

DESIGNATED ORIGINAL

Standard Form **83**
(Rev. September 1983)

Request for OMB Review

By Regina**Important**

Read instructions before completing form. Do not use the same SF 83 to request both an Executive Order 12291 review and approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act.

Answer all questions in Part I. If this request is for review under E.O. 12291, complete Part II and sign the regulatory certification. If this request is for approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act and 5 CFR 1320, skip Part II, complete Part III and sign the paperwork certification.

Send three copies of this form, the material to be reviewed, and the paperwork—three copies of the supporting statement, to:

Office of Information and Regulatory Affairs
Office of Management and Budget
Attention: Docket Library, Room 3201
Washington, DC 20503

PART I.—Complete This Part for All Requests.

1. Department/agency and Bureau/office originating request Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission Washington, DC 20555	2. Agency code 3 1 5 0
3. Name of person who can best answer questions regarding this request Frederick J. Hebdon	Telephone number (301) 492-4480
4. Title of information collection or rulemaking "Licensee Event Report (LER)"	

5. Legal authority for information collection or rule (cite United States Code, Public Law, or Executive Order)
USC _____ or Sections 103 and 104B, Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

6. Affected public (check all that apply)

1 ☐ Individuals or households3 ☐ Farms5 ☐ Federal agencies or employees2 ☐ State or local governments4 ☒ Businesses or other for-profit6 ☐ Non-profit institutions7 ☐ Small businesses or organizations**PART II.—Complete This Part Only if the Request is for OMB Review Under Executive Order 12291**

7. Regulation Identifier Number (RIN)

_____, or, None assigned ☐

8. Type of submission (check one in each category)

Classification1 ☐ Major2 ☐ Nonmajor**Stage of development**1 ☐ Proposed or draft2 ☐ Final or interim final, with prior proposal3 ☐ Final or interim final, without prior proposal**Type of review requested**1 ☐ Standard2 ☐ Pending3 ☐ Emergency4 ☐ Statutory or judicial deadline

9. CFR section affected

_____, CFR _____

10. Does this regulation contain reporting or recordkeeping requirements that require OMB approval under the Paperwork Reduction Act and 5 CFR 1320? ☐ Yes ☐ No

11. If a major rule, is there a regulatory impact analysis attached? ☐ Yes ☐ No

1 ☐ Yes 2 ☐ No

If "No," did OMB waive the analysis? ☐ Yes ☐ No

3 ☐ Yes 4 ☐ No**Certification for Regulatory Submissions**

In submitting this request for OMB review, the authorized regulatory contact and the program official certify that the requirements of E.O. 12291 and any applicable policy directives have been complied with.

Signature of program official

Date

Signature of authorized regulatory contact

8508010031 850723
PDR ORG EUSOMB
PDR

Date

12. (OMB use only)

PART III. — Complete This Part Only if the Request is for Approval of a Collection of Information Under the Paperwork Reduction Act and 5 CFR 1320.

13. Abstract—Describe needs, uses and affected public in 50 words or less

NRC collects reports of operational events at commercial nuclear power plants in order to incorporate lessons of that experience in the licensing process, and to feed back the lessons of that experience to the nuclear industry.

14. Type of information collection (check only one)

Information collections not contained in rules

1 ☒ Regular submission

2 ☐ Emergency submission (certification attached)

Information collections contained in rules

3 ☒ Existing regulation (no change proposed)

6 Final or interim final without prior NPRM

4 ☐ Notice of proposed rulemaking (NPRM)

A ☐ Regular submission

5 ☐ Final, NPRM was previously published

B ☐ Emergency submission (certification attached)

7. Enter date of expected or actual Federal Register publication at this stage of rulemaking (month, day, year): _____

15. Type of review requested (check only one)

1 ☐ New collection

2 ☒ Revision of a currently approved collection

3 ☐ Extension of the expiration date of a currently approved collection without any change in the substance or in the method of collection

4 ☐ Reinstatement of a previously approved collection for which approval has expired

5 ☐ Existing collection in use without an OMB control number

16. Agency report form number(s) (include standard/optional form number(s))

NRC Forms 366, 366A, and 366B

17. Annual reporting or disclosure burden

1 Number of respondents

92

2 Number of responses per respondent (*Varies, see SS) 26

3 Total annual responses (line 1 times line 2)

2,360

4 Hours per response

50

5 Total hours (line 3 times line 4)

118,000*

18. Annual recordkeeping burden

1 Number of recordkeepers

2 Annual hours per recordkeeper

3 Total recordkeeping hours (line 1 times line 2)

years

4 Recordkeeping retention period

19. Total annual burden

1 Requested (line 17-5 plus line 18-3)

118,000

2 In current OMB inventory

124,800

3 Difference (line 1 less line 2)

- 6,800

Explanation of difference

4 Program change

5 Adjustment

- 6,800

20. Current (most recent) OMB control number or comment number

3150-0104

21. Requested expiration date

8-31-88

22. Purpose of information collection (check as many as apply)

1 ☐ Application for benefits

2 ☒ Program evaluation

3 ☒ General purpose statistics

4 ☒ Regulatory or compliance

5 ☒ Program planning or management

6 ☒ Research

7 ☐ Audit

23. Frequency of recordkeeping or reporting (check all that apply)

1 ☐ Recordkeeping

Reporting

2 ☒ On occasion

3 ☐ Weekly

4 ☐ Monthly

5 ☐ Quarterly

6 ☐ Semi-annually

7 ☐ Annually

8 ☐ Biennially

9 ☐ Other (describe): _____

24. Respondents' obligation to comply (check the strongest obligation that applies)

1 ☐ Voluntary

2 ☐ Required to obtain or retain a benefit

3 ☒ Mandatory

25. Are the respondents primarily educational agencies or institutions or is the primary purpose of the collection related to Federal education programs? ☐ Yes ☒ No

26. Does the agency use sampling to select respondents or does the agency recommend or prescribe the use of sampling or statistical analysis by respondents? ☐ Yes ☒ No

27. Regulatory authority for the information collection

10

CFR

50.73

; or

FR

; or

Other (specify): _____

Paperwork Certification

In submitting this request for OMB approval, the agency head, the senior official or an authorized representative, certifies that the requirements of 5 CFR 1320, the Privacy Act, statistical standards or directives, and any other applicable information policy directives have been complied with.

Signature of program official

Date

Signature of agency head, senior official or an authorized representative

Date

for Patricia G. Norry, Office of Administration

7/23/85

SUPPORTING STATEMENT FOR
NRC FORMS 366, 366A and 366B,
"LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER),"
10 CFR 50.73

1. Justification

a. Need for the Information Collection

The accident at TMI focused attention on the importance of an effective understanding and feedback of operating experience of nuclear power plants. Studies of the TMI accident (e.g., Rogovin, Kemeny) emphasized the importance of collecting and evaluating operational experience.

This operational experience consists largely of frequent events of apparently low individual safety importance which are reported on NRC Forms 366, 366A, and 366B, "Licensee Event Report (LER)." The assessment of such events, both individually and collectively, have led to understandings of how safety can be improved and have identified problems having the potential to seriously impact public health and safety.

b. Practical Utility of the Information Collection

The timely feedback of operating experience is clearly a vital and integral prerequisite to safety, and a strong NRC and nuclear industry commitment exists to assess the significance and implications of operating events. The establishment of the NRC Office for Analysis and Evaluation of Operational Data (AEOD), the industry Institute of Nuclear Power Operations (INPO), and the licensee operational data programs are a direct result of that commitment; as are the NRC

assignment of extensive resources and high priority to the review of operational data as a matter of Agency policy. Other countries with nuclear power programs, and international nuclear organizations are also committed to developing and implementing programs to learn from operating experience. Major progress has been made in establishing systems for the international sharing of operational experience. The Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) Incident Reporting System (IRS) is now operational and reports are being provided by all of the participating countries.

Within the NRC, a formal and systematic program has been established for the collection, assessment, and feedback of operational experience. This program, involving extensive resources, has resulted in an improved understanding of reactor performance, timely identification of important safety issues, and timely initiation of corrective or remedial actions such as issuing generic letters, revising license requirements, and issuing bulletins requesting licensee action. In addition, formal and informal methods have been developed to couple the NRC's program with the industry's programs; thus, a close working relationship is maintained between the NRC and INPO.

c. Duplication With Other Collections of Information

The staff has reviewed numerous other NRC reporting requirements (e.g., Part 20, Part 21, Paragraph 50.55(e), Section 50.72, NUREG-0654,

Section 50.73, Section 73.71) and has attempted, to the extent practical, to eliminate redundant reporting and to ensure that the various reporting requirements are consistent.

d. Consultations Outside the NRC

There have been no consultations since the last OMB approval of the LER forms. However, the NRC has given extensive consideration to the relationship between the LER system and the Nuclear Plant Reliability Data (NPRD) system.

In December 1980 the NRC decided that the reporting of operational experience data needed major revision and approved the development of an Integrated Operational Experience Reporting (IOER) system. The IOER system would have combined and made mandatory the existing Licensee Event Report system and the NPRD system.

As a result of this decision, an Advanced Notice of Proposed Rulemaking (ANPRM) was published in the Federal Register on January 15, 1981 (46 FR 3541). That ANPRM explained why the NRC needed operational experience data, and described the deficiencies in the existing LER and NPRD systems.

While the NRC still believes that both types of data are essential to the NRC mission, subsequent events indicated that the NRC could obtain the needed reliability data without assuming direct responsibility for its collection. On June 8, 1981 the INPO Board of Directors decided that because of its role as an active user of NPRDS data, INPO

would assume responsibility for management and funding of the NPRD system. Further, INPO developed criteria that are being used in their management audits of member utilities to assess the adequacy of NPRD system participation.

Consequently, the NRC decided that there was a reasonable likelihood that the NPRD system under INPO direction would meet the NRC's need to collect reliability data. Consequently, the collection of detailed technical descriptions of significant events proceeded as a separate rulemaking (i.e., 10 CFR 50.73) to modify and codify the existing LER reporting requirements.

2. Description of the Information Collection

a. Number and Type of Respondents

LERs will be required from all holders of operating licenses for commercial nuclear power plants. There are currently approximately 92 such licensees, twelve fewer than the previous submittal to OMB. These licensees are generally large electric utilities that own and operate nuclear power plants licensed under Sections 103 and 104b of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended.

b. Reasonableness of the Schedule for Collecting Information

The NRC Form 366 must be submitted within 30 days of discovery of the event so that the NRC can review the reports and take timely action to correct generic problems that are relevant to other plants with similar equipment and procedures.

c. Method of Collecting the Information

The NRC believes that the most practical method of collecting the information required to achieve this regulatory objective is through use of the LER forms.

d. Record Retention Period

There is no record retention requirement.

e. Reporting Period

LERs are submitted at irregular intervals as reportable events occur.

f. Copies Required to be Submitted

The original is to be submitted to the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Document Control Desk, Washington, D.C. 20555, with a copy to the appropriate NRC Regional Office.

3. Estimate of Burden

a. Estimated Hours Required to Respond to the Collection

The total annual burden to prepare the LER forms is 118,000 hours. In 1984, 92 operating nuclear power plants submitted a total of 2360 LERs. Thus, the average level of reporting was approximately 26 LERs per unit. It is estimated that each LER requires approximately 50 hours to prepare. Thus, the total annual burden associated with LER reporting is approximately 118,000 hours.

