and governmental partners at the Federal, State, and local levels and tribal communities.

### Existing Regulatory Framework

The NRC's regulations related to the reporting of nonemergency events are codified in 10 CFR 50.72(b), "Non-emergency events." These provisions were established in a final rule dated February 29, 1980 (45 FR 13434). Since the issuance of 10 CFR 50.72 in 1980, the NRC has amended the rule three times, based on experience with the existing requirements. These amendments occurred on August 29, 1983 (48 FR 39039); September 10, 1992 (57 FR 41378); and October 25, 2000 (65 FR 63769). The following table summarizes the current nonemergency event immediate notification requirements, including the amount of time for the licensee to report the event to the NRC. Note that the paragraph designations are not sequential because the reserved paragraphs are omitted.

<b>10 CFR 50.72 Paragraph</b>	<b>Time to Report (hrs.)</b>	<b>Licensee Required to Notify the NRC of:</b>
(b)(1)	1	any deviation from the plant's technical specifications authorized in accordance with 10 CFR 50.54(x)
(b)(2)(i)	4	initiation of any shutdown required by technical specifications
(b)(2)(iv)(A)	4	any event that results or should have resulted in emergency core cooling system (ECCS) discharge into the reactor coolant system as a result of a valid signal except when actuation results from and is part of a preplanned sequence during testing or reactor operation
(b)(2)(iv)(B)	4	any event or condition that results in actuation of the reactor protection system (RPS) when the reactor is critical except when the actuation results from and is part of a preplanned sequence during testing or reactor operation
(b)(2)(xi)	4	any event or situation, related to the health and safety of the public or onsite personnel, or protection of the environment, for which a news release is planned or notification to other government agencies has been or will be made; such an event may include an onsite fatality or inadvertent release of radioactively contaminated materials
(b)(3)(ii)	8	any event or condition that results in the condition of the nuclear power plant, including its principal safety barriers, being seriously degraded or the nuclear power plant being in an unanalyzed condition that significantly degrades plant safety
(b)(3)(iv)	8	any event or condition that results in valid actuation of the RPS, containment isolation signals, ECCS systems, boiling water reactor [BWR] reactor core isolation cooling system, isolation condenser system, feedwater coolant injection system, pressurized water reactor auxiliary or emergency feedwater systems, containment heat removal systems, or emergency alternating current electrical power systems
(b)(3)(v), (b)(3)(vi)	8	any event or condition that could have prevented the fulfillment of a safety function of structures or systems that are needed to shut down the reactor and maintain it in a safe shutdown condition, remove residual heat, control the release of radioactive material, or mitigate the consequences of an accident (paragraph (b)(3)(vi) clarifies events covered in paragraph (b)(3)(v))
(b)(3)(xii)	8	any event requiring the transport of a radioactively contaminated person to an offsite medical facility for treatment
(b)(3)(xiii)	8	any event that results in a major loss of emergency assessment capability, offsite response capability, or offsite communications capability

The applicable regulatory guidance appears in NUREG-1022, Revision 3, "Event Report Guidelines 10 CFR 50.72 and 50.73," issued January 2013 (ADAMS Accession No. ML13032A220), and NUREG-1022, Revision 3, Supplement 1, "Event Report Guidelines 10 CFR 50.72(b)(3)(xiii)," issued September 2014 (ADAMS Accession No. ML14267A447).

If rulemaking is approved, then the staff would consider the reporting requirements in 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73, "Licensee event report system," that address similar events or conditions. The staff notes that while there is overlap in events and conditions addressed in 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73, the rapidity with which information is provided to the agency is different and the two regulations serve different, but complementary, purposes. For all but three of the criteria in the table above, the requirements in 10 CFR 50.73 require licensees to submit reports to the NRC within 60 days of discovery of the event. These reports contain a more detailed account of the event and are released to the public through ADAMS after receipt. The regulations in 10 CFR 50.73 have no corresponding reports for the following:

- 10 CFR 50.72(b)(2)(xi) for a news release or notification to other government agencies
- 10 CFR 50.72(b)(3)(xii) for transportation of a radioactively contaminated person
- 10 CFR 50.72(b)(3)(xiii) for major loss of emergency assessment capability

The staff received several public comments on the petition that discussed the overlap between 10 CFR 50.72 and 10 CFR 50.73 reporting requirements. The petitioner did not suggest changes to the requirements of 10 CFR 50.73.

