

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA  
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 \*\*\*

4 ROUNDTABLE PUBLIC MEETING ON THE  
5 REVISED REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS

6  
7 NRC Technical Training Center

8 Suite 200

9 5746 Marlin Road

10 Chattanooga, Tennessee

11 Tuesday, January 25, 2000

12  
13 The above entitled meeting commenced, pursuant to notice, at  
14 7:00 p.m.

15 PARTICIPANTS:

16 ALAN MADISON

17 SERITA SANDERS, NRR

18 BILL TITTLE, Chief, Emergency Management, Hamilton  
19 County, Tennessee

20 WAYNE STUNTZ, Facility Planner, Hamilton County,  
21 Tennessee

22 RUSSELL GIBBS, NRC

23 BOB QUIRK, Public

24 PAUL FREDRICKSON, NRC

25 RON HERNON, Project Manager, Sequoyah

PARTICIPANTS: [Continued]

MARY BARINSKI, TVA

DENNIS COE, TVA, Sequoyah

JIM SMITH, TVA, Sequoyah

ANN  
RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25

HARRY JOHNSON, Sequoyah

KEN CLARK, NRC

TONYA ANN HARRIS

ANN  
RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

## P R O C E E D I N G S

[7:00 p.m.]

MR. MADISON: On the record.

My name is Alan Madison. Please state your name and who you're with, please.

MS. SANDERS: Serita Sanders. I'm with NRR Headquarters Office, Inspection Program Branch. I work for Alan Madison.

MR. TITTLE: I'm Bill Tittle, Chief of Emergency Management for Hamilton County, Tennessee.

MR. STUNTZ: Wayne Stuntz. I'm Facility Planner for Hamilton County, Tennessee.

MR. GIBBS: I'm Russell Gibbs. I work with the NRC. I'm a Senior Resident at Sequoyah.

MR. QUIRK: I'm Bob Quirk. I'm just a member of the public.

MR. FREDRICSON: I'm Paul Fredricson and I work with Nuclear Regulatory Commission in Atlanta.

MR. HERNON: I'm Ron HERNON. I'm the Project Manager for Sequoyah. I'm in the Headquarters Office in Rockville, Maryland.

MS. BARINSKI: Mary Barinski with TVA.

MR. COE: Dennis Coe, Sequoyah, TVA.

MR. SMITH: Jim Smith, TVA, Sequoyah.

MR. JOHNSON: Harry Johnson, TVA.

MR. CLARK: Ken Clark, NRC Information Office in Atlanta.

MR. MADISON: Tonya, thank you. The lady who just walked in could you introduce yourself, ma'am?

MS. HARRIS: My name is Ann Harris.

MR. MADISON: Ann, I think you're one of the invited

ANN members. If you would come up to join us here I'm Alan Madison.

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

---

MS. HARRIS: I apologize for being late but I probably drove

1 further than all of you all did.

2 MR. MADISON: If you will have a seat at the front table,  
3 Ann, and if you would --

4 MS. HARRIS: Here?

5 MR. MADISON: Yes, ma'am. We're going to get started here.

6 I have a brief overview. Actually, we've made up some real quick  
7 slides because -- brought all the handout material or was supposed to  
8 bring all the handout material and slides. He didn't make it so they  
9 didn't make it either but I'll pass this information out and it may  
10 help. It may hurt. We'll see.

11 We're going to look at a quick fifteen minute 50,000 foot  
12 view of the oversight view. Not a lot of details as I said. Part of  
13 the price of admission for the folks at the table here was to have an  
14 understanding of the oversight cost estimate a macro sense and there was  
15 some material that August sent them in advance.

16 We're also going to then get into the round table discussion  
17 and the round table discussion which normally -- would have facilitated  
18 I'm going to handle that and that's mainly the dialogue between you and  
19 I and the other folks at the table. Around seven questions that we're  
20 in the federation of. We'll try to focus on discussions around that,  
21 but we'll also take some time and try to collect some input from the  
22 other folks in the audience if time permits.

23 We want to be out of here by 9:00 I think is the time limit.

24 Who we are. We're the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. I'm from the  
25 Federal Government and I'm here to help. Heard that before. Nuclear  
Regulatory Commission is the Federal Agency that has the mission and  
responsibility to protect the public health and safety as it relates --

ANN nuclear materials in the United States.

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

Specifically, what we're going to talk about - what we're

1 going to deal with here is the operation of commercial nuclear power --.

2 What we do, how do we do that, some of our primary activities we insure  
3 nuclear plants of a design and construct it and operate it in a safe  
4 manner. We issues licenses for not only reactors but material licenses  
5 as well.

6 We insure licensees use those nuclear materials and operate  
7 the plants safely and prepared to respond to emergencies. We also  
8 insure that research provides technical base for sound rules and  
9 regulations so that's becoming more and more of a TS factor of the job  
10 of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is the research aspect and what it  
11 does.

12 More specifically though who we are are some of the members  
13 you see here at the table and one of the things I want to focus on one  
14 reason why I had these certain individuals sit at the table is the  
15 Senior Resident Inspector at the site Russell Gibbs. You should know  
16 who he is. You should know that he has a staff of inspectors that work  
17 for him out at the site.

18 You should know that you have an individual that's his boss  
19 that is responsible in Region 2 and Paul Fredricson is that individual.

20 That's an individual you can contact. These are the people for the NRC  
21 that do the job at the site. I'm from Headquarters. I'm the Program  
22 Office and they don't think we do anything. They could be right but  
23 anyway that's who we are.

24 Now about the program one of the first things you probably  
25 want to know is why we're changing. I think some of this we have  
already talked about at previous public meetings but let's kindly  
outline some of the major reasons. We talked about having mature

AIN industry. That the industry has improved and we're having fewer and  
RILEY  
& fewer problems at the site and that's because of the maturing industry.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 Part of the -- for our change though is our efforts to  
2 reinvent Government, to reengineer our processes, and some of the  
3 urgings we get from our other State -- are members of Congress to be  
4 more effective and efficient in our operation.

5 What we want to keep an eye on though or what we consider  
6 our primary objectives or our key outcome measures and these are the  
7 four key outcome measures that we consider primary. How we're going to  
8 judge our success of this program or any other program we have.

9 You notice the first one is the maintenance of safety. That  
10 is our primary cause. The second one, one of the reasons why we're here  
11 tonight and that's a tough one and we're going to ask you folks to help  
12 us figure out how to measure that.

13 I mentioned already improving the effectiveness and the  
14 efficiency and the realism and where we get with the realism that's  
15 really that's the aspect I was talking about with research. That's  
16 where we really get into how real are we. How about the safety aspects  
17 that we're monitoring, we're regulating.

18 Finally, reduce unnecessary regulatory burden. A lot of  
19 people focus on that but what they really should focus on is that word  
20 unnecessary. We are a regulatory agency. We will be a burden. That's  
21 part of our job, but we can reduce unnecessary regulatory burden and  
22 that's what we think we've tried to do with part of this process along  
23 with the other outcome measures.

24 Now our -- program, our current program we call it, the  
25 program we're moving from is really not a program - a single program.  
It's a collection of processes. It's a collection of programs. It's  
kind of created like a large glacier over time. We've added to it and

AIN we have a body of regulations that we've developed over time. We have a  
RILEY  
& body of inspection activities, red guides, a whole bunch of things that  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 have slowly grown and in some cases overwhelmed our resources. That's  
2 again one of the reasons why we want to change.

3 The current program is based strictly on inspection. That's  
4 the only activity that we really do as an input to the assessment of the  
5 current program. It's compliance oriented. No matter how small the  
6 regulation strict compliance is to the letter of the law is the  
7 inspector's activity. That's what they look for. Compliance with all  
8 the regulations.

9 Enforcement became a major input to the assessment process.

10 The levels of enforcement, the dollar amounts that were associated with  
11 a violation and so it became a primary input to the assessment process.

12 We thought that was a little backwards.

13 Our new program is unified. We hope easily understood  
14 approach. It's a closed - what we call a closed or complete process in  
15 that the output may have impact on the input. In other words, if we  
16 find problems we will do more inspection which will give more input to  
17 the process so it kindly feeds upon itself.

18 It's based upon performance indicators as well as  
19 inspections and we will talk a little bit about performance indicators.

20 The performance indicators and inspection findings provide overall  
21 assurance we feel and the cornerstone to our objectives and I'll talk a  
22 little bit more about that.

23 What are the features of the program. Here is the No. 1  
24 feature I guess. Focuses inspection activity on where the potential  
25 risks are greater. In other words the focus is on safety in the new  
program. It's not on enforcement. It's not on the regulations. The  
focus is on the safety aspect of the operation of the Plants. It

ANN applies greater regulatory tension to the facilities that are having  
RILEY  
& performance problems.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1           The current program or the old program would spread a lot of  
2 our resources across all Plants and provide - in fact when we looked at  
3 a lot of the Plants it was very little difference between what was  
4 considered in systematic assessment of licensee performance and that --  
5 of itself of -- [Inaudible].

6           I'm doing this to help out Gary here our Court Reporter as  
7 well as anybody else in the audience who doesn't like -- [Inaudible] but  
8 the systematic assessment licensee performance there was very little  
9 difference between inspection activities in Category 1 or Category 2  
10 Plant. That's going to change with the new program.

11           It uses objective measures of Plant performance whenever  
12 possible and that's where the performance indicators come in as well as  
13 some other aspects. We think one of the things it does and goes towards  
14 enhancing public confidence it gives the public and the industry a lot  
15 more information in a more timely manner.

16           We hope it avoids the unnecessary regulatory burden, and we  
17 believe it responds to violations and issues of the Plant in a --  
18 manner. Not only do we provide our inspectors and our Management Staff  
19 with a kind of guidance in how they should react you should - you as a  
20 member of the public or a member of industry should also be able to  
21 follow the process and predict our outcomes based upon our inputs.

22           Continued emphasis as I said earlier is still on safety.  
23 Strict compliance. Strict standards. Daily monitoring will continue.  
24 There is nothing in the program that relieves the licensee of the  
25 responsibility from following regulations. They're still required to  
obey the regulations.

          The clear consistent objectives focus again on safety. You

ANN notice I keep going back to that. That is the biggest --, biggest  
RILEY  
& change in this process is the move from compliance to regulations to a  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---



1 focus on safety.

2 We think again the monitoring results are easier for the  
3 public to understand. There is more information more often and more  
4 readily available. Again, enforcement is no longer an input.  
5 Enforcement is where it belongs. It's an output of the process.  
6 Enforcement still happens but it is no longer an input to the process.

7 Inspections are going to continue. We've defined a baseline  
8 inspection program. The minimum inspection at any facility. There are  
9 additional inspection activities and these come as performance as been  
10 shown to the -- or the performance problems identified at the Plant.  
11 Supplemental inspections to diagnose these concerns. Special inspection  
12 teams may still be necessary depending upon events at the Plant or  
13 generic issues nationwide.

14 Inspection reports and all the activities associated with  
15 this are going to be available on the Web and that's kind of a change.  
16 I want to put this up right now so anybody that wants to take that down.  
17 That's our web site. That's where you can go and get the information  
18 and track what we're doing at any of the sites. I'll go - a little bit  
19 later on in the presentation I'll show you kind of an example of what  
20 you'll see on the web site.

21 Again, this is just kind of a repetition but the public is  
22 going to see these kind of public meetings. More output from the NRC or  
23 dialogue with the NRC to the public. You're going to see more activity,  
24 more of our activity, more of our information, periodic reports and  
25 performance indicator information on the Web.

Okay, here we go. Here is the program. This has the basis  
for the program. This is called the cornerstones of safety. There is a

AIN  
RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

cornerstone diagram. Some of you may have seen this already. Anybody  
familiar with this? Wayne, Bill, familiar with this?

1 VOICE: I'm not sure.

2 MR. MADISON: Ann?

3 MS. HARRIS: Never seen it before.

4 MR. MADISON: Never seen it before. Did you come to the  
5 last public meeting? I know it was shown at the last public meeting.

6 MS. HARRIS: Yes, I was here.

7 MR. MADISON: Okay. Well it was shown at the last public  
8 meeting.

9 MS. HARRIS: Well I assume it was the last one.

10 MR. MADISON: This was inside the package I gave away. Let  
11 me describe where we got this. The idea as I mentioned before what's  
12 our job, the NRC's job, that's it right up there. Protecting public  
13 health and safety our No. 1 job. In that to assure ourselves that we  
14 protect the public health and safety we establish three teaching  
15 performance areas where we establish some goals. Reactor safety,  
16 radiation safety both to the workers at the site and the public, and the  
17 safeguards area or security, physical protection at the Plant.

18 We had some goals previously established in all of those  
19 areas. We then looked and say what are we - how are - what information  
20 do we need to know. What things do we need to have knowledge of to  
21 assure ourselves that we meet those goals. We can achieve those goals  
22 and that's where we came up with the cornerstone. This diagram down  
23 here then establishes the cornerstones that we call the cornerstones of  
24 safety.

25 Initiating events, mitigation systems, -- and --  
[Inaudible]. The concept being if we don't have initiating events or if  
we minimize initiating events in that area we don't have problems at the  
ANN site. We're not going to have any events that impact the public.

RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

If we do have events and the systems are available and

1 capable and reliable and can mitigate the events we're not going to have  
2 any impact on the public. If they fail as long as the barriers remain  
3 intent, --, the fuel and the -- system remain intact nothing is going to  
4 get out to affect the public, but even if that happens as long as the  
5 Plant is prepared to respond to evaluate the public, protect the public  
6 the public is still protected. We still meet the goals. We have some  
7 other goals but our overall goal is still met. Protecting the public  
8 health and safety.

9           We have assumed more philosophy in the other cornerstone.  
10 Then from there what we did is we defined - all right, underneath this  
11 in what areas were important things that we need to measure and look at  
12 to assure ourselves we can meet the objectives of each of these  
13 cornerstones, meet the goals of the strategic performance area, and our  
14 overall goal of protecting the public health and safety and that's how  
15 we developed the inspection program and the performance indicators.

16           The performance indicators and the inspection activities  
17 will not stand alone. They work together. They're complimentary and  
18 supplementary to each other. To assure ourselves of safety we used  
19 performance indicators. Performance indicators don't give us  
20 information. We inspect.

21           Now there is some -- in here where we also - where we have  
22 information from the performance indicators and we verify it through  
23 inspection. That's a key concept to remember. The performance  
24 indicators will not stand alone. They're indicators of performance.  
25 They're not measured.

          Performance indicators are used objective -- to monitor  
performance in each of the cornerstone areas and if you look at

AIN materials -- sent you it listed the performance indicators and each of  
RILEY  
& the cornerstones has between two and three performance indicators. You  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 measure various aspects of performance.

2           Again, they're indicators of performance. They're not  
3 necessarily measures so we're not striving for a perfect measure of  
4 safety in that area. We're striving for a good indicator of safety in  
5 that area. We rated and you can't see it on this diagram but we rate -  
6 what that indicator means in safety significance -- by the color  
7 associated with it. Green for low risk significance and getting worse  
8 all the way down to red where we have what we consider a significant --  
9 of performance.

10           As I mentioned this already the minimum level of inspection  
11 supplement, compliment the performance indicators. That's called the  
12 base line inspection. It falls into basically three parts. Inspection  
13 in areas where performance indicators are not identified, or do not  
14 fully cover a cornerstone. We do inspection.

15           We also do what we call a performance indicator verification  
16 inspection. That means it's kind of a trust but verify. The licensee  
17 as you know reports the performance indicator data to us. To the NRC,  
18 so they provide us the data. We do the calculation for the performance  
19 indicator but they provide us the data so we need to verify the accuracy  
20 of that data. Periodically, we will - as part of the base line  
21 inspection program we verify the accuracy of the data.

22           The licensee problem identification resolution program  
23 because we consider that almost a foundation of the cornerstone program  
24 we do separate inspections. In fact, ten to fifteen percent of all  
25 inspection activity at the site will be looking at the corrective action  
program. Problem identification resolution.

          As I mentioned earlier there will be additional inspection,

AIN reactive inspections for events when there is areas of concern as  
RILEY  
& ordered by the Region. Inspections when needed for resolution of  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 generic issues. Nationwide issues that we identify either through our  
2 vendor type inspection or through notification of other licensees, and  
3 depending upon the issues and problems identified either through the  
4 performance indicator or through inspection findings we will do  
5 additional inspections that fully characterize and insure ourselves of  
6 safe performance at the Plant. We call those supplemental inspections.

7 Color codes what do they mean. Well the first thing folks  
8 want to know or so we've been told by other members of the public is if  
9 the Plant is safe. Let me point out to you first of all where safety  
10 falls on this diagram. Down there. In other words, our thresholds are  
11 set such that we never allow unsafe operation in the Plant.

12 The red threshold is considered unacceptable. Not  
13 necessarily unsafe but unacceptable performance and that's where we ask  
14 the licensee to not - stop working until the problem is corrected so the  
15 unsafe performance is not achieved.

16 The green what we call in the licensee response then once --  
17 objectives of -- that by the program based upon the measures of the  
18 program the licensee problem identification resolution system is  
19 functioning adequately so that we have assurance that they can identify  
20 and correct their own problems in a timely manner.

21 White the indication of white inspection findings may be an  
22 indication of problems in the problem identification resolution system.

23 We need additional assurance and we call that the NRC response -  
24 increased response --. My old slides aren't here so it's kind - I  
25 remind myself what I'm talking about.

The increased regulatory response that's right. That's  
where we need to have additional assurance that the licensee's

AIN corrective action program is functioning adequately and we'll do  
RILEY  
& supplemental inspection to assure ourselves of that.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1           Yellow we think at that point the performance indication or  
2 an inspection finding that that is evidence of problems in the  
3 licensee's problem identification resolution system. We're not going to  
4 just verify that the licensee's corrective action program is functioning  
5 adequately because we think that shows it's not.

6           We're going to do a kind of side by side validation of the  
7 corrective action program and the actions that are taken with that issue  
8 and issues like it so we do a similar - we do a -- like they do and we  
9 verify that the actions that they're taking are the actions we think are  
10 appropriate.

11           Red as said earlier is more on the order of stop, fix it  
12 before you move on. That's kind of a simple -- but we can talk a little  
13 more detail as we answer questions. The concept here though is to try  
14 to make performance indications and the inspection findings kind of have  
15 an equal footing so that all we have to do and all you have to do when  
16 you look at them as -- in that process it says okay, as performance  
17 indications and inspection finds we turn that into what we call the  
18 action maker. The outcomes are impact. That's our action. That's what  
19 we're going to do as an Agency and it's kindly almost -- of what we're  
20 going to do as an Agency based upon these inputs.

21           Out of those inspection findings will come enforcement. You  
22 notice it doesn't have -- any questions on what I've said so far? Real  
23 simple. I know it's real high level. Ann.

24           MS. HARRIS: When are you going to deal with the old  
25 problems from the Plant?

          MR. MADISON: I'll talk about that. Not right now but I  
will talk about that. I know you had that question.

ANN  
RILEY  
& going to get an answer or somebody was going to talk more to me about it  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 and I never have received any input back.

2 MR. MADISON: All right. Well we'll talk about that as we  
3 go along. Let me just wrap this up here and we'll get into that kind of  
4 conversations. All public benefits I mentioned this already. More  
5 information, more often, more readily available. We think it's more  
6 predictable. It's consistency of action. Consistency from Region to  
7 Region to Region and if you have a white inspection finding in Region 3  
8 you're going to see similar actions to a white inspection finding in  
9 Region 2. It's not going to be different across the country.

10 We think - what we've tried to do is focus the actions on  
11 the safety significance of the issues rather than enforcement activity.

12 What you'll see when you go on the Web page is something that looks  
13 like this. For each Plant under the cornerstones you mark up kindly  
14 this says that's the strategic performance area with the cornerstone.

15 Under each cornerstone will be identified performance  
16 indicators associated with that cornerstone. Below that on another -  
17 you could actually -- on another page but it's just below there will be  
18 the inspection findings. A similar type of color identification. These  
19 will be in color.

20 You can't see it on this slide because it's not my color  
21 slide but that would be a green color right there. That would indicate  
22 that that performance indicator is in the licensee response bin so the  
23 risk associated, the safety associated with that is minimal. It's in an  
24 acceptable zone.

25 That would indicate a white performance indicator in the  
increased regulator response bin. One of the things you can do on this  
web page with this as well as the inspection findings is click on that

ANN with your mouse and it will take you directly to the chart that shows  
RILEY  
& what that performance indicator looks like.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1           On inspection finding it will take you to what we call Plant  
2 issues matrix. It will describe what that inspection finding is. You  
3 can go further from the inspection finding Plant issues matrix. You can  
4 go right to the report that that inspection finding is in and read the  
5 report.

6           From this performance indicator to the chart you can go  
7 right to the raw data associated with that if you choose to. You can  
8 calculate the performance indicator yourself and make sure it's right.  
9 You will also see on that report on that web page links to other things  
10 such as the annual report associated with the program, the generic  
11 reports. There is a lot more information on there. You will see - one  
12 of the documents that you will hopefully sent is what we - the number  
13 title is new reg 1649. I notice you have it, Wayne. The title on that  
14 is --

15           MR. STUNTZ: This here?

16           MR. MADISON: Un-hum.

17           MR. STUNTZ: 1649.

18           MR. MADISON: Yeah.

19           MR. STUNTZ: New NRC reactor inspection and oversight  
20 program.

21           MR. MADISON: You will see that on the web site as well.  
22 That is what we call the plain English version of the program. Kind of  
23 a description for the public. That - the one that's on the website  
24 right now we're in the process of revising that. It will be helpful for  
25 the Region 3 OPA folks, Office of Public Affairs, and we will have the  
new revision up on the website prior to April.

        We just came out of a pilot program where we piloted the new  
ANN process. We had two sites in each Region. There are nine Plants.  
RILEY  
& Salem, Old Creek up in Region 1 consider themselves one site. The  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---



1 licensee does and NRC treats it pretty much as one site so even though  
2 there are two licensees - well actually they're the same licensee but  
3 there are two licenses is held there.

4 We established some success criteria for that. We've looked  
5 at that. We've reviewed the success criteria. We had a group called  
6 the program pilot - pilot program evaluation --. It included members of  
7 industry, members of the NRC, members of the public. David Lockbalm sat  
8 on that from -- [Inaudible] sat on that panel.

9 We had Gary Wright from the State of Illinois on the panel,  
10 and those folks did an independent review of the program and the  
11 numbers, the information that we provided, the data we provided them on  
12 the program and they had provided a report on their feelings of the  
13 success of the program.

14 We held public meetings throughout. We held one at the  
15 front end. We were holding these public meetings at the back end of the  
16 pilot program kindly soliciting additional information from the public.

17 We had -- notice that we actually extended the date on that. We  
18 originally were going to close that out in November. We extended the  
19 date to the end of December to collect public information.

20 We just held a public meeting in DC with about three hundred  
21 and fifty participates from the states, members of the public, a lot of  
22 licensee folks, members of industry and NRC to look back at the pilot  
23 program and review the pilot program and do what we call lessons learned  
24 and recommended resolutions to some of the issues associated with the  
25 program so we're still doing that.

We have a document called a Commission paper, second  
document that we'll be issuing in the very near future. We'll meet with

ANN the Commission on March 1st to describe the outcomes of the pilot  
RILEY  
& program and the changes that we're going to make to the process before  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 initial implementation April 2nd of this year, and that's the kind of  
2 data information there.

3 Now your question, Ann, was on what are we going to do with  
4 the old issues out at the site. As we've done with the pilot issues we  
5 asked the Regions to review the - and I may not answer your question.  
6 I'll check with you in a second but what I think your question dealt  
7 with I'll try to answer it.

8 We asked the Regions to take a look historically at the  
9 site. See what information, what issues were on the books. Try to put  
10 them in the context of the new program to see where the new program  
11 would take them.

12 For example, the licensee event reports at the site. We  
13 asked them to review those ones that had not been closed out. Put them  
14 in context with the program. If there were anything that showed up that  
15 was of significance they were treated with the new program, but if not  
16 they were treated again with the new program but would be what we call a  
17 green finding or an item of low risk and put in the licensee's  
18 corrective action program and dealt with it in that manner.

19 The same with other outstanding issues out at the site. Did  
20 that answer your question, or is there another area that you want to go  
21 into?

22 MS. HARRIS: You're talking about sites specific issues.  
23 I'm talking about those things that are like programmatic. I don't see  
24 anywhere in this process dealing with old programmatic issues.

25 MR. MADISON: Generic.

MS. HARRIS: Well generic is still different from  
programmatic.

MR. MADISON: Well I guess - maybe you could give us an

ANN  
RILEY  
& example.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 MS. HARRIS: Okay. Corrective action programs.

2 MR. MADISON: We inspect directly the corrective action  
3 program out on the site. Ten to fifteen percent of every inspection  
4 activity at the site is dealt - deals with the corrective action  
5 program.

6 MS. HARRIS: But those would be selective.

7 MR. MADISON: And we have an annual - no, we have an annual  
8 team inspection that looks at the overall corrective action programs.

9 MS. HARRIS: And how long does it take to bring that around?  
10 You're looking at what once a year?

11 MR. MADISON: To do the annual. There is continuous  
12 monitoring in the corrective action programs out at the site.

13 MS. HARRIS: But the public doesn't know and it has no way  
14 of judging how you're going to bring these programmatic issues back in  
15 under the umbrella. When you're talking about a generic issue you're  
16 talking about the steam generator leaks. Okay.

17 When you're talking about programmatic issues you're  
18 talking about corrective action programs that as a whole the site has  
19 continually dealt and given you bad information or in some cases just  
20 out and out lied to you and it keeps coming up over and over again.  
21 Another programmatic issue is work documents.

22 MR. MADISON: I'm not sure you --

23 MS. HARRIS: And then whenever --

24 MR. MADISON: I'm really not sure you heard me because we  
25 look at the - we look annually to do a team inspection at the corrective  
action programs. We report out on them on at least an annual basis. As  
I said each inspection is done at the site. Ten to fifteen percent of

ANN the inspection is to focus in the corrective action program.

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

If there are problems they are to be identified and

1 documented in the inspection report. How is that not getting that  
2 information --

3 MS. HARRIS: Well why is that we see the repetition of  
4 certain issues and certain types of behavior from the projects or from  
5 the job site that continue over and over and over again with specific  
6 utilities?

7 MR. MADISON: I guess you know depending upon the issue we  
8 as an Agency may not - we may not have been as prompt in the past to  
9 address some of these concerns. Part of this program is to force the  
10 Agency to take the actions specified by the -- because they're out in  
11 the open. It says in the matrix that if problems of this safety  
12 significance are identified these are the actions we are going to take.

13 If we don't take them we have to justify why we're not taking them.

14 Now the old program didn't do that admittedly. The old  
15 program could have been called the black box of regulation. We had a  
16 lot of information come in and we went into a closed door meeting and  
17 discussed all this information and thought we came to very good  
18 decisions but then when we made the decision and told everybody about it  
19 on the other end you know we got a lot of -- [Inaudible] because we  
20 didn't explain ourselves. We didn't show how we were going to go about  
21 it.

22 This new program does that. This new program - if the issue  
23 and if it's a programmatic issue and it comes out as a green issue  
24 that's of low safety significance. That defines the safety significance  
25 of that issue for the Agency, for the licensee, the utility, and the  
public.

MS. HARRIS: Are you not relying upon the utility to

ANN determine the significance of what they supply to you?

RILEY

& MR. MADISON: No. We have our own processes. We have what

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

1 is called the significance -- process that we've designed. We validated  
2 it and verified with the licensees that we have the correct information  
3 from their risk assessment but we have the program. We developed the  
4 process and we make the determination on what the safety significance of  
5 that issue is.

6 MS. HARRIS: You're not still permitting the utility to  
7 determine if it's reportable or not?

8 MR. MADISON: Oh, we verify that. If there is something  
9 that they haven't reported that is required by regulations to report we  
10 still write a violation against them. We've always done that. We as a  
11 - you know we're not a big Agency. We're one of the smaller agencies in  
12 the Federal Government. We don't run the facility. We don't have the  
13 manpower to run the facility. We don't want to run the facility.

14 We monitor. We spot check. If we find a problem and we  
15 have a lot of ways of doing that besides the inspection program. You  
16 know everybody out at the facility - every individual out at the  
17 facility knows who to contact. The Resident Inspector, Senior Resident  
18 Inspector's numbers are up there. The Region's numbers are up there.

19 I don't know how many allegations we get from members of the  
20 public and we review all those allegations. The allegation program  
21 still exist and will exist to collect that feedback from the folks out  
22 at the site. It's pretty hard with I don't know how many folks you've  
23 got out at the site - 800 out at Sequoyah. Individuals on site. It's  
24 pretty hard with 800 people to hide something. It can be done but it  
25 takes a lot of work and eventually it's going to come out.

MS. HARRIS: Are you reducing then the level - the  
percentage of inspection that you're going to be doing then? Is that

AIN what --

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

MR. MADISON: No, we're focusing the inspection and safety

1 -- and more risk significant - areas that should be of more concern to  
2 the public. Is there more - there is more safety significance with the  
3 issues that we're now inspecting. Instead of inspecting, looking at  
4 areas and I'll give a real -- example.

5 We had inspectors and I've been inspecting a long time. We  
6 had inspectors that used to just look at how many -- points were  
7 missing. Quality control. Quality control inspector didn't show up or  
8 he didn't sign off. He might have been there but he just didn't sign  
9 the piece of paper. We had a lot of people spending a lot of time  
10 looking just at that.

11 Well that's not a safety significance as having a pump out  
12 of service for a long time. That's where we want to focus our  
13 inspectors' activity with things that are more - have more impact on the  
14 safety of that Plant. That's where we want them to focus their --.

15 MS. HARRIS: You want to look at hardware then?

16 MR. MADISON: Well some, yeah, but that's where a lot of  
17 your safety significant issues are going to come from.

18 MS. HARRIS: Well I agree with that.

19 MR. MADISON: If the human performance aspects - if the  
20 humans are missing up they're going to mess up equipment and we're going  
21 to find it in the hardware.

22 MS. HARRIS: Well by the time you find it in the hardware it  
23 could be a little too late.

24 MR. MADISON: That's - no. That's why we have the safety  
25 significance of the hardware issues we find and if it's of low safety  
significance it's still --.

MS. HARRIS: Safety is safety. I mean I have a problem with

ANN this. I've never gotten anybody at the NRC to tell me what is your  
RILEY  
& determination and what your definition of significant is.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 MR. MADISON: Well you've got that now.

2 MS. HARRIS: I've got that one all over the Board.

3 MR. MADISON: No, you've got that now. With the  
4 significance of the determination process it says in there. You can  
5 read it in the inspection report. You can read it on the web. We  
6 published a document on how we determine safety significance of  
7 inspection findings. Not just in the reactor area but in -- security  
8 area, and the radiation protection area.

9 We described to you in those processes what we think is  
10 significant and the assumption because it is a process that you have to  
11 make some assumptions about what things are wrong, what things are right  
12 the assumptions we made are there and they're open to -- by licensees or  
13 the public that we've made the wrong assumptions.

14 MS. HARRIS: Well licensees has a quick and dirty look at  
15 what you're assuming. The public has kindly been left out of this  
16 process.

17 MR. MADISON: In the past I will agree with you.

18 MS. HARRIS: Well it's still there because you haven't  
19 implemented this.

20 MR. MADISON: Well, Ann, we have.

21 MS. HARRIS: Well that's one, but you're taking the position  
22 that everything is okay. How many licensed Plants do we have across the  
23 nation?

24 VOICE: 103 and we've tested thirteen of them.

25 MS. HARRIS: Okay.

VOICE: Ten percent.

MS. HARRIS: Okay.

ANN  
RILEY  
& test ten percent, and then during our initial implementation we're not  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 just going to - it's not like we're throwing it out there to be you know  
2 implemented and then we're going to walk away from it.

3 The process still has a lot of checks and balances and a lot  
4 of oversight in there from specialists, myself, and others who are going  
5 to watch the process and we have some verification checks that we're  
6 going to make to make sure we're still moving the right way. We're  
7 still doing the right things and the consistency measures up.

8 MS. HARRIS: It just appears that we're forgiving  
9 everything from the past. Everything and we're going to be born again  
10 tomorrow morning whenever we start with the new --

11 MR. MADISON: I'm sorry you got that impression but that's  
12 not the case. That's not the case. The old issues are incorporated  
13 into this program.

14 VOICE: Alan, I don't think you mentioned this position of  
15 outstanding [Inaudible].

16 MR. MADISON: That's the same as with the disposition of  
17 outstanding licensee --

18 VOICE: -- but you didn't mention violations. We're not  
19 going to --

20 MR. MADISON: All old issues will be recharacterized. Now  
21 we're not going to go back for five years of inspection findings and try  
22 to recast them into this new program because they've already been  
23 addressed. They've already been addressed by the corrective actions in  
24 the old program, but if there is anything that is open and outstanding  
25 that will be recast in this program --

VOICE: Inspection open items which are still --  
[Inaudible].

MR. MADISON: Now did that get your question?

MS. HARRIS: No, but I can deal with it.



1 MR. MADISON: All right. Let me get to my questions. These  
2 are the questions all of you gave me. These are the ones in the --  
3 notice. Really we already started some of the conversation but the  
4 questions we've asked the public in the Federation Notice and we kindly  
5 centered our -- around --.

6 From what you've been able to see in limited aspects of the  
7 pilot program what you can read I'd just kindly like to get your  
8 feedback on it --. Do you believe the new oversight process will -- for  
9 assurance that the Plants are being operated safely. Bill, any comment  
10 on that?

11 MR. TITTLE: Yes, I do because I think that it focuses on -  
12 I was listening to what -- will say and I think that the data gives you  
13 more time to focus on these issues that she is talking about that maybe  
14 haven't been resolved in her mind or others in the past. Now you have  
15 the time to focus on that without spending all of your time -- and  
16 inspecting programs that already -- [Inaudible].

17 MR. MADISON: Wayne.

18 MR. STUNTZ: Well I think it's more in depth in what I read  
19 and everywhere I turn -- the hierarchy of this inspection report that  
20 come through. From the NRC I'd like to ask that -- [inaudible] but I  
21 think this program really gets down to the nuts and bolts of it not to  
22 mean it's all superficial or was.

23 You mentioned the inspector may come in and say all you did  
24 was -- but that's important and it may lead further down to a bigger  
25 problem. But getting down into the cornerstone the safety I think  
that's the greatest issue.

MR. MADISON: Any comment, Ann?

ANN  
RILEY  
& ASSOCIATES,  
ATTORNEYS AT LAW  
1300 ...

MS. HARRIS: I find that 45 percent of your own Regional  
employees with this survey that you ran with them that they didn't

1 believe that this program would work. Now you're asking me as a member  
2 of the public to trust you and your people should know your programs  
3 better than I do, and I'm not sure if that's a good -- on a temperature  
4 of how things happen but in this overall process I'm not seeing a  
5 regulatory participation from the NRC that gives me a warm fuzzy feeling  
6 and I'm sorry for that because I'm seeing deregulation and who provided  
7 this program or this process.

8 I thought the only thing - problem that I had with the --  
9 report was that there was a -- once a year and everybody within NRC got  
10 together and kindly voted Paul one of the members and kind of voted you  
11 know on it was like a political background you know but this process to  
12 me is I don't find it any different and irregardless of where you go  
13 with it if you don't ever implement it like you say you're going to it's  
14 never going to work. I would like to see the NRC implement a program as  
15 they promise to the public. If you do that --

16 MR. MADISON: Well I'll take that last as a positive then  
17 because that's what we intend to do, and I think by putting it on paper  
18 and by putting it out there as the action - you know I mentioned the  
19 action matrix. I didn't show it.

20 We've got a document now that says that if these things  
21 happen these are the actions we're going to take. You've got something  
22 you can hold our feet to the fire on. That document right there. It  
23 says if those bad things happen these are the actions we're going to  
24 take, and if we don't I would assume you would be filing a Petition to  
25 find out why.

Now as far as the first item you talked about I am sorry  
that that piece of internal communication has got out because it's

AIN incomplete. We had only gotten part of the information from the public  
RILEY  
& from our internal state -- when that document was released by someone.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 Again, it's an internal piece of communication.

2 We had collected - to get in preparation for lessons learned  
3 meeting we held an internal lessons learned meeting and an external  
4 lessons learned meeting. We had sent out a survey form to participants  
5 of the pilot plan and the Regional Offices.

6 We also sent out the same survey form to members of the  
7 Headquarters Staff that had participated in the development and in the  
8 implementation of the pilot program. We had not gotten all the  
9 information back when that document was released.

10 MS. HARRIS: From which group?

11 MR. MADISON: Primarily from Headquarters Office.

12 MS. HARRIS: How many people are there in Headquarters?

13 MR. MADISON: There is 2500 people in the Agency so you only  
14 had 94 respondents on that particular document that you saw. There was  
15 still quite a few more folks who hadn't responded when that --

16 MS. HARRIS: What did the - what was the percentage of  
17 change?

18 MR. MADISON: I don't have the figures for you. I'm sorry.  
19 I wouldn't be prepared to talk about this because it is - right now  
20 it's an internal document although we will be prepared to talk about  
21 that at Commission -- on March 1st.

22 Do you believe a new oversight program will provide  
23 sufficient regulatory attention to utilities with performance problems.

24 MR. GIBBS: Alan, let me interrupt for a minute.

25 MR. MADISON: Sure.

MR. GIBBS: The gentleman to my right he might want to  
comment on the previous question.

ANN MR. MADISON: Sure. I'm sorry, Bob.

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

MR. QUIRK: Thanks Russ. No, thank you.

1 MR. MADISON: You don't want to comment?

2 MR. QUIRK: No.

3 MR. MADISON: That's all right. We'll let you comment a  
4 little bit later on. Do you believe that the new oversight program will  
5 provide sufficient regulatory attention to utilities with performance  
6 problems. Bob.

7 MR. QUIRK: I'm in an awkward position. I'd rather not  
8 comment. I'm just here to -- more than anything else.

9 MR. MADISON: All right.

10 MS. HARRIS: I'm sorry. I don't know who this gentleman is.

11 MR. QUIRK: I'm Bob Quirk. I live in the area and I used to  
12 work for TVA.

13 MS. HARRIS: Well welcome to the Club.

14 MR. QUIRK: Well.

15 MR. MADISON: Bob read about the issue on the web site?

16 MR. QUIRK: Right.

17 MR. MADISON: Or about the meeting and decided he wanted to  
18 come so we invited him to sit at the table. Anybody want to comment on  
19 this one?

20 MS. HARRIS: I'd like to say a couple of things here. When  
21 a utility is caught with its so called safety pants down shareholders  
22 panic and share price goes out the window and everybody kind of throws  
23 up their hands and runs around talking about the bad things that are  
24 going to happen.

25 Whenever one of the - whenever a Senior Vice President at  
TVA's Plant can call up the Administrative - the Regional Administrator  
down in Atlanta and sway the NRC on how they're going to write up a

ANN report to give their specific Plant a good performance on certain issues  
RILEY  
& I'm seeing the ability here of the industry to totally take you over and  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 that bothers me because I don't see anything here where - everybody has  
2 to work together; and

3           The trust that you are asking the public to put into you and  
4 into your program I would like to see that - those kinds of issues  
5 addressed because you're talking to a room and basically a group of  
6 engineers who already understand the process, and not everybody out on  
7 the street understands what sufficient regulatory attention is and  
8 performance problem;

9           So I'm looking at a regulatory agency that has not  
10 adequately defined these kinds of things for the public consumption.

11           MR. MADISON: I think that's good criticism. This is part  
12 of the reason why we're doing these public meetings. The aspect of  
13 communicating what we do and how we work as an Agency. I'm not talking  
14 about what the - how nuclear power works or you know how you should be  
15 happy with the -- as your friend. I'm talking about what the NRC does  
16 to protect the public health and safety and that's one of the reasons  
17 why we're out here.

18           We recognize this is the beginning of the dialogue. This is  
19 not the end, and I think - personally I think we need to do more so I'll  
20 take that as a legitimate criticism. I do question and maybe - I'm  
21 sorry but I do question the assumption and I hope it's an assumption  
22 that we're somehow being captured by the licensee.

23           I mean if you have any proof of that please I'll give you  
24 the number of the Inspector General and you can turn us in.

25           MS. HARRIS: Well you don't have to.

          MR. MADISON: The program is out in the open. Our  
communications, the sunshine act are out in the open. All the meetings

AIN that we've had to develop this process and talk about this process have  
RILEY  
& been public meetings. We're shared draft material with the public.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 Something we've never done in the past to make sure the public can get  
2 involved in the development of the process along with the utilities and  
3 other folks within the Agency.

4 We have tried maybe not successfully but we have tried to  
5 involve all members of the public in the process, in the development, in  
6 the oversight, and in the final end of the process. That's going to be  
7 - that should continue with the inspection activities.

8 That's why we think by putting a significance determination  
9 process it may take a little work. In fact it does take a little work.

10 A lot of work to understand some of the assessment, the risk numbers.

11 We're not asking folks to be risk experts but if we can  
12 explain ourselves to you in plain English in the reports and that's the  
13 goal of the program is to explain - because we have another program  
14 going on in the whole Government in plain English. If we can explain in  
15 plain English in the reports the assumptions we've made and why that's a  
16 safety significant issue so that you can understand where we're coming  
17 from that's part of the goal of the program.

18 Now we may have to check our assumptions with the licensee.

19 In some cases they have more current information on some of the systems  
20 and equipment at their Plant than we do.

21 MS. HARRIS: I heard a comment back in your earlier  
22 presentation about the NRC's objective. This is the first time that I  
23 have heard in layman's terms an open understandable - what's a good word  
24 - a way that the NRC knows what its objectives are. That's the first  
25 time I've ever heard it laid out and not covered up with all these other  
things where the issue of safety was set over in the corner somewhere  
and we go by and -- it off whenever it's convenient. It looks good. If

ANN the public comes by and says what is that and oh, that's our safety  
RILEY  
& program and I didn't see that here tonight and I'm pleased to see that.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 MR. MADISON: Thank you.

2 MS. HARRIS: I want you to know that.

3 MR. MADISON: We're making progress then.

4 MS. HARRIS: Well I'd hope so.

5 MR. MADISON: Is the information provided by the NRC  
6 appropriate to keep the public informed of Agency activities related to  
7 the plants. I told you may not have had a lot of time to look at the  
8 web site for this. I've described it to you as maybe some of the  
9 information you received from Dr. Spector. I guess I'd ask you, Wayne,  
10 your feelings on that issue?

11 MR. STUNTZ: I think so. I deal mainly with the public on  
12 Sequoyah. For example, I get these special needs cards and I ask the  
13 public or them when I talk to these people are you aware of what is  
14 going on. If it's not the first Wednesday of the month and the sirens  
15 are going off at noon do you know what to do, and I think the public  
16 from what I gather know about the NRC's - the purpose of what is being  
17 done here. The safety issues. I think they do know.

18 MR. MADISON: Bill, would you like to comment?

19 MR. TITTLE: I think one of our problems in getting people  
20 to prepare and to understand is indifference. I mean you understand and  
21 you read but so many people don't as you know and the general population  
22 in particular that ten mile zone but we cannot get them to read the  
23 calendars that are set out to understand any of that.

24 These cards that he talks about we have trouble getting  
25 people to send those back in. I think there is an indifference out  
there that probably is brought about by a degree of --. I mean nothing  
has happened in the years that Sequoyah Plant has been there that has

ANN caused any concern or raised any eyebrows and I think people are  
RILEY  
& comfortable.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1           You need to drive in the area and see all the new homes  
2 going up and there is no resistance by the public to live in the area.  
3 I happen to live four miles from there and I'm not sure if twenty years  
4 ago I would have done that, but I think there is a comfort level and an  
5 indifference there.

6           I think more people need to look at that information and  
7 perhaps we in emergency management can do more to heighten awareness  
8 that --

9           MR. MADISON: Do you have a web site?

10          MR. TITTLE: We do have and I was just thinking we could put  
11 a button on there to go over to yours and we'll have our folks work on  
12 that. I'll do that.

13          MR. MADISON: Do you get a lot of participation from local  
14 members of the public from your web site?

15          MR. TITTLE: No, we really don't. There is apathy there  
16 also, but we certainly could do that and maybe there are some other  
17 things that we could do to heighten awareness. Perhaps you could get  
18 the press involved and help them understand that if they see all green  
19 things are okay, and if they don't then they could raise concerns and  
20 issues but I think indifference is a problem that we face.

21          MS. HARRIS: Why wouldn't --

22          MR. QUIRK: I just have a couple of comments on this issue.  
23 You said something everything is green there is no - there should not  
24 be any concern. Green does not necessarily mean good.

25          MR. TITTLE: Thank you.

          MR. QUIRK: Bottom line green does not mean good. The  
column is there but they're not - at this point they're not considered

ANN --.  
RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

          MR. MADISON: Yeah, I --



1 MR. QUIRK: They're not unmanageable.

2 MR. MADISON: There is a --. White is not all bad. Green  
3 is not necessarily good and white is not all bad. We set the threshold  
4 for green and white at kind of a nominal performance threshold so that  
5 we know that there is going to be some white performance indicators  
6 routinely show up.

7 There are some Plants that operate outside the nominal  
8 performance bin. It's part of their even their licensing basis they're  
9 close, so we expect some white performance indicators during normal  
10 operation. We expect that there would be white inspection findings even  
11 in an operated facility that is performing fairly well.

12 The purpose - try to get back to the purpose of that. The  
13 green says there are problems but the risk associated with those, the  
14 safety associated with that is acceptable such that the licensee's  
15 corrective action program is adequate enough to take the action. We as  
16 an Agency don't need to get people involved.

17 White we need to verify that their correction action program  
18 is functioning before we walk away from it, but the licensee still has  
19 got the responsibility to correct the problem. We're still not going to  
20 get deeply involved in it.

21 We're not going to look at the root cause and do you know a  
22 team inspection on site just to look at that one issue. It has to be  
23 more significant issues, more significant findings before we do that. I  
24 just wanted - there is a misreception that you know they fall off a  
25 cliff if they get a white finding. That's not the case. Ann.

MS. HARRIS: I want to make a suggestion about how you deal  
with these isolated rural communities. I live in a community where my

ANN driveway is a mile long off of the pavement and there is five families  
RILEY  
& lives back in there, and we've got - every mailbox got a calendar from  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 TVA. It hangs in the appropriate place in my house.

2 MR. MADISON: And I won't ask where that is.

3 MS. HARRIS: But --

4 MR. TITTLE: Where do you live at?

5 MS. HARRIS: I live up at Ten Mile up at Watts Bar, and my  
6 mother recently fell and broke her ribs. It took us sixteen hours to  
7 find her which that's still another problem but in like a forty-eight  
8 hour period my mother became an invalid that we would have to deal with  
9 in the case of an accident.

10 I - my mother-in-law became an invalid like a year and a  
11 half ago but she was at my house. I had care for her there, but during  
12 that period I got the calendar. I returned it back to TVA to say that  
13 there is more families here than you're taking into consideration, and  
14 that if the accident happens in the night time hours when I'm there  
15 that's fine.

16 If I'm awake you need to send help for these two women, and  
17 it took almost five and a half months for me to get a telephone call  
18 back from a TVA person asking me what did I want and I marked the survey  
19 appropriately but I dealt with that because I know how.

20 I would think that the NRC somehow or another that you would  
21 provide to TVA a postcard with some sort of survey on it that they could  
22 mail back to you if they're not happy or if they have an issue and then  
23 you forward it to the utility so that the utility knows that you know  
24 because I'm in and out.

25 It's like a high from like early March up until October.  
We're looking at an area on the weekends ungodly amounts of people pour  
into that area to go fishing from out of state and they don't even know

AIN that a nuclear plant - right now most of the evacuation signs on Watts  
RILEY  
& Bar they don't exist, so we're looking at a way that somehow or another  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 the evacuation issue whose in these rural communities that are isolated.

2           Particularly here we're looking at Southern Appalachia. I  
3 mean you look at it on TV every night I'm sure so I'm not telling you  
4 anything that you don't know, but I think that just this idea of send  
5 around a calendar is not sufficient whenever there is women that have  
6 moved in for the summer they don't even know. They don't get a calendar  
7 because they're not there to pick one up and they don't know what the  
8 process or the procedure is.

9           MR. MADISON: This isn't the only location that has an issue  
10 of --. I'm sure you folks have dealt with this also in your aspect too.  
11 I note Russell and Paul are taking notes on it. We're not going to try  
12 to resolve any site specific issues.

13           MS. HARRIS: Well I don't - that was not the issue.

14           MR. MADISON: We're really trying to talk about the overall  
15 oversight program and focus on the questions associated with that. I  
16 understand your specific concerns and I'm not going to walk away from it  
17 because they made some notes so it's not forgotten.

18           MS. HARRIS: But what I want you to address not - that was  
19 just an example. Some type of a problem. The NRC being way out here  
20 somewhere and then the utilities here close by and locals are not seeing  
21 or hearing from you.

22           MR. MADISON: Well that's part of why we're coming out. Now  
23 we --

24           MS. HARRIS: And --

25           MR. MADISON: Are you done?

          MS. HARRIS: No.

          MR. MADISON: No.

ANN  
RILEY  
& these public document rooms because you're putting this Adams Program  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 that is like the Adams Family. I'm sorry but it's a nightmare.

2 [Laughter.]

3 But it would seem to me that it would be to everybody's  
4 benefit if the NRC and the utilities shared the price of a person to  
5 work in these public document rooms to talk about issues or somebody  
6 that could talk and direct people into areas that need to be or they  
7 want to talk about or find information about because right now I'm - for  
8 lack of a better word I'm just really angry that I have to go down here  
9 to the public document room and pay twenty-five cents for a page of  
10 print that I can't read.

11 Now don't send me off to the Inspector General because I  
12 don't want to talk about that silly audit group. They found that  
13 everything was publicly okay.

14 MR. MADISON: Well I'm going to send you to your Congressman  
15 because your Congressman is the person - do you want to address this?

16 MR. CLARK: Well we're closing our -- [inaudible].

17 MR. MADISON: Yes.

18 MS. HARRIS: Well now you have given me to the Adams Family,  
19 Ken.

20 MR. CLARK: I know we are.

21 MS. HARRIS: Because you're not helping.

22 MR. CLARK: Believe me I've been given to the Adams Family  
23 too. We hope it works.

24 MS. HARRIS: Don't we want to address the problem or is the  
25 idea just to make it worse. Is that the idea here?

MR. CLARK: Well the Agency and I don't mean to interrupt  
this process - the Agency -- [inaudible]. People will be I guess

ANN expected to use their computers. If they don't have a computer --  
RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

MR. MADISON: Use the public library.

1 MR. CLARK: Use the public library.

2 MR. MADISON: Unfortunately, and that is why - I'm not being  
3 facious then. I'm not being facious at all.

4 MR. CLARK: No.

5 MR. MADISON: If you have a concern in that area and I don't  
6 blame you because probably you're not alone write your Congressman.

7 MS. HARRIS: Well he doesn't want to hear my problems.

8 MR. MADISON: Part of the issue is dollars and that's where  
9 it comes with the public document. See we want to spend the money -  
10 instead of in a public document room we want to spend the money on Mr.  
11 Russell Gibbs here inspecting the site.

12 MS. HARRIS: Why wouldn't the - I'm not sure who this  
13 gentleman is but you work for the NRC?

14 MR. MADISON: No.

15 MR. QUIRK: No, I don't.

16 MR. MADISON: No.

17 MS. HARRIS: Oh, I'm sorry. Somebody in here does because  
18 the Inspectors do.

19 MR. MADISON: Russell.

20 MS. HARRIS: Russell. I mean it seems to me --

21 MR. GIBBS: Presently I'm the Project Manager for Sequoyah.

22 MS. HARRIS: Well I'm sorry. Okay, but it seems to me that  
23 for just for the public consumption that you would put that person - I  
24 mean you share everything else with the utility. How much would it take  
25 to - are we talking \$350.00 a week to get a person to put out on the  
streets that if they're not busy in doing public document work or  
showing somebody how to go through the Adams Family House to put them

ANN out into a school, over on the campus, in a Town Hall meeting what would  
RILEY  
& that consume. That would consume the amount of hours that it takes Paul  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 to come up here and ride to Tennessee once a month in travel expenses.

2 MR. MADISON: Okay. Again, like I said we're not going to  
3 resolve that here.

4 MS. HARRIS: But I want to know the table --

5 MR. MADISON: I'm not going to -- the Agency to spend the  
6 money to do that.

7 MS. HARRIS: But I want it on the table that --

8 MR. MADISON: It is.

9 MS. HARRIS: That with public information because it's not  
10 out there. By the way Ken, what are you going to do with these  
11 documents that you're going to throw away?

12 MR. CLARK: Well I don't think they're going to really throw  
13 them away. The library -- keep them. If they elect not to I don't  
14 know.

15 MS. HARRIS: [Inaudible] They throw away their documents.  
16 They purge their records like once every three months so I can't get  
17 anything out of locals.

18 MR. MADISON: I tell you what. After the meeting why don't  
19 you and Ken get together and talk. You can talk a little bit more about  
20 that.

21 MS. HARRIS: I'm sorry.

22 MR. MADISON: My next question - that's okay. You got it on  
23 the table. Do you believe the NRC is providing the public with timely  
24 and understandable information on plant performance with the oversight  
25 program we've described. I know your answer is no. Anybody want to  
comment on that? It's kindly the same question.

MR. QUIRK: I guess I don't understand the program

AINN completely yet. My understanding is there is no issue or finding --

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

MR. MADISON: Yeah.

1 MR. QUIRK: Inspectors go through it and then they go  
2 through and submit the determination process.

3 MR. MADISON: Un-hum.

4 MR. QUIRK: And determine if it's - if it even goes in the  
5 report or not based on -- and perhaps it a -- violation. [Inaudible]  
6 The public would know. My understanding now that process - that  
7 information will not even be in the reports now, and then the  
8 determination - okay, that's one issue about how the information gets to  
9 the public.

10 MR. MADISON: Okay.

11 MR. QUIRK: The next issue is the coloring of it. The  
12 green, white, and so on. If I'm not mistaken that's all based on --.  
13 Is that correct? If you have an issue on those you show that the --  
14 damage gets graded. The chance of -- damage are greater if it remains  
15 green. Is that the way that works or not?

16 MR. MADISON: Let me answer - there is two questions.  
17 Simply, yes and no. First of all the first question as far as whether  
18 or not it goes into the report we've established in the documents on  
19 Inspection Manual Chapter 0610 and that -- there is a draft document in  
20 there.

21 VOICE: 610 star.

22 MR. MADISON: Oh, 610 star. It's got an asterisk on it  
23 because it's part - it's a draft document and it's only part of the --  
24 and it describes process for determining whether an inspection issue is  
25 wisest to the level of significance to be called a finding.

We chose for that threshold what we have been calling for  
years minor violations. We have for the last four or five years told

AIN inspectors do not document minor violations. They fill up a report with  
RILEY  
& a lot of things that are not of significance and confuse the public. We  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 want to focus on the safety issues not the minor violation issues.

2 We said that for a number of years. This program says you  
3 shall not put in the report minor violations unless there is extenuating  
4 circumstances associated with those. Now we've described what some of  
5 those extenuating circumstances may be.

6 With respect to the significance of determination color  
7 determination, yes, there is a basis in PRA, probability - probablistic  
8 risk analysis, associated with the Plant in the significance of that  
9 finding and its effect on -- damage or potential effect on -- damage.

10 In some cases in some of the non-reactor areas there is no  
11 clear -- to -- damage. For example, emergency preparedness. There is  
12 no --. You're already in emergency the -- will assume that the -- is  
13 damaged during the test and you're testing to see how licensee plans --  
14 affect the public. [Inaudible]

15 With findings associated with -- we're trying to get a  
16 relative risk and we've done all. We've held work shops and a lot of  
17 discussions back and forth to kindly get a relative risk associated with  
18 that so that a white emergency preparedness finding has the same weight  
19 as a white reactor safety finding so that's why I said yes and no. Did  
20 that answer your question? Do you have any follow up on that?

21 MR. QUIRK: Yeah, let's go same engineering inspection and  
22 you have to look at a calculation as an inspector and you have some  
23 questions about some - perhaps the calculation is not up to date as it  
24 should be. And in the past you could have said that hey, you could  
25 read an inspection report that says that.

The calculation did not account for these modifications and  
then unless you actually go through and completely calculation now or in

AIN the past you say hey, calculation was not maintained. Did not address  
RILEY  
& these modifications. It's going to be in the report. People are going  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---



1 to read that.

2 Right now my understanding is you have a calculation that is  
3 not up to date unless you can in fact show that it is a real problem it  
4 does not go in the report. Is that correct or not?

5 MR. MADISON: Yes. Why would you want something that is not  
6 a real problem in the report?

7 MR. QUIRK: Well no, it's a problem that the calculation is  
8 not up to date.

9 MR. MADISON: Why?

10 MR. QUIRK: That's your proof that your safety systems will  
11 work.

12 MR. MADISON: But if you look at the calculation and the  
13 error is such that it would not have any impact on the safe operation of  
14 the facility why do you want to know about it?

15 MR. QUIRK: Well how do you know if it's not incorporated --

16 MR. MADISON: You make conservative assumptions which we  
17 challenge and ask the inspectors to do. You make conservative  
18 assumptions with that calculation and then you bound your analysis based  
19 upon those conservative assumptions so you do a worse case analysis and  
20 if it shows up that that would produce a safety impact now you've got  
21 something you can write about. Now you've got a concern.

22 MR. HERNAN: As an answer to Bob's question the fact that  
23 these details will be on the web site if he wants to get into the  
24 details of --

25 MR. MADISON: No, no, they won't. The answer is no, they  
won't unless they arise to a level of significance that we've  
predetermined with our significance determination process. Unless they

ANN write and 0610 star unless they arise to a level of significance no,  
RILEY  
& they will not appear in the report without extenuating circumstances,  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 and some of those extenuating circumstances may be that we're responding  
2 to an allegation by an employee or member of the public.

3 It may be that there is - there was an event at the site and  
4 we're documenting what our findings on the event were, and so even  
5 though they may be some minor issues there we're basing our  
6 interpretation of what the significance of that event was.

7 Those extenuating circumstances may - we may still talk  
8 about some of the minor - what we would call minor issues but the intent  
9 is not to bring - not to put all - not to report it. I used to lead the  
10 diagnostic evaluations and one of the things I used to tell inspectors  
11 in the -- and the team is do not confuse activity with accomplishment.  
12 We shouldn't as an Agency confuse the public with activity with  
13 significance.

14 Because an inspector has been out there looking at a lot of  
15 things and wants to document what he has done doesn't mean that he has  
16 found anything of significance. We want to report to the public the  
17 issues that they should be concerned about because we're concerned about  
18 them. We don't want to report to the public the longer list of things  
19 that the inspector looked at. That's part of the inspection document.  
20 We've told the public these are the things we're going to look at so  
21 expect us to look at them.

22 MR. TITTLE: Is that the same as saying that if an item is  
23 not in an inspection report it will not be found on the PIM?

24 MR. MADISON: Yes. In fact well there are some items that  
25 appear in the inspection report the Plant issues matrix - I want to do  
away with acronyms for our Court Reporter here. Plant issues matrix is  
PIM. Actually there are some issues that will appear in the report that

AIN won't appear on the PIM.

RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

Only findings of significance appear in the PIM and those

1 will be in the front of the report as a summary of findings. There may  
2 be additional issues. Some of these minor violations that have some  
3 extenuating circumstances that we want to document them.

4 We want the public to be able to read them but we're not  
5 raising them to a level - we're not bringing them forward as something  
6 that the public or the Agency or the utility ought to be concerned  
7 about.

8 How often will you permit the utilities to use items about  
9 proprietary information that they don't want anybody to know. That they  
10 don't want put on the web?

11 MR. MADISON: As long as they meet the test of the law I  
12 guess they'll be allowed to use that.

13 MS. HARRIS: Well they could say that.

14 MR. MADISON: We haven't changed the law either. We still  
15 have to obey the law too.

16 MS. HARRIS: Well they say that about things that virtually  
17 are silly. They use it. They've overused it and you're permitting them  
18 to and I'm asking is that the way it's going to be?

19 MR. MADISON: Again, if you have proof where we have  
20 violated the law please contact the --

21 MS. HARRIS: Oh, that's not what I said.

22 MR. MADISON: Well that is what you said because you said  
23 that we have allowed them to do something in violation of the law. We  
24 have an office of General Counsel that reviews all proprietary requests  
25 by the licensee and they determine whether or not they meet the tests of  
the law.

MS. HARRIS: Then how long is it going to be before the

ANN public has knowledge of what is happening with these inspections then  
RILEY  
& and with these - with this new program because the General Counsel has -  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 they have other work besides proprietary information documents.

2 MR. MADISON: If your question is are we putting the request  
3 to the Office of General Counsel that's not the case. Inspection  
4 reports go through Regional Management --. Now there may be certain  
5 parts of that - there are certain drawings.

6 There are certain safeguards information that we ask the  
7 licensee to make sure that we're not releasing proprietary data but as  
8 far as the significance of the inspection findings and what the  
9 inspectors have we don't withhold that information from the public and  
10 we never have.

11 MR. TITTLE: Ann, are you familiar with the process that the  
12 -- team must go through to withhold something as proprietary?

13 MS. HARRIS: Yes.

14 MR. TITTLE: I'm not talking safeguards. I'm talking about  
15 -- [inaudible].

16 MS. HARRIS: Safeguards don't count with this.

17 MR. TITTLE: But it has to be --. I witnessed an Affidavit  
18 to the NRC. The NRC has to respond -- [inaudible].

19 MR. MADISON: I can't remember the last time it happened.

20 MS. HARRIS: Now back to --

21 MR. TITTLE: It's almost never.

22 MS. HARRIS: I'll talk to you about that later.

23 MR. MADISON: Again, if you've got something - I'm serious.

24 MS. HARRIS: So am I.

25 MR. MADISON: We need to keep the integrity of the program.

If there is something you think that one of us is violating the program  
you need to --

ANN  
RILEY  
& long is it going to be from the time that the utility knows what's in  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 the inspection report before it's posted on the web. For my consumption  
2 for me to see what is going on in my community --

3 MR. MADISON: We have some regulations that says as soon as  
4 the report is issued to the licensee it has to also be issued currently  
5 to the public. That's the rule.

6 MR. TITTLE: On the web site.

7 MR. MADISON: On the web site. It's current. You get it at  
8 the same time they do. Now we may be discussing issues with them on a  
9 day to day basis. Russ out at the site may have some issues and some  
10 concerns. He is asking them some questions so they know some of the  
11 issues that he may be looking at, but when the determination is made as  
12 to the significance and the report is issued you get it at the same time  
13 the licensee does. That's the rule.

14 MR. CLARK: [Inaudible.] Usually right now the way we're  
15 working with our inspection reports we issue inspection reports at --  
16 [inaudible].

17 MR. MADISON: Anybody else in that area?

18 MR. QUIRK: We still go back to my questions. Take for  
19 example say this is not a -- at Sequoyah. I -- think about this but  
20 suppose there was a calculation that shows the ability these are  
21 generated to support the loads after an accident and if there was some  
22 low tech changed on the -- and that calculation was not maintained, the  
23 calculation was not updated and the inspector finds this through an  
24 inspection although you didn't include this well the inspector is not  
25 going to be able to go through this voluminous computer base calculation  
and say ah, you proved the -- cannot handle the loads. Let's just say  
initial problem you need to get these loads in the --. I do not know

ANN whether or not the -- can handle the loads at this point. How do you  
RILEY  
& handle something like that in the new process? Once I - how do you  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 handle it in the final program?

2 MR. GIBBS: Well the Resident Inspector are more generalis.  
3 We have experts in the Region that help us answer very hard questions  
4 like you just brought up but we need to be satisfied that what you just  
5 described we need to be satisfied that there is not a consequence to the  
6 problem, and that's where the new process is different. There needs to  
7 be a real consequence to the issues. If there is a consequence then we  
8 take action.

9 MR. MADISON: Now what we've done with the significance of  
10 determination process there is a check list and work sheets associated  
11 with that such that the Inspector doesn't have to go through a lot of  
12 calculation material to come up with at least a ballpark approximation  
13 of the safety significance of that issue. So if it comes out and we're  
14 conservative with those checks we think. So far the tests have shown  
15 that we're still conservative.

16 In one case where we did find that we feel that we may have  
17 been unconservative we made a decade adjustment there so that we're than  
18 conservative in those assumptions. The idea being that if it shows up  
19 green in that first screen it is really green. There is no worry and he  
20 should turn that over. He should identify his concern. Turn it over to  
21 licensee. Make sure it's in there corrective action program if they're  
22 taking action, but he doesn't need to do a lot of in depth review of  
23 that subject.

24 Now if it turns out to be more than green now he needs to do  
25 a little more leg work to get more information to check his assumptions  
and verify that it does not have safety significance before we make it  
an issue with the licensee.

AIN  
RILEY  
& identify the problem. The licensee makes a condition report or  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 corrective action document for it and they track it, and the inspectors  
2 go away. It's not mentioned in the inspection report.

3 MR. MADISON: Oh, yes, definitely it's documented in the  
4 inspection report. If it rises to the level of green it's documented in  
5 the inspection report.

6 MR. QUIRK: Well you don't know if it rises to the level of  
7 green because he don't know if it's any significance -- at it yet.

8 MR. TITTLE: Well we need to --

9 MR. QUIRK: To enter the calculation, right.

10 MR. MADISON: No, no, he can make some conservative  
11 assumptions and there are some test questions that are asked in that  
12 document that he can make a determination pretty fast whether it rises  
13 to the level of significance to be documented. You know I don't want  
14 to go into detail.

15 MR. QUIRK: Right.

16 MR. MADISON: Right now because we don't have the details  
17 here with us, and part of the significance of determination process  
18 drives a lot of detailed assumptions and you have to really do the work.  
19 You can't shoot from the hip on these things and that's good. We're  
20 not making snap judgments. We're making deliberate judgments on the  
21 safety significance of issues out at the site.

22 We don't want to make non-conservative judgments, but we  
23 don't want to be - we don't want to be alarmists and raise issues that  
24 aren't issues so we have bounds that we need to live within too, and  
25 that's what the process does. So if you've got - you know I tell folks  
if you want me to tell you how long that piece of string is let me see  
the string and we'll measure it with the process and we'll tell you what

ANN it is, but we can't shoot from the hip on generalities on it. Sorry.

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

MR. QUIRK: Understand.

1 MR. MADISON: Anything else? You've got a frown on your  
2 face.

3 MR. TITTLE: I probably understand what he is talking about.

4 MR. MADISON: Okay.

5 MR. TITTLE: I really have. It's important for us. I mean  
6 we serve folks like that. We answer to them and I was trying to  
7 understand, follow what he was saying. It's good for us. It gives us  
8 balance in our judgment to hear these things and to hear these  
9 questions. I have more confidence in the system apparently than they  
10 do, but it's good for us to hear these things too.

11 Our focus is on preparedness. We have to - our job is to  
12 plan for the worst and hope for the best and that's what we do. This  
13 program helps us understand what is going on better than the other  
14 program did I think so --

15 MR. MADISON: I'm going to kindly move us along a little  
16 bit. One of the last couple of questions we have here is the question  
17 of balance and one of the comments and criticisms we've had in the past  
18 we struggled with in the old process was to try to present a balanced  
19 picture of licensee performance.

20 One of the questions we've had from the public folks is why  
21 don't you put positive findings in the inspection reports. Well we've  
22 answered back we don't think we're very good at it. We don't have real  
23 good criteria for what is positive, and we're really dealing with a  
24 negative kind of process. We're looking for the exceptions. We're  
25 looking for the problems. The lack of problems is a positive.

So the question we have is what you see on the web page and  
I guess I'm not going to find it. What you see on the web page with all

ANN the material present does that in itself present a balanced picture, or  
RILEY  
& is there something that we should be adding to it. Wayne?  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---



1 MR. STUNTZ: I'm sorry. I have not gone into the web page  
2 so I can't provide anything.

3 MR. MADISON: Okay. Ann, you've looked at the web page.

4 MS. HARRIS: I check the web page twice a day. I like the  
5 web page because I can get information there that it provides me with  
6 the type of information. I know that there is a lot of what I call the  
7 uneducated general public that doesn't know what to do with it and when  
8 you tell them and use a lot of these words they don't know what to look  
9 at.

10 You know where to go with it or what to use it, and I find  
11 that I spend a lot of my time explaining you guys so that they can  
12 understand because they don't overreact and that makes me maybe feel  
13 better that I know that you guys you know are going where you need to.

14 The other thing is and we touched on it a little bit a few  
15 minutes ago you're still talking about rural areas. I don't care even  
16 out in the Sequoyah area, down at Huntsville, down at Augusta you're  
17 still looking at this is not town where everybody has got a computer.

18 I don't care what the belt line mentality is. These people  
19 still don't have this and they still don't have access to it, and it  
20 seems to me that you would put Ken Clark on some sort of NRC parade or  
21 somebody to send out stuff like my local newspapers.

22 I have weekly and bi-weekly and just the five day a week  
23 newspapers in my community and then there is a little Mom and Pop Radio  
24 Stations and the little bitty public TV stations that something could be  
25 - like a five minute public information because they're obligated to do  
the same thing that the City of Chattanooga is and put out that  
information and describe and talk about some of these words and why you

ANN use them and where they're coming from so that people don't panic

RILEY

& whenever they see this.

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

1 Oh, God, Sequoyah got - they've had another accident down  
2 there. They've had another shutdown. They don't understand the  
3 difference between a manual scram and an automatic scram. I probably  
4 had twenty calls this week over that. They don't understand what that  
5 means.

6 They think something is fixing to blow but it's hard to  
7 explain that to them but if it becomes a matter of their verbiage and  
8 their daily words so they hear the regular basis then it sure would make  
9 my life easier and I'm thinking it would make yours and TVA's easier  
10 also.

11 MR. MADISON: Ken, do you want to comment on that?

12 MR. CLARK: No. I haven't really given that much thought.

13 MR. MADISON: Okay.

14 MR. CLARK: [Inaudible.]

15 MS. HARRIS: It doesn't necessarily have to be the NRC. It  
16 could be the utility.

17 MR. MADISON: I haven't asked - I'll get right back to you.  
18 I haven't asked anybody from the observers here if they have any  
19 comments on what we've talked about so far. I'd like to take this  
20 opportunity if there are any comments. All right, Bill.

21 MR. TITTLE: Once Sequoyah shut down at the -- and made some  
22 noise I was concerned that the public would start calling and lighting  
23 up our switchboard. We didn't get one call. We never got the first  
24 call.

25 MS. HARRIS: They don't want to call you because they assume  
you don't know.

MR. TITTLE: No, they already know. You know I'm on TV all

ANN the time talking about issues, and they know they'll get an answer but  
RILEY  
& it goes back to that indifference that we just don't have the concern.  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 Whether that's good or bad I'm not sure but we just don't have it. We  
2 didn't get one call. Not one phone call.

3 MR. MADISON: Do you believe the new oversight process  
4 improves the effectiveness and efficiency of the NRC regulatory process  
5 focusing agency resources on those areas with the most significance.  
6 I'll be honest with you. One comment we got back from the first time we  
7 had all these meetings at Auburn, Nebraska was how can you ask us this  
8 question when we weren't sure about your old process, or we don't know  
9 anything about your old process.

10 It's kindly hard to compare so you know I'll accept I don't  
11 know or a shrug from you because that's a hard question to ask right  
12 now. I don't know how familiar you are with the old program, but we  
13 hope - this is one of our primary goals because as with all Government  
14 Agencies are resources are shrinking and we need to be smart about how  
15 we use them.

16 We want to use them in the right areas so that we still meet  
17 our goals and objectives and meet the mission of the Agency. This is  
18 criticism and it's legitimate criticism. We have to do what we say  
19 we're going to do.

20 Do you believe the new oversight process reduces unnecessary  
21 regulatory burden on licensees and the NRC? You know we have a  
22 regulatory burden on ourselves. We're our own worst enemy in some cases  
23 in doing our processes. Any comment? Seeing none we'll move on.

24 Does the new oversight process enhance public confidence.  
25 This is one I'd like to - this is kind of a hard thing to measure.  
Public confidence, but what we're trying to do here is improve the --,  
the consistency of the process, the clarity by explaining what we're

ANN doing and what we mean by risk significance, by safety significance, and  
RILEY  
& issues and the goal here is that if the public starts to understand our  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 processes more and where we're coming from that they may have more  
2 confidence in what we're saying and that we're out there actually  
3 looking out for the public health and safety. No comment? We'll move  
4 on.

5 Are there any other appropriate means by which the Agency  
6 could solicit stakeholder feedback. Now this is a question for Bill.

7 MR. TITTLE: I think she makes a good point. I think a lot  
8 of people who don't go to web sites a radio show probably the ratings  
9 would plummet if they got on there and talked a lot about these  
10 technical terms so they're not going to do that, but there should be  
11 other way besides the internet to get that - the web site to get  
12 information to people. I'm not sure if that's --

13 MS. HARRIS: Public service announcements, columns in the  
14 local newspapers.

15 MR. TITTLE: That's right.

16 MS. HARRIS: That's not controlled by the utility. That  
17 comes out of your mouth.

18 MR. TITTLE: Right.

19 MS. HARRIS: But you don't run by them to see if it's okay.

20 MR. TITTLE: Ma'am, we don't do that.

21 MS. HARRIS: I wasn't talking to you. I was talking to him.

22 MR. TITTLE: Okay.

23 MS. HARRIS: The NRC.

24 MR. TITTLE: Okay.

25 MR. MADISON: Bob.

MR. QUIRK: No comment.

MR. MADISON: Wayne.

MR. STUNTZ: No.

MR. MADISON: That was the last question believe it or not.

1 Any overall comments? Any overall questions?

2 MR. STUNTZ: Sir, I'd like to ask - I should have asked this  
3 when you mentioned it but you mentioned Category 1 and Category 2 and  
4 I've forgotten - I think they was mentioned during the last --

5 MR. MADISON: The systematic assessment -- yeah, and we're  
6 doing away with those. I thought I had answered that.

7 MR. STUNTZ: [Inaudible.]

8 MR. TITTLE: Yes.

9 MR. MADISON: The systematic assessment and licensee  
10 performance was suspended and we're recommending with the implementation  
11 of this new process that it be abandoned so there will no longer be a  
12 self-rating 1, 2, or 3. A lot of the criticism with the self was that  
13 it was you know it was eighteen to twenty-four months between self  
14 reports.

15 By the time the public ever saw the information it was at  
16 least twenty-four months old. Probably older. It was really old news  
17 so when you say a lot, Ann, I know with the South a lot of it had to  
18 deal with the fact that hey, we already knew there were problems. We  
19 were already told about them. You already had fixed them. It's okay.

20 That was how you were and now you're better so it looked  
21 kindly like a love in. Like we were forgiving them for all their  
22 mistakes when we weren't. We beat up on them back then but now it  
23 wasn't a problem any more so we really were - we try to be good with it  
24 but it was not necessarily a timely program.

25 It was inconsistent with the -- because every Region did it  
a little bit differently because there was no clear criteria about what  
- how you would make it a Category 1, Category 2 Plant.

ANN This process doesn't attempt to do that. It doesn't attempt  
RILEY & to roll all these up into one overall number, but what it does try to do  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

1 is produce a total picture of our assessment of the licensee performance  
2 in all the areas we consider important. Any other questions, comments?

3 Ann.

4 MS. HARRIS: I'm extremely pleased. You would be  
5 disappointed if I didn't say this. I'm extremely pleased to see these  
6 public meetings happen although I drove probably further than most  
7 people would want to believe tonight to get here even though I was late  
8 but these kinds of meetings you have to make more people aware outside  
9 the City.

10 I talked with about seven people today that had no knowledge  
11 that this was going on. That would have come if they had known like  
12 yesterday or last week because we have lives and we have to plan our  
13 lives around these kinds of things also. It's not a criticism with --

14 MR. MADISON: Now Ken wants to say something.

15 MR. CLARK: Ann, last week we did send a news release, a  
16 press release to the local newspapers up in your area and also we sent  
17 --

18 MS. HARRIS: The -- News said they never had gotten  
19 anything.

20 MR. CLARK: Well we faxed it and the phone rang and the fax  
21 took it. You know --

22 MS. HARRIS: Radio stations they should be -- a public  
23 service --

24 MR. HERNAN: I did in fact hear a radio announcement about  
25 this meeting as I was leaving the Plant about 5:30 this afternoon.

MS. HARRIS: What was the --

MR. HERNAN: I don't know. It was a -- station.

MR. MADISON: We struggle with that and I tell you what --

ANN  
RILEY  
&  
ASSOCI  
ATES,  
---

and Augie is the one who talked to you Augie spent hours on the phone

1 calling people to get them here tonight. We've got four people from the  
2 public. He wrote letters. Right? You got a letter in the mail from  
3 Augie.

4 We went out of our way with this meeting to try to get  
5 people here to come and talk about this program. Now we've had better  
6 success at other facilities. We had a lot of folks show up at Ft.  
7 Calhoun public meeting. In fact we were filmed by TBS at that meeting.  
8 That was an experience, but you know it varies.

9 It depends upon the Plant but it has been a struggle, and  
10 Augie went to - I mean David Lockbalm at a Commission meeting challenged  
11 us to go out and talk to his people so we asked David Lockbalm give us a  
12 list of your people. We'll call them and we did. We got the list from  
13 David and we called them. They're not here.

14 MS. HARRIS: From this area also?

15 MR. MADISON: We are making attempts. They do have a point.  
16 There is some apathy. We have to break over that. That's not - I'm  
17 not trying to justify it because we have to break through some of that.

18 MS. HARRIS: Everybody wants to wait and the media talks  
19 about let's wait until the accident happens and then we'll talk about  
20 it. I don't want to wait until then.

21 MR. MADISON: We don't either.

22 MS. HARRIS: I'm not interested. I'll be gone.

23 MR. MADISON: And we're going - we'll keep looking for other  
24 ways to reach out but we accept criticism. There is probably - we could  
25 do better.

MS. HARRIS: I know that like in my local paper they accept  
a guest column that they run it. You just fax them or maybe if they get

ANN a column from anybody they will run one regardless of -- [inaudible.]

RILEY

&

ASSOCI

ATES,

--

MR. MADISON: All right, Ann, you can have the last word and

1 we're going to close tonight. I thank everybody for their patience and  
2 their attendance and with that the meeting is adjourned.

3 [Whereupon, at 9:10 p.m., the meeting was concluded.]  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25