This estimate is 12 fewer nuclear power plants in operation since our last submittal to OMB. The previous submittal was based on an assumption that 104 nuclear power plants would be in operation by 1984. Currently there are 92 operating nuclear power plants.

b. Estimated Cost to Respond to the Collection

The estimate annual burden to prepare the LER forms is \$7,080,000 (118,000 x \$60). It is expected that the average level of reporting per unit will remain approximately constant; however, the total burden will increase gradually as the number of operating nuclear power plants increases.

b. Source of Burden Data and Method of Estimating Burden

These burden estimates are based on reporting rates in 1984 and the engineering judgment and experience of senior NRC personnel who have extensive experience in the operation of nuclear power plants. These judgments have been confirmed by informal discussions with utility personnel familiar with the LER program.

c. Reasonableness of Burden Estimates

Based on the comments received and the NRC staff's LER assessments, the staff has concluded that the estimates of burden are reasonable.

4. Estimate of Cost to the Federal Government

The cost to the government is associated with editing, coding, and tabulating LERs and publishing results. The NRC estimates that these activities, including overhead costs, amount to \$481,200 (8020 hours X \$60 per hour) plus approximately \$1,600,000 in Program Support funding for various contractor and support activities, including funding for data base management, document processing, and publication. The total estimated government cost is \$2,081,200.

Enclosures:
NRC Forms 366,
366A and 366B

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER)

FACILITY NAME (1)

DOCKET NUMBER (2)

PAGE (3)

0 5 0 0 0 1 OF

TITLE (4)

EVENT DATE (5)			LER NUMBER (6)			REPORT DATE (7)			OTHER FACILITIES INVOLVED (8)		
MONTH	DAY	YEAR	YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER	MONTH	DAY	YEAR	FACILITY NAMES		DOCKET NUMBER(S)
											0 5 0 0 0
											0 5 0 0 0

THIS REPORT IS SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO THE REQUIREMENTS OF 10 CFR § (Check one or more of the following) (11)

OPERATING MODE (9)	20.402(b)	20.405(e)	80.73(a)(2)(iv)	73.71(b)
POWER LEVEL (10)	20.406(a)(1)(i)	80.38(a)(1)	80.73(a)(2)(v)	73.71(e)
	20.406(a)(1)(ii)	80.38(a)(2)	80.73(a)(2)(vi)	OTHER (Specify in Abstract below and in Text, NRC Form 366A)
	20.406(a)(1)(iii)	80.73(a)(2)(i)	80.73(a)(2)(vii)(A)	
	20.406(a)(1)(iv)	80.73(a)(2)(ii)	80.73(a)(2)(vii)(B)	
	20.406(a)(1)(v)	80.73(a)(2)(iii)	80.73(a)(2)(x)	

LICENSEE CONTACT FOR THIS LER (12)

NAME

TELEPHONE NUMBER

AREA CODE

COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13)

CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NRC	CAUSE	SYSTEM	COMPONENT	MANUFACTURER	REPORTABLE TO NRC

SUPPLEMENTAL REPORT EXPECTED (14)

EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE (15)

MONTH DAY YEAR

YES (If yes, complete EXPECTED SUBMISSION DATE)

NO

ABSTRACT (Limit to 1400 spaces, i.e., approximately fifteen single-space typewritten lines) (16)

LICENSEE EVENT REPORT (LER) TEXT CONTINUATION

APPROVED OMB NO. 3150-0104

EXPIRES 8/31/85

FACILITY NAME (1)	DOCKET NUMBER (2)	LER NUMBER (8)			PAGE (3)	
		YEAR	SEQUENTIAL NUMBER	REVISION NUMBER		

0 5 0 0 0

OF

TEXT (If more space is required, use additional NRC Form 386A's) (17)

COMPLETE ONE LINE FOR EACH COMPONENT FAILURE DESCRIBED IN THIS REPORT (13)