#### Explanation of Why Rulemaking Is the Preferred Solution

In response to the petition, the staff assembled a working group made up of resident inspectors from each NRC region and representatives from the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, the Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response, the Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards, and the Office of the General Counsel. The working group reviewed each notification criterion in 10 CFR 50.72(b) and sought input from other staff to determine whether there was enough regulatory experience to support revising or eliminating the current notification requirements. Through this review, the staff determined that a further examination of the current requirements and guidance would benefit the NRC and external stakeholders. An evaluation of the petition through the rulemaking process is warranted to consider the needs of the agency while reducing burden on the licensees.

The staff recommends holding public meetings with stakeholders throughout the rulemaking process to better understand which requirements have the greatest impact on industry and the public. The staff notes that amendments to the reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 would require changes to NRC guidance (i.e., NUREG-1022, Revision 3, and NUREG-1022, Revision 3, Supplement 1).

The staff considered several non-rulemaking options such as revising guidance, revising internal agency procedures, or taking no further action. The staff determined that some petitioner concerns could be addressed by clarifying the associated guidance; however, to fully address the concerns, the staff should consider amendment of the rule through rulemaking. Taking no further action would maintain the status quo and would not require any resources for implementation, but the concerns raised in the petition would not be considered. If the Commission determines that rulemaking is not needed, then the staff would close the petition docket and the petition would be denied.

The working group also considered expanding the scope of this activity to take a broader look at other reporting requirements beyond those identified in the petition to assess whether changes would be appropriate. The NRC's Retrospective Review of Administrative Requirements (RROAR) (see 85 FR 6103; February 4, 2020), already underway, will accomplish this.

The purpose of the RROAR activity is to identify outdated or duplicative administrative requirements that may be eliminated without an adverse effect on public health or safety, common defense and security, protection of the environment, or regulatory efficiency and effectiveness. The staff plans to provide the result of that review and applicable recommendations to the Commission by March 2021.

The staff discussed the 10 CFR 50.72 PRM with the RROAR working group and determined that submitting the rulemaking plan separately is warranted and timely so that action on this PRM is not delayed further. The staff may combine these efforts later if appropriate.

In addition, the staff will consider in the rulemaking process whether the reporting requirements should be modified to address non-traditional reactors (e.g., AP1000, small modular reactors).

The staff notes that there are two rulemakings currently pending before the Commission with new immediate notification requirements. The Enhanced Weapons, Firearms Background Checks, and Security Event Notifications final rule<sup>1</sup> includes requirements for suspicious activity reporting and notification of physical security events. The Cyber Security for Fuel Facilities proposed rule<sup>2</sup> includes a requirement to report certain cyber security events. The staff believes that these issues can be considered by the Commission separately.

If the rulemaking is approved, then the staff intends to evaluate the reporting requirements in 10 CFR 50.72(b) on a case-by-case basis to eliminate, modify, or retain the requirements with the intent of reducing unnecessary burden while preserving the NRC's ability to maintain adequate situational awareness, respond to events, provide effective oversight, and notify the public. The staff would develop and issue for public comment a regulatory basis document to further refine the rulemaking scope before developing a draft proposed rule.

#### Description of Rulemaking: Scope

The rulemaking scope would include the immediate notification requirements for nonemergency events in 10 CFR 50.72.

#### Description of Rulemaking: Preliminary Backfitting and Issue Finality Analysis

The proposed revisions to 10 CFR Part 50, "Domestic Licensing of Production and Utilization Facilities," would not constitute backfitting, as defined in 10 CFR 50.109, "Backfitting," or impact the issue finality of an approval issued under 10 CFR Part 52, "Licenses, Certifications, and Approvals for Nuclear Power Plants," because the rulemaking would involve reporting requirements that do not fall within the scope of 10 CFR 50.109 or any issue finality provision.

#### Description of Rulemaking: Estimated Schedule

- Initiate regulatory basis phase—upon Commission approval to initiate rulemaking.
- Publish regulatory basis for comment—10 months after Commission approval to initiate rulemaking.
- Publish proposed rule—14 months after regulatory basis comment period closes.
- Publish final rule—16 months after proposed rule comment period closes.

---

<sup>1</sup> SECY-18-0058, "Final Rule: Enhanced Weapons, Firearms Background Checks, and Security Event Notifications," dated May 22, 2018, and supplement dated February 4, 2020 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16264A000).

<sup>2</sup> SECY-17-0099, "Proposed Rule – Cyber Security at Fuel Cycle Facilities (RIN 3150-AJ64; NRC-2015-0179)," dated October 4, 2017 (ADAMS Accession No. ML17018A218).

### Description of Rulemaking: Preliminary Recommendation on Priority

Based on the prioritization methodology in “FY20/21 Guidance on Common Prioritization of Rulemaking Factor Selection Criteria,” issued September 2018 (ADAMS Accession No. ML18263A070), the preliminary priority for this rulemaking activity is medium. This rulemaking is estimated to score 23 points out of 50 points (medium priority) because (1) it would be a moderate contributor toward the NRC Strategic Plan safety goal and would implement several of the plan’s safety strategies, (2) it would be a moderate contributor to implementing the Principles of Good Regulation, and (3) it would ensure that regulatory activities are consistent with the degree of risk reduction they achieve. This estimate is consistent with the priority assigned to rulemakings that do not raise an immediate safety, environmental, or security concern. The priority for a rulemaking activity can change over time. Common reasons for a change in priority are new Commission or senior management direction or changes in the rulemaking scope.

### Description of Rulemaking: Estimate of Resources

The staff estimates that the proposed action could provide the following benefits:

- Amend the nonemergency reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 to enhance reporting efficiency and reduce or eliminate reporting that does not have a commensurate safety benefit.
- Further align the nonemergency reporting requirements of 10 CFR 50.72 with safety and risk significance.

The proposed rulemaking action is estimated to involve a medium amount of costs including completing a medium complexity rulemaking, updating one guidance document, and developing internal training and procedures. Implementation costs for licensees are estimated to be minimal, but the staff would seek additional information about this in the rulemaking process.

According to the petitioner, licensees spend approximately 10 man-hours for a simple notification and 25 man-hours for a complex notification. If burden is reduced to 4 hours for a simple notification and 8 hours for a complex notification, the result in overall industry savings would be approximately \$395,000 annually. The staff expects that there will be a minimal increase in NRC recurring costs, potentially due to the need to conduct refresher or new resident inspector training. It is important to note, however, that these preliminary estimates did not completely assess the impacts to licensee resources that would result if the requested changes are not fully adopted or the full impact on NRC resources from shifting the burden of gathering, verifying, and communicating information from licensees to resident inspectors.

During the regulatory basis stage, the staff would develop a more detailed analysis of costs and benefits. If the staff determines at any point that the costs associated with rulemaking are not justified by the benefits or that rulemaking would unacceptably degrade the NRC’s situational awareness, then it would follow the process for discontinuing rulemaking and no further resources allocated for the rulemaking would be spent. In other words, if the rulemaking were discontinued, the actual resources spent on this activity could be less than estimated because the estimate assumes the NRC would proceed through the rulemaking process to completion.

### Cumulative Effects of Regulation

This rulemaking would have a net positive impact on the cumulative effects of regulation for the following reasons:

- The regulation would not add unnecessary regulatory burden because the amendments under consideration would relax existing requirements.
- Public comments from industry representatives on the *Federal Register* notice of docketing of PRM-50-116 (83 FR 58509; November 20, 2018), identified benefits from improving efficiency in nonemergency event notification.
- The staff currently anticipates that no critical skill sets or other ongoing NRC activities would significantly impact the implementation of the proposed changes.
- Reasonable assurance of adequate public health and safety and common defense and security would still be maintained through the deliberate and reasoned rulemaking process.

### Agreement State Considerations

No considerations in this rulemaking would impact Agreement States.

### Guidance

The following guidance documents may need to be updated, as appropriate, to support the rulemaking: NUREG-1022, Revision 3, and NUREG-1022, Revision 3, Supplement 1.

### Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards Review

Because the rulemaking would involve reporting requirements for operating nuclear reactors, the proposed and final rules would be subject to review by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards.

### Committee to Review Generic Requirements Review

Review by the Committee to Review Generic Requirements would not be necessary because the recommended rulemaking would not constitute backfitting.

### Advisory Committee on the Medical Use of Isotopes Review

Review by the Advisory Committee on the Medical Use of Isotopes would not be necessary because the recommended rulemaking would not be related to the medical use of isotopes.

### Analysis of Legal Matters

The Office of the General Counsel has reviewed this rulemaking plan and has not identified any issues necessitating a separate legal analysis at this time.

### Alternative Views

Members of the petition review board expressed concerns with shifting the burden for gathering, verifying, and communicating information on nonemergency events from licensees to resident

inspectors. The specific concern was that adding such responsibilities to NRC staff would adversely impact the ability of the NRC to provide timely and effective oversight because residents would need to work through licensee staff to collect and verify information and then communicate internally and potentially externally as well. Such required actions could both delay and distract NRC staff focus from providing effective oversight. Some members of the petition review board also offered a perspective that evaluating such requested changes through the rulemaking process would not be the best use of agency resources if these changes are not likely to be adopted in the long run. However, initiating the rulemaking process would allow a thorough vetting of the petitioner's recommendations, including the additional considerations raised by the petition review board, and would prevent premature elimination of any options without the full analysis afforded through the development of a regulatory basis. Some staff questioned whether the standard rulemaking process recommended in this paper is the most efficient and effective method of responding to the concerns in the petition. A suggested alternative approach was to perform a pilot in which a limited number of licensees would be exempt from the nonemergency notification requirements in 10 CFR 50.72 for a certain period of time. After that time, the NRC would reassess and either deny the petition or proceed with a more focused rulemaking proposal. This approach was not selected because exempting certain licensees from the nonemergency notification requirements would require the NRC to expend resources to adjust its internal reporting process for only a few licensees. Additionally, there would be no guarantee that the licensees would experience a nonemergency event in the specified time period or that voluntary notifications conducted under a temporary exemption process would be representative of a long term, industry-wide voluntary program.

Other staff questioned the need to maintain a requirement for immediate notification for nonemergency events if licensee event reports would still be required under 10 CFR 50.73. The concerns raised by the working group related to elimination of the notification requirements in 10 CFR 50.72(b) included a decrease in the NRC's ability to respond efficiently to events, maintain situational awareness, provide proper regulatory oversight, and maintain credibility with the public.

Finally, another view was that the scope of this activity should be expanded to take a broader look at other reporting requirements. The working group addressed this view under the heading "Explanation of Why Rulemaking Is the Preferred Solution."

#### COMMITMENT:

If the Commission approves initiation of the rulemaking, in accordance with SECY-16-0042, "Recommended Improvements for Rulemaking Tracking and Reporting," dated April 4, 2016 (ADAMS Accession No. ML16075A070), the staff will update the agency's rulemaking tracking tool. The rulemaking tracking tool currently lists this rule as "rulemaking plan pending" for planning purposes and transparency.

#### RECOMMENDATIONS:

The staff recommends that the Commission take the following actions:

- (1) Approve closure of the docket for PRM-50-116 by considering the PRM in the rulemaking process.
- (2) Approve the draft notice (Enclosure 1) for publication in the *Federal Register*.

- (3) Approve initiation of a rulemaking to evaluate the current requirements and guidance for immediate notification requirements for nonemergency events for operating nuclear power plants.
- (4) Approve the staff's recommendations on reviews by the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards, the Committee to Review Generic Requirements, and the Advisory Committee on the Medical Use of Isotopes.
- (5) Note:
  - The staff will inform the appropriate congressional committees.
  - A letter is enclosed for the Secretary's signature (Enclosure 2), informing the petitioner of the Commission's decision on the petition.

RESOURCES:

Enclosure 3 includes an estimate of the resources needed to complete this rulemaking.

COORDINATION:

The Office of the General Counsel has no legal objection to this action. The Office of the Chief Financial Officer has reviewed this paper and has no concerns with the estimated resources in Enclosure 3.

Margaret M. Doane  Digitally signed by Margaret M. Doane  
Date: 2020.11.30 18:08:39 -05'00'

Margaret M. Doane  
Executive Director  
for Operations

Enclosures:

1. *Federal Register* Notice
2. Letter to the Petitioner
3. Resource Estimates (not publicly available)

SUBJECT: PETITION FOR RULEMAKING AND RULEMAKING PLAN ON IMMEDIATE NOTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS FOR NONEMERGENCY EVENTS (PRM50-116; -NRC-2018-0201) DATED: November 30, 2020

**ADAMS Accession Nos.:** ML20073G004 (Pkg.); ML20073G008 (SECY Paper) \*via email

OFFICE	NMSS/REFS*	QTE*	NMSS/REFS*	NMSS/REFS*	NMSS/REFS*
NAME	DDoyle	JDougherty	GLappert	JShepherd	CBladey (JShepherd for)
DATE	3/26/2020	3/17/2020	4/2/2020	4/14/2020	8/17/2020
OFFICE	NRR/DRO*	NMSS/REFS*	NMSS/REFS*	NRR/DRO*	NMSS*
NAME	LRegner	IBerrios	JTappert (KCoyne for)	CMiller	JLubinski (RLewis for)
DATE	9/8/2020	8/25/2020	9/8/2020	8/10/2020	8/28/2020
OFFICE	NSIR*	RI*	RII*	RIII*	RIV*
NAME	BHolian (SHoliday for)	DLew (DCollins for)	LDudes	JGiessner	SMorris (AVegel for)
DATE	8/12/2020	9/4/2020	8/20/2020	8/10/2020	8/10/2020
OFFICE	OCFO*	OGC*	NRR*	EDO	
NAME	RAllwein (MSchofer for)	HBenowitz (NLO)	HNieh (MGavrilas for)	MDoane	
DATE	8/10/2020	9/18/2020	10/2/2020	11/30/20	

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY