

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

ROUNDTABLE PUBLIC MEETING ON THE
REVISED REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS

Arbor Manor Motel
1617 Central Avenue
Auburn, Nebraska
Tuesday, November 30, 1999

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

PARTICIPANTS:

ANNIE THOMAS
BOB HUTTON
LONNIE SWANSON
ROGER GOOS
T.O. DAVISON
CHARLES MARSCHALL
LARRY WASKOWIAK
KRIS ROGGE
AUGUST SPECTOR
RICH HENDERSON
ALAN MADISON, NRC
JEFF CLARK, NRC

PARTICIPANTS: [Continued]

DAVID LOVELESS, NRC
TROY PREWITT, NRC

P R O C E E D I N G S

[7:00 p.m.]

MR. SPECTOR: Why don't we get started?

First of all, let me introduce myself. My name is August Spector and I am with the Nuclear Regulatory Commission in Washington, and some of you I might have contacted. I know there are people sitting at the table and I will tell you why they are at the table, et cetera, in a second.

Is there anybody else that I had contacted here on the phone or sent a letter to? -- well, she can come up to the table.

Let me introduce Al Madison who will kick off the meeting for tonight. Al?

MR. MADISON: Thank you. I am Alan Madison. I am what is called the Transition Task Force Leader for the Revised Reactor Oversight Process. It's a large title. It means I am the fellow that has been responsible, to date anyway, for helping develop and try to implement pilot, test out the new process that the agency has decided or is practicing with as far as the oversight of nuclear power plants in the United States. August, if you would go ahead and flip to the next slide.

We are going to cover a lot of different things upfront -- actually, go to the next one, if you would, please.

We're going to talk about, first of all, who we are, who the AN NRC is, talk a little bit about that. This is based on a lessons RILEY learned we have had with other public meetings to try to explain a & little bit of what the Nuclear Regulatory Commission is and what we see ASSOCI our activities. We will do a brief overview of the revised program, ATES and I mean brief because a lot of you -- the folks that have been LTD.

1 invited to participate in this have been provided with some additional
 2 information. Hopefully you have read as much as you could but we will
 3 provide a brief overview, just talk a little bit about it to give you
 4 some background, and then we are going to get into the meat or the
 5 purpose, the reason why we are here -- the roundtable discussion.

6 We have invited and targeted certain what we would consider
 7 interested members of the public to participate in a roundtable
 8 discussion. They have been provided some information in advance on the
 9 program and on the pilot study that is underway, and we are going to ask
 10 them to answer and discuss -- I don't know how many question, August?
 11 Ten questions?

12 MR. SPECTOR: Nine.

13 MR. MADISON: Nine questions we have provided in advance.
 14 That is the real purpose for the meeting today.

15 We have noted as far as developing the process and in
 16 considering the process that there's a group of what we are calling
 17 stakeholders, and those are folks that we consider have a stake in the
 18 regulation, in the operation of a nuclear power plant. They are
 19 obviously the regulator, Congress, the licensee, the operator of the
 20 facility, but also the public, and there's various members of the
 21 public, obviously members of the press. There are special interest
 22 groups, intervenor groups that are what would be considered stakeholders
 23 in the process.

24 Today we are trying to focus on those people that are close
 25 to the plant -- the public, the interested public close to the plant,
 26 and try to gauge the impressions, the feelings, the understanding and
 27 acceptance of the process, the revised process that we are expecting to
 28 implement nationwide in April of 2000.

29 After that roundtable discussion we will allow for input and
 30 solicit input from the rest of the audience but we do want to focus on
 31 the folks that are sitting around the table that have been provided the
 32 information in advance. Next slide, please.

33 To get right to who we are, the slide says that we are a
 34 federal Government agency with a mission of ensuring the adequate
 35 protection of the public health and safety as it relates to the peaceful
 36 use of nuclear materials in the United States and specifically what we
 37 are going to focus on tonight is the operation of commercial nuclear
 38 power plants.

39 To kind of kick this off, I would like the folks that are
 40 from the Nuclear Regulatory Commission who are here tonight to stand up
 41 and introduce themselves and specifically tell how you are associated
 42 with the Cooper Nuclear Station. Charlie?

43 MR. MARSCHALL: I am Charles Marschall. I work out of
 44 Region IV in Arlington, Texas. My title is Project Branch Chief. We
 45 have resident inspectors who work here on the site and they work for me
 46 and my job is to administer the inspection program for Cooper and Fort
 47 Calhoun up in the Omaha area.

48 MR. MADISON: Jeff?

49 MR. CLARK: I am Jeff Clark. I am the Senior Resident
 50 Inspector at Cooper. I live here in the area, just south of Nebraska
 51 City. I am involved in the day-to-day business of the inspection
 52 process at the plant. We are going through the pilot inspection process

ANN as you know right now and it is a learning process for us as well as the
 RILEY Cooper plant to go through that process --

& MR. LOVELESS: I am David Loveless. I work with Charlie
 ASSOCIATE Marschall. My job is to coordinate and support the activities of the
 RESIDENT Inspectors and the branch.

LTD.

1 MR. MADISON: Jeff, did you want to mention yourself --
Troy, I mean.

2 MR. PREWITT: I am Troy Prewitt.

3 MR. MADISON: I'm sorry -- you're not catching that?

4 THE REPORTER: No.

5 MR. MADISON: It's Troy Prewitt. He is the Senior Resident
6 from River Bend. He is on an inspection, basically inspection visit at
Cooper Nuclear Station.

7 MR. SPECTOR: I would just like to mention in addition to
8 Jeff we also have another Resident Inspector that lives here in the
9 general area and works full time at Cooper. His name is Mike Hay.

10 MR. MADISON: Next slide.

11 This slide outlines the issues, the major issues that we try
12 to get involved with, our activities at the site, ensuring the plants
13 are designed and constructed, obviously the first phase.

14 We issue licenses at the power plant. The licensee has a
15 license. That is why we call him the licensee.

16 We then through inspection ensure the licensee has used the
17 nuclear materials and operates the plant safely and are prepared to
18 respond to emergencies and we're challenged to ensure that research
19 provides the technical base for sound rules and regulations in the event
20 that we add to the body of regulations that are already in existence.
21 Next slide, please.

22 The NRC measures what we call -- these are NRC outcome
23 measures. We are trying to measure the performance of the NRC against
24 these measures, how we maintain safety, how we enhance public
25 confidence, how we go about the business of improving our effectiveness
and efficiency and the realism of the processes that we implement and we
install and how we can go about reducing unnecessary regulatory burden.

Go ahead and leave that up there for a second.

26 If you look at the second bullet, this is part of why we are
27 here tonight, enhancing public confidence. That is one of the questions
28 we are going to discuss tonight is does the process enhance public
29 confidence, does it provide more information, better information, the
30 confidence in the process, in the NRC process and in the operation of
the facility. Next slide.

31 Our current program is really not one program. It is a
32 collection of processes. We really focus on doing inspection activities
33 at the plant. It is based upon compliance with the body of regulations
34 and the basis of the license, which is encompassed in the technical
35 specifications of the plant.

Enforcement, here on the slide, becomes a major input to
assessment and determination of how we view the licensee's performance.

Next slide.

36 We have received an awful lot of criticism in years past for
37 having a lack of consistent application. We have received criticism for
38 not being very objective in our methods, for not having consistent
39 criteria and not following criteria. What we have attempted to do in
40 the new process is develop a single process providing a logical
41 framework focusing on key areas. We hope that it provides objective
42 standards for performance and provides for a collection of basically
43 clear criteria where we can hold ourselves to these standards and become

ANN a little bit more objective, actually a little bit more predictable in
RILEY our performance and the performance of the plant. Next slide, please.

&
ASSOCI continued emphasis is on safety. We think the new process actually
ATES helps us focus more on the safety aspects of the plant, and less on what
LTD.

1 we would consider the unimportant aspects of the general operation of
the plant.

2 We still maintain the strict standards. We still are going to have the
3 Resident Inspectors onsite, and also Visiting Inspectors from
4 Headquarters as well as the region, but by having clear and consistent
objectives focused on safety and monitoring these results we believe
that we will continue the emphasis on safety.

5 The last bullet here is just a kind of a program note that
6 enforcement is actually no longer an input to the process. It is
7 becoming more of an output of the process. The focus is not as much on
8 enforcement as it is on safe operation of the plant. Next slide,
9 please.

10 Some of the key aspects of the program. I mentioned that
11 the current program or the old program has a large, strong basis of
12 inspection. The inspection is based upon a body of regulations and
13 compliance to those regulations and that is kind of what we call a
14 deterministic type of inspection. We have determined that if the plant
operates according to these regulations that they will be safe, so we
inspect to make sure that they comply with those regulations.

15 The inspection program then was based upon finding out why
16 they didn't comply -- if they didn't comply with the regulations why
17 they didn't comply, doing more of a diagnostic type of evaluation. The
18 new program, the inspection program, is more of an indicative program in
19 looking for indications of problems in the plant so that once we can
20 find that there are problems we can focus on the problems, not on
21 everyday operation of the plant.

22 We have developed with the program or instituted with the
23 program performance indicators. These are mathematical, quantitative
24 measures or indicators of performance in key areas that kind of support
25 and supplement the inspection program.

26 Along with both the inspection program and the performance
27 indicator program we have established thresholds, what we are calling
28 thresholds for action that have established clear criteria then of where
29 we consider the plant to be in a problem area. We stated with those
30 thresholds where we intend to engage and how we intend to engage.

31 We have developed an action matrix which gives clear
32 measures and clear criteria based upon inputs both from the performance
33 indicator program and the inspection program what the resultant actions
34 of the agency are going to be, and again, program note, enforcement is
35 no longer an input to the program. We are not necessarily focusing on
the enforcement aspect. We are focusing on the safety aspects so
enforcement becomes and outcome of the process. Next slide, please.

36 This is a simple outline of what the program is. We measure
37 performance indicators. We monitor the performance indicators that the
38 licensee reports to the agency. We do inspection in areas that the
39 performance indicators don't adequately cover or don't cover at all. We
40 also do inspection to ensure that the performance indicators are
41 reported accurately. All of that goes into an action matrix and out of
42 that comes the impact on the licensee that says what the agency is going
43 to do. Also, out of the inspection findings comes enforcement. Next
44 slide.

45 The purpose of this slide is to give you kind of a pictorial
ANN view of the action levels that we have established. This applies to
RILEY both inspection outcome as well as performance indicators. We have
& identified what we call the utility response band. This is an area
ASSOCI where -- and let me digress a little bit. Operating a nuclear power
ATES plant is much like operating any industrial operation. It is not a zero
LTD.

1 defect. There are going to be problems. There are going to be mistakes
 2 happening. People operating machinery produce mistakes. What we are
 3 trying to measure within the utility response band is that the safety
 4 significance of the mistakes being identified are at such a level that
 the utility in their corrective action program and their response has an
 adequate program to take care of these problems and resolve these
 problems in a timely manner.

5 There is what some folks would call risk associated with
 6 operation of this band but it is an acceptable risk. It is a risk that
 we have said is within the band that they can control.

7 We then establish four levels or three levels below that of
 8 regulator response. The first band is more of an early warning band
 9 where we said that that is where we are going to start getting involved
 10 to make sure that their corrective action program, the programs that
 11 they have established to identify and correct their own problems is
 12 still healthy and is still doing the job it is supposed to do.

13 The yellow band is more what we consider the licensee's
 14 corrective action program. They have problems. We are going to do more
 15 of a diagnostic look. We are going to fall back on more of the
 16 compliance orientation and find out why their corrective action program
 17 may be having problems and verify that the corrective action program
 18 then is being improved and that the actions taken are going to correct
 19 the problems that have been identified.

20 Finally, we have identified an unacceptable performance
 21 area. In this area generally licensed operation would be halted until
 22 the problems would be corrected. Next slide.

23 This slide again goes over kind of that area. We have
 24 established the green, white and yellow bands. We have established a
 25 cornerstone diagram -- if you go to the next -- I don't have the
 cornerstone diagram, do I? We will get to it.

26 We have established what we consider the cornerstones of
 27 safety and we did this from a top-down review -- that's fine -- the
 28 three areas we said that met the objective, the original objective that
 29 I pointed out in front was to protect the public health and safety from
 30 operation of the power plant, ensure safe operation of the power plant.
 31 t.

32 We broke it into three areas -- the reactor safety area,
 33 radiation safety area, and safeguards. We established under that
 34 cornerstones, areas that we felt were important to ensure that we would
 35 maintain safety in these three strategic areas, and then we established
 36 performance indicators and inspection activities to ensure that we meet
 37 the objectives of these cornerstones. Go back to the other slide -- the
 38 one before that -- sorry -- go green, white, yellow. Here you go. Now
 39 that makes more sense.

40 This is the first time we have done this presentation, this
 41 roundtable meeting, so we are adjusting as we go.

42 The cornerstone objectives are fully met when the operation
 43 is within the utility response band, the green band. That means that we
 44 area satisfied by inspection, by performance indicators that the
 45 licensee is identifying, correcting their problems. Their corrective
 action program is helping and is doing the job that it is supposed to do
 and they are operating satisfactorily.

ANN In the white the cornerstone objectives are still met. As I
 RILEY said before, this doesn't mean that they are operating unsafely. This
 & just means that there is some minimal reduction in the safety margin.
 ASSOCIATE need to verify that their corrective action program is still healthy.
 ATES, We'll do checks and make sure, follow up what their corrective action
 LTD.

1 program is doing for these identified problems but we are not assuming
2 that the corrective action program at the facility is broken or that
there are significant problems. There is a minimal reduction.

3 In the yellow, the cornerstone objectives, we still feel
4 that they are met -- in other words there's still safe operation of the
5 plant but there appears to be significant reduction in the safety
margin. It appears that their corrective action program may not be
6 healthy. It may not be identifying and correcting the problems in a
7 timely manner and we need to go out and find out why.

8 As the NRC part of our follow-up action would be to come out
9 and do a diagnostic type of inspection, to do a measure of their
corrective action program, to do a root cause evaluation of the problems
10 and verify and validate that corrective actions that they intend to take
11 are going to correct the problems.

12 Finally the red -- plant performance is significantly
13 outside the design basis. There are significant problems at the plant.

14 We would expect those problems to be corrected prior to continued
15 operation.

16 What is the public going to see as part of this process?
17 Remember, I said one of the reason why we are here tonight is to focus
18 on that second outcome measure, the enhancing public confidence.

19 We have gone out and done some public meetings in advance,
20 and I don't know how many of the folks here came to that first public
21 meeting for the pilot program, to talk about and provide some direct
22 information and opportunity for the public to provide input. Again, we
23 feel that the public and especially the public right around the power
24 plants are an important stakeholder in the process, and we are
25 soliciting input from that stakeholder.

26 As part of the normal process, and some of you folks that
27 are even around the table may not be aware of it, we have issued a
28 Federal Register notice that has all the elements or most of the
29 elements of the revised process that we are proposing we implement in
30 April. We are soliciting input formally by that Federal Register notice
31 and it doesn't close until the end of this month -- the end of next
32 month, beg your pardon -- 12-31-99.

33 You can actually submit formal input on that Federal
34 Register notice. If anybody has any questions about that, see us after
35 the meeting and we will try to get you some information on that.

36 The performance indicator data is available and has been
37 available for the pilot study on our public website. If you go into
38 NRC, and August can show you how to do that, our NRC public website --
39 you got that up there? There you go -- access to our public website --
40 you can find out all there is to know about the revised reactor
41 oversight process.

42 We have a lot of documentation, a lot of what we have
43 provided the folks around the table, the background information on the
44 process, a lot of the procedures of the process, descriptions of that,
45 on this website as well as we provided the -- go to what you are going
46 to show now -- there you go -- a diagram that sort of looks like this.
47 It actually has a little more information on it.

48 What this shows is the 19 performance indicators and you
49 will notice they are aligned underneath each of the cornerstones. Below
50 that you would also see information related to inspection findings for
51 each of those cornerstones. At a glance you can look at the color
52 & associated with those performance indicators and with those inspection
53 findings and you can come to your own conclusions about the operation of
54 that facility.

55 LTD.

1 This is kind of a mock-up of how it would look.

2 If you go to the website currently, the nine pilot plants
3 are on that website and the performance indicators and the inspection
4 data with them. You can point and click on any of those blocks. What
5 it will do is take you to the actual drawing or the -- do you want to
6 show them one of those? -- the actual diagram of what that performance
7 indicator looks like, which would look like a drawing something like
8 that. There may be a little more activity on some of them.

9 You have got to remember this is a pilot program that has
10 been in operation since June of this year, so we don't have a tremendous
11 amount of background data on the website yet, but it might look more
12 like that in some of the performance indicators.

13 If you click on that you will actually get the background
14 data, the raw data that goes into making up that performance indicator.

15 We don't have that. If you go to the blocks that are associated with
16 the inspection findings, you will get to what we call, first of all, the
17 plant issues matrix, which is a description of what that inspection
18 finding is and the significance of that inspection finding, and if you
19 want to go further you can get to the actual report that was issued that
20 has that inspection finding in it.

21 What we are trying to do and what we hope we are doing is
22 providing more information, more understandable information, easier to
23 kind of digest and interpret and it is more readily available. The
24 performance indicator information is updated -- in the routine program
25 will be updated on a quarterly basis, as will the inspection finding
information. It will be updated on the web on a quarterly basis, so
every three months you will have new information to look at about the
plant that you live near.

Inspections are going to continue. We still have a Resident
Inspectors out at the site. The baseline inspections will provide for
continued monitoring as performance indicators and the baseline
inspection activities identify. Supplemental inspections then will be
used to diagnose specific concerns, targeted concerns.

We may still need special inspection teams. There are
always going to be what we call generic issues that we identify through
other types of work through research work where we have specific
concerns in certain targeted areas where we may need to do special
inspections at all facilities in the nation. We will still continue to
do that. As events happen, we may also have a need -- and this is the
theory of "bad things happen to good people" -- every once in awhile God
gives a lightning strike out in the switchyard. We think as the agency
charged with protecting the public health and safety we should respond
to that event. It may not mean that the licensee has done anything
wrong, but we are still going to respond to that event and provide a
presence out here to verify that the licensee is taking the correct
actions.

Inspection reports are going to be readily available through
the website and if you don't have access to the website even through
your public library, you can get access to the hard copies in the Public
Document Room.

I mentioned already we started a six-month pilot program at
the end of May, first of June. The objective was to kind of exercise
ANN the program and the process as part of what we called at that time full
RILEY implementation. We are calling it now initial implementation -- we have
& got to change that slide.

ASSOCI We selected nine sites on a national basis. The original
ATES selection criteria had two sites per region. The reason we ended up
LTD.

1 with nine is one of the sites, Salem and Hope Creek in Region I --
2 excuse me -- they are owned by the same operator. They requested
3 participation as one site and Region I also tries to treat them as one
4 facility so we ended up with nine instead of eight.

5 We established some criteria in advance to determine the
6 success of the pilot program, trying to exercise the entire program, not
7 necessarily at each site but at least in each region exercise the entire
8 program, and we have established also as part of that a pilot, what we
9 are calling Pilot Program Evaluation Panel. This has members from
10 industry. It has members from the NRC. David Lochbaum from the Union
11 of Concerned Scientists is on this panel. We have a representative from
12 the state of Illinois who is on this panel. They have solicited input
13 from all the states involved in the pilot program as well as Mr. Riccio
14 from Public Citizen, thank you -- lost it for a second there, as well as
15 others have participated in providing input to this panel and this panel
16 will provide an independent report, an independent evaluation of the
17 pilot program at the close of it.

18 As I mentioned earlier, we are soliciting public comment
19 formally from the Federal Register notice. We have solicited public
20 comment through the website. You can call, write, e-mail OPA or myself
21 and provide input to the process.

22 This next slide talks about a variety of public meetings we
23 have held. We have held several public workshops to describe the
24 process. We're holding the initial public meetings we have talked about
25 and then these roundtable meetings. This is the first roundtable
meeting, by the way, so if we stumble a little bit on the way in trying
to develop the concept here, bear with us. August has got a good
concept and we hope it provides some good input and some good feedback
to the folks in the area.

We hold biweekly public working meetings with the process
and we have done that for the last year, year and a half. We have been
holding a meeting every two weeks with the Nuclear Energy Institute and
members of the public and working and sharing draft materials and
developing this process in a public format.

Of course obviously the Commission meetings are open to the
public as well as the PBEP meetings.

I think I said enough on that.

Some of the future things we are working on -- we are going
to do an internal survey to the agency to solicit input from our own
staff. We are holding a lessons learned workshop, a public workshop,
the second week of January, and that will be held at the Renaissance
Hotel in Washington, D.C. -- it is the week of January 10th. It is an
open meeting. Members of the public are invited to participate. We
will be collecting and trying to resolve some lessons learned, some
issues that have been identified during the pilot program -- more public
meetings.

We will have a Commission briefing of the formal paper
issued probably towards the end of February and a Commission meeting to
describe the pilot program and the improvements we have implemented at
the end of February and then initial implementation is scheduled for
April 1 of the year 2000. We say initial implementation because one of
the things we have learned during the pilot program is we still have a
lot to learn and there's going to be lessons learned during initial
implementation.

&
ASSOCI
ATES
LTD.
There is going to be some new information that we will gain.
There's going to be some learning process that has to go on, not only
with the licensee but with ourselves as far as how the program is going
LTD.

1 to work and how we are going to implement it during the initial phases
2 of full implementation, so that we intend to get back to the Commission
3 one year later and report on how it has gone during the first year of
4 implementation, because one of the questions we have to answer to the
5 Commission long term is has the process helped us to maintain safety.
6 We still think that is our key question and our key outcome measure is
7 the maintenance of safety.

8 At this point if there aren't any general questions, real
9 general questions, I would like to turn it over to August Spector and we
10 will start with the roundtable portion of the meeting. Thank you.

11 MR. SPECTOR: All right, any questions, general questions on
12 this?

13 I had a prepared statement that I was going to make. I am
14 not going to read this. Instead we'll talk a little bit about this.

15 You all have a handout and I have some more on the back
16 ledge -- these questions that we asked.

17 What we are going to try to do is make this roundtable
18 discussion kind of informal if we can. What we have done is we have
19 invited people from the community. We received names from David
20 Lochbaum. We have received names from our own public affairs people,
21 looked through the telephone book and found people, and we asked them to
22 come down.

23 Our objective, as Al was saying, is to gain some insight
24 from you and also to get some feedback. We have asked the people
25 sitting at the table and some of your also have received information
26 related to the WEB SITE, and on the WEB SITE we have all of the
27 information which Al talked about a little while ago so we are making an
28 assumption that people are cognizant to some extent with some of the
29 information.

30 We are going to focus on the revised Reactor Oversight
31 Program. I know that there are other issues that people might have
32 interest in related to the plant, but we are going to concentrate on
33 this Reactor Oversight Program. If you have other kinds of issues at
34 the end we can talk about them. We have some other people from the NRC
35 who might be able to answer them or we will try to get back to you. Our
36 concentration is going to be on this program.

37 We are going to have a moderated discussion and I am going
38 to try to be the moderator and try to speak as little as possible and
39 get you all to speak.

40 First we will start with the people at the table and we will
41 show the questions on the screen and I think most of you already have
42 them. We have these nine questions and these are basically the same
43 questions that are in the Federal Register notice. They are the same
44 questions that we are asking the industry for the most part to answer as
45 well as other interest groups around the country, so we will start off
46 with somebody here. We have somebody who is a volunteer? I volunteered
47 Kris a little while ago. She will start off, just to get the ball
48 rolling, and as we said earlier, this is an opportunity for anybody to
49 contribute so after we finish our dialogue at the table here we will go
50 to anybody else who has anything to say.

51 Again, we're going to try to be as informal as possible. Do
52 you have any questions at all or comments?

ANN I'll just pull the first one up. Okay. The first question
RILEY is basically do you, meaning you personally and as a group, believe that
& the new oversight process is going to provide some kind of adequate
ASSOCI Assurance that plants are being operated safely, and I guess that is the
ATES key question for the whole evening, and I will just open it up. Does
LTD.

1 anybody -- Kris, do you have any comments?

2 We have a Court Reporter here. I guess this is something
3 that they do in Washington, you know, they have Court Reporters, so what
4 we will do is if you want to speak, kind of put your card like this, at
5 least in the beginning so you don't have to keep raising your hand all
6 the time.

7 I think the Court Reporter knows everybody? Okay, great,
8 thank you. Kris?

9 MS. ROGGE: I think I am lacking some of the substance that
10 some of the others here may have had access to but I don't see anything
11 wrong with the process per se. I guess I am a little bit short on
12 content.

13 So a little point of clarification -- just exactly how you
14 think this is an improvement, how you can get the same information and
15 guarantee the same level of safety with this slightly more relaxed
16 approach?

17 I applaud the more relaxed approach. That isn't my problem.
18 I just am not sure that you will get the same desired results.

19 MR. SPECTOR: Alan? I think Al is the --

20 MR. WASKOWIAK: I've got one -- why are you doing this?
21 It's apparently worked in the past. Why are we going to this other
22 approach?

23 MR. MADISON: I gave you the 50,000 foot view of the process
24 in my overview -- primarily because we came out the first time, we went
25 into a lot of that type of information during that public interaction
26 and that was also one of the reasons why we wanted to get that
27 information at least in your hands before coming to this meeting.

28 There are a lot of reasons why. The current process, the
29 old process did the job of actually helping drive improvement in the
30 industry, but the industry has matured and we see through other
31 performance measures that the industry's performance has risen to a
32 level of safe operation, where we feel that now that we are no longer
33 trying to drive improvement, we are trying to maintain safety, so it is
34 kind of like a new startup on a process. We have got, we feel the
35 operation of the power plants has risen to a level where it is safe,
36 where the operation is much better, it is much improved, and we are no
37 longer in an improvement mode. We are more in a maintenance mode, so we
38 need to back off a bit and focus not on everything at the plant.

39 The old process would be more like a bottom-up approach.
40 What is everything we can look at? What are all the regulations, the
41 body of regulations that we need to ensure compliance with, and inspect
42 everything. Now we are trying to focus on what is important, what is
43 risk, what is safety significant out at that plant that we need to focus
44 on and that is where we need to put our time.

45 The plants that are operating well, where their corrective
46 action programs are doing the job, that is what we wanted, so now we
47 need to back off and let them do their job.

48 MS. ROGGE: I think that speaks to another question I have.

49 I don't know if this is the appropriate time or to get to it later --

50 MR. MADISON: That's fine.

51 MS. ROGGE: Delayed gratification is fine too.

52 The threshold between NRC interest and NRC action, how do
53 you determine that? I mean you don't have to get terribly technical. I
54 am just curious. I am an old evaluator --

55 MR. MADISON: No, it's a fair question. Put up the slide on
56 the green and white -- the green, white and yellow, red bands. I'd ask
57 your question as kind of why -- that is kind of the driving reason, and
58 LTD.

1 the real answer is it was the right thing to do now based upon we have a
2 need to make more efficient and effective use of our people and we want
3 to focus more on the safety areas than just in broad general areas so it
4 was the right thing to do to get better with our own processes.

5 We tried to establish an area, just kind of a band, to say
6 with the process that there is a band up here where the utility has a
7 right to operate their power plant in that band. That is the utility's
8 response band. Their corrective action program is working well. The
9 risk associated, the safety issues -- yes, they are having some minor
10 problems but they are okay.

11 Down here, in that area down in there, that is the unsafe
12 area. That is where we don't want to get. We defined that, by saying
13 "we" -- the task group that I am with -- defined that by based on a goal
14 that the NRC has that we will not have an event of 10 to the minus 3
15 magnitude. Now that is a numerical number -- let me throw it out. It
16 is just basically a measure of merit that says that is a very unsafe
17 thing to happen. We don't want anything like that happening.

18 We looked mathematically at a lot of different actions that
19 happen out at the plant and we have a model that we call the PRA, a
20 short term, and we can measure some of the reactor activities on that
21 and then we use that model to judge the activities out at the plant and
22 we can also back off mathematically some of the performance indicators
23 using that same model, and not to get into the real descriptions but we
24 use, we back those off then several of what we call decades, orders of
25 magnitude, saying all right, if we don't ever want to get there and we
want to back off at least one order of magnitude and say that is
unacceptable, you can't ever do that -- if you get to that point, you
must stop and fix it -- and then we backed it off a couple of decades
each time to say that is how we are going to then engage, so that we
engage early enough to prevent -- we should be able to engage early
enough that they are never going to get into the red now, but they are
absolutely never going to get to the unsafe condition. Ann?

MS. THOMAS: Well, I think partially this is going to be
better where you guys have been watching it all along, you are watching
it pretty good, now that it is on the WEB SITE, I think it is going to
be much better and we are going to have a better -- the whole public is
going to have a better idea.

I pulled up Cooper today and saw in the third quarter they
had four greens, I think, and knew exactly what they were talking about
because you had given me information, so I think the public is going to
be much more aware of it as soon as they are able to use the WEB SITE
and get familiar with it and comfortable with it, so I think, no, I
think it is a good process as long as the information is true, as long
as the information is current, and there's not maybe somebody
whitewashing it someplace.

MR. SPECTOR: Any comments related to that on the WEB SITE?

That is a later on question though.

MS. THOMAS: I think that's great. I think that's really
good.

MR. SPECTOR: You found that good?

MR. WASKOWIAK: Could you put that WEB SITE up one more
time? I think I have got it but I wanted to --

MR. SPECTOR: Oh, the web address -- I'm sorry.

MR. WASKOWIAK: I think I have got it correct.

ANN
RILEY
&
ASSOCI
ATES
LTD.
When from that menu you go to some sub-menus, which will direct you to
exactly -- on the menu we have official documents of the Nuclear

1 Regulatory Commission. We have information supplied by our public
2 affairs department. We have the performance indicators, inspection
reports, everything. You know, we are laying it all out.

3 We even have some of our draft materials up there that we're
4 working on. We have the meetings that we are holding in Washington,
5 some of the official public meetings. We have the transcripts of those
6 meetings available for you to read, et cetera, so the WEB SITE is
7 updated periodically right now. That is what we have available.

8 MR. MADISON: During the pilot program the performance
9 indicators and inspection data is updated monthly and so for the last
10 seven months you would be seeing that data. The next one will go up --
11 we will receive information from the licensees on December 14th and the
12 WEB SITE will be updated within a week after that with that new
13 information.

14 MR. SPECTOR: One of the other questions, Question Number 2,
15 for example, we are talking about some of the key areas that we are
16 interested in. Do you feel that we are providing sufficient regulatory
17 attention to various utilities? Of course we have the Cooper Station
18 here. Tomorrow night we are going down to the Fort Calhoun area and we
19 will be going to other areas of the United States.

20 We want to get an idea, do you feel that this program is
21 going to be providing the kind of attention that you would expect?

22 MS. THOMAS: I guess in a way maybe I don't know how much
23 regulatory attention has been given previously. If this is a great deal
24 more -- I mean I just don't know. I think because we were not privy to
25 maybe some of the attention that was given before to the nuclear sites
or to the utility sites are there going to be more people watching or is
it going to be an inhouse type thing more?

MR. MADISON: We are still trying to determine the actual
level of effort as far as the number of people and the number of hours
spent on the site that it takes to do the program.

The focus is not necessarily not on reducing the effort. It
is getting more efficient and effective in the use of the people that we
do put out at the site and the inspectors that do come to the site.

We do expect however that at a site that is performing well
that their inspection effort will be less than a site that is having
problems. With the current program, that is not always true. In the
current program there is a certain amount of what is called regional
initiative and activities that are just required to be done at the site
regardless of their performance. This is what we mean by trying to get
a little more effective, a little more efficient with the way we are
doing business. We want to stop doing those things and focus on the
safety areas.

If a plant is performing well and a plant down the river is
performing worse, we want to move people over there. We want to move
activity and focus it on the plant that is having problems, and that is
what we are hoping this process does for us. Yes, Roger?

MR. GOOS: I was asked a question earlier this evening about
the NRC. They said do they have a calendar of inspection dates that is
given to the plant? Do they make any surprise visits to the plant? You
know, how do we -- how do they monitor their inspections?

MR. MARSCHALL: That is a big part of my job actually, and
ANN the answer is yes, there is an inspection schedule. We put it out twice
RILEY a year actually. We publish it in a letter to the licensee and that
& letter is available in your local public document room, typically a
ASSOCI public library, and --

ATES,
LTD. MR. MADISON: It would also be available on this WEB SITE.

1 MR. MARSCHALL: It is available through the WEB SITE. It is
 2 available through our headquarters public document room so there are a
 number of ways that you could get to see it if you were interested.

3 As far as unannounced inspections, we introduced earlier
 4 Jeff Clark and we have another Resident Inspector here, Mike Hay. Those
 folks are here. Their full-time job is to be here at this plant and we
 5 have a requirement for them to spend 50 hours a year at the plant at
 night, on weekends, on holidays so we do have them go to the plant
 unannounced and see what kinds of things are going on.

6 MR. MADISON: And when they are at the plant they have full
 access to anywhere in the plant.

7 The program gives them guidance on the types of things they
 should be looking at while they are out there, but they are not
 restricted on a daily basis.

8 MR. GOOS: Do they take a history of the plant's operation?
 9 Do they look at points that have been in question prior to that
 inspection?

10 MR. MADISON: Yes, that is part of the process is to focus
 on that and look at the risk-significant aspects of those things first.

11 MR. MARSCHALL: In addition to that there is an annual
 problem identification and resolution inspection. It is a team
 inspection, which means they have a number of people on the inspection.

12 We did it here at Cooper during this pilot program and we
 13 had about half a dozen people here for two weeks and their entire job
 during that period was to look at plant performance and look for trends
 of problem performance that weren't being appropriately addressed, to
 14 look at Cooper's corrective action program to see that it is effectively
 addressing, identifying and addressing problems so we do have a special
 15 inspection that looks at that aspect of performance as well.

16 MR. MADISON: Bob?

17 MR. HUTTON: When they inspect that and they find something
 wrong, do you shut it down right now or how do they handle that?

18 MR. MARSCHALL: Well, it's conceivable that that could
 happen if it was something sufficiently significant but what commonly
 19 happens -- first of all, most of what we find because of the fact that,
 as Alan said, over the years performance has improved in nuclear power
 plants, most of what we find doesn't impose that great a safety question
 that there is a requirement to shut the plant down.

20 However, if we were to find something like that, what we do
 with that is turn it over to the people that operate the plant and in
 21 every case that I can think of in recent history they recognized what
 the right thing to do is from a safety standpoint and from the
 22 standpoint of what the regulations requirement them to do and they take
 the right action.

23 In a few rare cases in the past -- and it happened more
 frequently in past years than it has happened in recent years, licensees
 24 have been taking the correct action. In our senior management that is
 why we have Jeff Clark and folks like him here to watch what goes on.
 25 If they don't take the correct action they are in communication with me,
 with my senior managers and we will make phone calls and we will have
 some discussions and hopefully get them to change their minds but that
 kind of thing happens very, very rarely.

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
 MR. MADISON: That is part of this process though too is to
 give them a measure, criteria of what is significant. Is it significant
 enough to tell them that they have to shut down or that we need to take
 some extraordinary action? Do you want to put that action matrix up?

MR. SPECTOR: Well, the action --

1 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: It may not be obvious to everyone
2 here that Cooper has a license to operate the plant and that license
3 tells them under certain criteria if they don't have certain safety
4 systems available that they themselves have to shut that plant down,
5 which they do. We ensure that they follow that license, so hopefully --
6 or in all cases they are taking those actions when necessary before we
7 have to intervene.

8 MR. SPECTOR: I don't have a slide for this. We can make
9 copies. This is also available on the WEB SITE. It is part of the
10 process.

11 This is what I was referring to earlier, when you take the
12 inputs from the inspection, as well as inputs from the performance
13 indicators, if you have one or two of those in the white area, it lists
14 the actions we're going to take. That's how we're going to handle it.

15 If you get to the point of the far right, overall
16 unacceptable performance, and that's more in the area of -- we've
17 defined that in more qualitative terms, but that's overall unacceptable,
18 we will order the plant to shut down.

19 But even before you've reached there, you've got what we're
20 calling repetitive degrading. You've got one red input, and it's
21 possible that all it will take, and we're issuing demands for
22 information, we're issuing what we call confirmatory action letters that
23 says they're confirming if the actions you're going to take are
24 appropriate.

25 We may be issuing orders or sending out large team
inspections to find out why the problems at the plant are there and what
the licensee is doing about it. So we're taking some significant action
even before they get to the point of overall unacceptable.

MR. SPECTOR: This action leads us to Question Number 3,
which is the question related to predictability, confidence by
increasing predictability, consistency, clarity, and objectivity in the
way we're doing business or will be doing business in the future all
over the country.

Any comments on that at all?

Yes, sir?

MR. DAVISON: Well, I think that the whole system in
Question 1, you know, everything we went through so far, Questions 1, 2,
and 3, basically from the public's standpoint, at least my perspective
on it, is that I'm not overly educated in the nuclear industry, so a lot
of it, I have to take with faith that you folks are going to do a good
job. And it's the same thing with the plant.

And you really couldn't bring -- I read through quite a
number of things, but you really can't come up to the level of
understanding in a short period of time. I mean you guys spend all the
time in the world doing this. That's your job.

MR. MADISON: I have been doing it for three years, just
doing this part.

MR. DAVISON: But at any rate, to try to enhance the public
confidence and so forth, it is kind of an education process I think, and
I don't think you can educate people to the level that they are terribly
knowledgeable but you have to bring them to the level of some sort of
understanding and be upfront with people on what is going on and
ANN continue to involve the public sector.

RILEY Like I said, basically you could say white is good and red
& is bad and we'll kind of have to agree with you because -- you know,
ASSOCI until we get a degree in Nuclear Reactivity we are just not going to be
ABLES able to get there.
LTD.

1 MR. HENDERSON: May I ask a question?

MR. MADISON: Yes, sure.

2 MR. HENDERSON: Do things like plant tours and WEB SITES and
things like that help?

3 MR. DAVISON: I think they really would.

MR. HENDERSON: Have you been on the plant tour?

4 MR. DAVISON: No, I haven't.

MR. MADISON: Do you want to introduce yourself?

5 MR. HENDERSON: I am Rick Henderson. I am an NRC public
affairs officer and I am just interested in things that make the public
6 feel more comfortable about all this because I get a lot of questions
from phone calls and I had a gal call me the other day who was worried
7 that there might be some nuclear electricity coming into her house.

[Laughter.]

8 MR. HENDERSON: I had to explain to her that whether it is
generated by a coal plant or a fossil or a nuclear plant it is all the
9 same kind of electrons -- so you know that is a severe case of education
there, but, you know, I think that you are on the right track. The more
10 familiar you make yourself with it, the more time you look at the WEB
SITE or go on the plant tour and Paul here can give you a plant tour --
11 and that helps.

MR. DAVISON: I think that's a lot of it is people need to
12 understand what is there. You know, one of the other concerns that I
have in the whole process and I am sure you guys have probably thought
13 about it is most of, well, all of the nuclear plants -- there's no new
ones -- are aging, and as things age they need more care and upkeep and
14 maintenance and there's more things to really be concerned about, and do
you guys -- how do you take that into -- I'm sure there's ways of doing
15 it, but how do you take that into consideration?

MR. MADISON: One of the areas that we have been focusing on
16 in recent years as an agency before the development of this process or
the implementation of this process was what was called the maintenance
17 rule. In response to that concern, the aging of the plant, what do you
do for aging plants, you maintain them.

18 MR. DAVISON: Right.

MR. MADISON: So we issued a maintenance rule to kind of
19 establish some criteria, some guidelines as to how we thought the plants
could maintain their equipment in an acceptable manner.

20 All plants have met that rule. We have been monitoring
their progress and what they are doing in that area and that is a key
21 component of the baseline inspection program in this process.

22 MR. MARSCHALL: If I could elaborate on that just a little
bit --

23 MR. DAVISON: I knew somebody would have the formula for
that.

[Laughter.]

24 MR. MARSCHALL: Actually, it is not a formula. It's just a
diagram that tells you something that folks have learned through
25 experience. It is actually called the "bathtub curve" because it looks
like a bathtub, and this is increasing number of failures go in this way
and this is time going this way and this is something we all know from
experience with stuff that we have in our homes. When you first buy it,
ANN first 90 days, the reason you get a 90-day warranty is because the
RILEY greatest likelihood that it is going to fail in the short term is in the
& first 90 days. If you get through the first 90 days then you go a long
ASSOCI period of time with a low number of failures and eventually when the
ATES component gets to the end of its useful life, you start seeing -- if you
LTD.

1 have got a lot of them, you start seeing failures again.

2 This is the point that you want to try to avoid. What this
3 maintenance rule does -- it's based on this basically -- and it also
4 incorporates from our point of view what we are interested in is the
5 equipment in a plant that ensures that you folks that are living in the
6 area are not going to be harmed by the operation of the nuclear aspects
7 of the plant, so we are mostly interested in those components but what
8 it says is we require licensees to monitor their equipment and when they
9 start seeing failures, they need to take some action -- not only that
10 but they need to trend it long-term so that over time they can learn
11 from the failures that they have seen and they can start replacing
12 components before they get to the point where it fails. That is what
13 the maintenance rule does.

14 MR. SPECTOR: Roger, did you have a comment?

15 MR. GOOS: I just want to relate to some of the comments
16 that he had and I want to agree that the public sure is way, way
17 antiquated in their thought process of nuclear plants. You still hear
18 probably 50 or 60 percent of the people -- uneducated people think that
19 if something happens at a plant there is going to be an explosion. That
20 is their thought process goes back to the old civil defense days.
21 Everything is going to blow up.

22 You try to explain to them that that will never happen
23 unless a 747 goes in -- the plane is going to blow up, the plant isn't
24 going to blow up.

25 Cooper does in my opinion an excellent job of trying to get
the public aware of how they are operating, what their status is. They
utilize a lot of the media locally and otherwise to try to educate the
people, so you just don't reach them all and it is the few that cause
concerns for the many.

You know, is there a way that you can educate them all? I
doubt it. Some don't pay that much attention. But like I said, Cooper
doesn't an excellent job of getting that information out

Also, anybody that wants to set up a tour if they want to
contact my office, Emergency Management, here in Auburn, I can work
through these guys and set up tours too.

MR. SPECTOR: Lonnie, did you want to say something on that?

MR. SWANSON: I guess I am fortunate over in Johnson because
I work at Cooper and I have another board member who works at Cooper so
we are kind of -- what do I want to say? -- we know and we can tell the
people in Johnson, you know, if there is a concern, really if there is a
concern and if there isn't by working there.

This new program, you know, I feel that it is going to give
the utility more flexibility on how they do business, but yet they are
providing enough information to the NRC that they can still do their job
to ensure the health and safety of the public.

MR. SPECTOR: Bob?

MR. HUTTON: When will their time be up to be relicensed
again down there? Do you know what year that will be in?

MR. SPECTOR: 2013.

MS. THOMAS: I do think that public relations with Cooper
and the surrounding communities has become much better. I think they've
worked at it. I think they have been very involved, at least I know
ANN that in Auburn, the people are really good about getting involved in our
RILEY youth programs, our church programs.

&
ASSOCI their families are going to mix in with our families. I think it helps
ATES with making the plant safe. That's good, you know.
LTD.

1 I think those are good points, and I do commend then for
2 working with the public relations, really better in the last few years,
3 better than they used to be. There was maybe a line drawn that it was
4 maybe not as compatible, but I think it's much better now, and I
5 appreciate that.

6 MR. MADISON: That's good news for the Cooper folks. What
7 about the NRC folks?

8 I guess the question is really that we know a licensee in
9 most areas has spent an awful lot of time and money trying to get the
10 message out about the operation of their facility.

11 But we're trying to also get the message out about how we
12 oversee the facility, what our oversight is, and what our perception of
13 the operation of the facility is.

14 And I guess the question is, are we doing -- does this seem
15 to you that we would do a better job with this process than we've done
16 in times past?

17 MR. DAVISON: I think you're being proactive now instead of
18 reactive. Before, you were kind of in a reactive state. Now, you went
19 out and looked for something that basically you could find problems
20 with, and now you're going out in a little more systematic manner.

21 MR. SPECTOR: Are there other things that we could do? I
22 mean, we've had some public meetings, this one, and we had the previous
23 one, and we'll be having others in the future.

24 And we have the WEB SITE, some Public Affairs information
25 and booklets that have been distributed. Are there other things that we
could do as a Government agency?

MS. THOMAS: The press. I think really getting it more into
the press, and not just a little bleep someplace. I think that if you
could work with local papers and actually get a feature story, you know,
what this process is, how they can access it on the Web, so people can
really learn more.

I think what T.O. said earlier, a lot of us are happy with
the plant and everything, but still we don't actually understand the
processes, what's going on right now with the oversight and everything.

I think it just needs to be told, and make people more aware
of it, more educated.

MR. WASKOWIAK: Does the WEB SITE have an e-mail address
where we can respond?

MR. SPECTOR: Yes, there are several. They'll say e-mail.
One of the e-mails is out, but you don't know that, but that's what
happens to it, and we have another one that goes to me.

And we just last week set up a new code internally where
we're going to try to filter all the e-mails into one site, so many
people in the office can actually see them. We do have that.

MR. MADISON: There are also e-mail at OPA, the Office of
Public Affairs.

MR. SPECTOR: And Public Affairs has a direct e-mail link.

MR. WASKOWIAK: Do you target the children in the schools?
That's our future.

MR. SPECTOR: Yes.

MR. WASKOWIAK: They're right there in the schools, and
these kids are very knowledgeable on this stuff, more so than we are.

ANN MR. SPECTOR: I think you might want to mention that.

RILEY MR. HENDERSON: There's a whole section on the WEB SITE
& that's aimed at education for our kids, and also one for teachers, so
ASSOCI that you can go to that button on our WEB SITE and get a whole bunch of
ATES really nicely done educational material at a real simple, elementary
LTD.

1 school level.

2 MR. MADISON: You might want to check that out, and see if
that's what you're trying to get at.

3 MR. SPECTOR: Are the teachers in the school aware of this?
And do they utilize it?

4 MR. HENDERSON: It's going to take awhile, I'm sure.

5 MR. WASKOWIAK: Have you noticed that teachers go to the WEB
SITE and check this out?

6 MR. SPECTOR: Every time I get a chance, I do. But I'm sure
if it hasn't, we could probably make more effort to.

7 MR. HENDERSON: We've had that up for about six months now.

8 MR. SPECTOR: Not much more than that.

9 MR. HENDERSON: And you know, it's simple. I went to it
myself, so I could understand what was going on, and it's in simple
10 terms, and it's available to the public on the -- if you go to the
nuclear reactor, the NRC home page, nrc.gov, you'll see one that says
11 student groups or something of that sort, so it's under Public Affairs
Section. And it will have an explanation of how these reactors work.

12 MS. ROGGE: Is there information there about the safety
measurements? For example, I guess where I'm coming from is that is it
13 when something sets off alarm bells in the plant, it doesn't mean that
there's a public safety hazard, it means, you know, that the thresholds
14 are sufficiently low that it doesn't necessarily mean that it's any sort
of threat?

15 MR. DAVISON: Just fix it.

16 MS. ROGGE: Yes, exactly.

17 MR. HENDERSON: Well, when we have an event like that, and
we just had one this weekend at the plant down here in New Orleans,
18 where their primary coolant system, they were shutting down and they
were going to do some maintenance.

19 They opened the valve and some water from the primary system
went into a tank, but they didn't expect that to happen. So right away,
20 they said, oh, my god, and they went to another system and then they
realized that it was just going through a tank and that when they shut
21 the right valve, it all stopped. So they didn't really come close to
damage of anything, but it was a condition that they didn't understand,
22 so they went to alert status.1

23 Well, they called us at the Region, we man our instant
response center, and then I come in and send out a press release. We
24 had television stations, we had Associated Press and we had the local
talk radio show who called me and asked just those questions that you
25 asked.

26 You know, basically they're saying is this serious enough
that we should all run for our lives? And I say, no, it's -- we've
27 started the process early, and we want to get public officials involved,
at an early level so that if anything should happen, they're all aware
28 of what's going on so we don't surprise anybody.

29 And, you know, we go through that whole thing. We make sure
that we practice these drills, too, in an imaginary way, where you go to
30 the plant and we notify the people. They go to the simulator, actually,
and they simulate having a real serious problem where there is radiation
31 out there.

ANN RILEY And we go through all the various levels of notifying people
& making sure that all those systems work so that everybody involved
ASSOCIATED knows what's happening and what a -- it gives you a flavor for what a
real problem would feel like.

ATES, And we have a system and we activate it and it works, and we
LTD.

1 get the word out to people and we do the best we can.

2 MR. MARSCHALL: Let me just expand on that a little bit. He
3 was just touching on a process that every plant has because they are
4 required to have it by law, whereby if something happened at a plant
5 that really had the potential for threatening the health and safety of
6 the public, we would get the word -- actually the plants would get the
7 word to the public to tell them to take shelter or tell them to evacuate
8 in a timeframe that was sufficient to make sure that we minimized any
9 risk to them.

10 Now, at plants like Waterford, the one that Brett was
11 talking about, we get to a point where we get the people in place at the
12 plants well in advance so that if they need to, they can take action.

13 But just because of the fact that we staff up their
14 emergency response organizations, doesn't mean that actually the health
15 and safety of the public has actually been threatened in any way.

16 But the point here is that reason that they have emergency
17 response organizations and you have people here in this room that are
18 involved in that, the reason that the plant staffs and members of the
19 public are involved in those kinds of things is so that we can let
20 people in the public know if they need to take some action to protect
21 themselves.

22 And so if there are routine things that go on at the plant
23 and you don't hear about it, then that's a good sign, because you would
24 hear about it if you had to get in your car and take off because there
25 was some danger of a spread of radioactivity.

MR. MADISON: I'm not sure we're answering your question,
though.

MS. ROGGE: Well, I was sort of coming at it from two
directions. Part of -- as a member of the hugely paranoid public, it's
a simple matter of trust, you know. And, in fact, you know, when you
say there's no danger, is there none? And that's just -- that comes
back to the education issue.

MR. MARSCHALL: Yes, it is an education issue.

MS. ROGGE: That's really why I asked the question.

MR. MADISON: Let's put the colored bar back up there for a
second please.

MS. ROGGE: Is there someplace that one could go and read and
say, you know, this level of radiation is in the air, and it's not going
to do anything to anybody, but we consider it unacceptable, however,
this level is --

MR. MADISON: There is, but you probably have to dig through
a body of --

MR. MARSCHALL: Actually, it's not that hard. It's in the
technical specifications for the plant. There are limits for releases
of radioactivity, and those are actually way, way down below the point
where you need to worry about your health being threatened.

But they're at a point where if that level of radioactivity
gets released, the plant is required by their license to do something
about, and it may be shut the plant down.

MS. ROGGE: I think now I'm getting finally to my question.
I wasn't exactly quite sure how to ask it.

ANN It seems to me that that kind of information would be
RILEY helpful, just as a public information kind of thing, not highly
& technical stuff, but that when major action has to be taken, is required
ASSOCI to be taken at the plant, that it is.

MR. MADISON: The fact that we have limits that are legally
ATES imposed on the plant, and when they get to those limits --
LTD.

1 MS. ROGGE: They're so much lower than any potential threat
level, that action can -- I'm really talking less about the action than
2 I am about the exposure threat, I guess.

3 MR. MARSCHALL: In a way, that's what this is all about on
the chart.

4 MS. ROGGE: That's why I wanted to know.

5 MR. MARSCHALL: What we're talking about, as we go from
green to red, is less equipment, less processes, less people between
safe plant operation and unsafe plant operation, which is when we get to
6 unsafe plant operation, we're at a point where we're concerned about you
folks that live around the plant, okay?

7 And what we're saying with this band of colors that's up
here -- and this is actually been based on plant designs and the
theorized problems that could occur in a plant that ultimately, if they
8 weren't dealt with appropriately, would affect the health and safety of
the public.

9 When we're up in green, we've got lots of equipment between
safe plant operation and a situation where the public is threatened, and
10 we have lots of operator action that can be taken, and lots of margin,
basically, between the plant operating safely and the public being
11 threatened.

12 And as we move further down into white and yellow and red,
we have less equipment that's available to protect the public, and less
operator action that's available to protect the public.

13 And some of that is based on performance history that we've
seen repetitive things that make us more concerned about the margin of
14 safety that we have in plant operation. That's exactly what this
concept is meant to capture.

15 MR. SPECTOR: Again, you mentioned the webpage. If you were
to go into the web page, and if you were to click on one of these boxes,
16 these are the indicators.

17 This is what he was just talking about. It will give you a
definition of what those indicators are. And I think you'll be able to
understand them, once you go into the page.

18 Has anybody gone to the page yet?

19 MS. THOMAS: Yes, I have gone in on the page, and that's
where I found out some of the information on Cooper, and some of other
things.

20 And it explains the -- I was telling the City Hall today, if
nothing else, I've learned green, white, yellow, red. I really know
21 what they all stand for, pretty much.

22 But I think I had gone into it earlier. I don't even --
before I even got this information, for some reason, somebody had told
me to go into the site, and I had found it otherwise. So when I got
23 this, I was a little bit familiar with what to do.

24 And, no, I think it's a great tool. I just think people
don't know about it.

25 MR. SPECTOR: Well, it's new.

MR. MADISON: Has anybody else gone onto the WEB SITE yet?

MR. SPECTOR: Another area -- I think we're going to skip a
couple of questions. I think we've kind of answered them.

ANN But we have another area related to the resources. One of
the things that we're concerned in in our total plan is agency
RILEY resources, and that's what this question is dealing with, both the
& agency resources and those issues which are most -- are you getting any
ASSOCI kind of reaction to that issue of resources?

ATES, MS. ROGGE: I know that program evaluation is enormously
LTD.

1 expensive, especially when you have teams of people going out and
2 spending lots of time. They're generally pretty expensive people in the
3 first place, and it seems like any situation where you can have more
4 baseline data that's collected there, and paid attention to there, the
5 better it is.

6 And I think the last discussion has shown me that there are
7 very careful decision points along the way to determine when it is
8 appropriate for you to come in.

9 MR. SPECTOR: When it's appropriate to use more resources.
10 Annie?

11 MS. THOMAS: Yes, I agree that it is better, and I want to
12 ask a question. And I think probably a few -- while I was going over
13 the WEB SITE -- can you give me a good definition of a SCRAM?

14 MR. MARSCHALL: Yes. It's an old -- a SCRAM is actually a
15 term that applies to BWR. There is some history, as I understand it,
16 that goes back to the first atomic pile in the Chicago Project.

17 And the nuclear reaction is controlled by materials with
18 physical properties that absorb neutrons. Neutrons are important to a
19 fission reaction.

20 And there are a couple of ways of doing that, but in the
21 original atomic pile in boiling water -- actually in any commercial
22 reactor, there are control rods. They're called control rods because
23 they're made of a material that absorbs neutrons.

24 In order to have the fission reaction going on, you have to
25 pull these rods out of the core so that they stop absorbing neutrons.

26 And what a SCRAM is, is when these rods -- in a BWR, they go
27 in from the bottom and in a PWR, they go in from the top, and when they
28 go into the core, they absorb neutrons and the fission process stops.

29 SCRAM comes from, as I said, from the first atomic pile in
30 the Chicago Project, and the rods, as I understand it, were actually
31 held up by ropes that were on a pulley, and there was a man called the
32 Safety Control Rod Ax Man, SCRAM.

33 And his job, if situations got a little dangerous, was to
34 take the ax and cut the ropes so that the rods would drop into the core
35 and stop the reaction, but that's what -- it's called a SCRAM to this
36 day in boiling water reactors such as Cooper, and it's called a TRIP in
37 reactors such as a pressurized water reactors such as Ft. Calhoun.

38 MS. THOMAS: Thank you.

39 MR. MARSCHALL: You're welcome.

40 MS. THOMAS: That was very interesting.

41 MR. SPECTOR: Lonnie?

42 MR. SWANSON: Well, as far as it affecting us at the NRC, I
43 think people knew what the process was, like the SALP process, how much
44 time the NRC spent with that, versus the new process, where they will
45 focus on the ones that are on the lower part of that curve, you know,
46 that it is definitely an improvement.

47 MR. SPECTOR: The new process?

48 MR. SWANSON: Yes.

49 MS. ROGGE: I would imagine they would serve as performance
50 incentives for the plants themselves, because the better they perform,
51 the less they have you all coming into what --

52 MR. SPECTOR: That is partially true.

53 ANN RILEY: How about other people in the audience? Any comments? And
54 if you want to speak, could you go to the mike, just so that she can
55 & pick you up on the tape recorder. Does anybody have any comments yet?

56 ASSOCI [No response.]

57 ATES, MR. SPECTOR: I see some smiles out there.

58 LTD.

1 Any other comments on the resources?

[No response.]

2 MR. SPECTOR: So, basically, you've said so far, related to
3 resources, that it might be more efficient than the current process, the
4 SALP process, and you indicated that there might be less burden for the
5 licensee, is that the way I was reading that?

6 MS. ROGGE: No, actually, on the NRC's budget.

7 MR. SPECTOR: On the NRC budget.

8 MS. ROGGE: Yes. It's just a hugely expensive process to
9 organize the teams and spend all the time.

10 MR. SPECTOR: So the inspections would be more meaningful?

11 MS. ROGGE: Yes.

12 MR. DAVISON: It could be more critical aspect of work
13 instead of this just going to a plant and, you know, regulating and
14 checking everything, you have safety.

15 MR. SPECTOR: Larry, did you want to say something?

16 MR. WASKOWIAK: I can see where this is going to probably
17 hopefully even reduce some manpower at the sites that we don't have to
18 -- the NRC does not have. You're basically going to a self-check
19 program. That's the way I see it. Is this correct?

20 MR. MADISON: I'm not saying that we're going to -- you
21 know, we've always had a self-check program, they have license, as
22 Charlie has mentioned. They have a requirement as part of that license
23 to do self-checks. And if they find themselves outside of the
24 boundaries, to get back in the boundaries, to take the corrective
25 actions.

26 We have done more of a cross-check, an oversight of their
27 corrective action program, and we've done some independent checks of our
28 own as the NRC, going in and looking at activities.

29 What we're trying to do with this process is control the
30 amount of independent work that we do, to look more at the oversight of
31 looking at the corrective action program and to focus the work in more
32 safety-significant areas.

33 So, yes, in some ways we're looking at their taking more
34 control of their activities, but we've already had some assurance that
35 they're doing a good job at that activity; that they have a good
36 corrective action program before we step back and let them do their
37 work.

38 And we're still there to watch. We're still there to
39 monitor. We're still there. It's cross-checking. We have -- on an
40 annual basis, we look at their corrective action program.

41 Actually, as part of every activity that's done out at the
42 site, there's a certain portion of that that is a check of the
43 corrective action program at the licensee's facility. We think that is
44 a very key aspect of any safety program at the power plant.

45 MS. THOMAS: Does the NRC frequently, seldom, however, find
46 problems within their own self-regulation of the plant? Are plants
47 really -- I hate to say being truthful in their reporting, but is that
48 an easy thing to do? Is it an easy thing to mess up with the reports,
49 or is that something that the NRC find that maybe someone's reporting is
50 not completely truthful?

51 MR. MADISON: It's been a very, very rare occurrence, and I
52 can't even think of any issues that were in a reactor operation
53 facility. Now, in some of the small, what have been the licensees that
54 & handle the small, like the well drillers and the radiographers. There
55 ASSOCI have been some problem, periodically, with those folks. But with the
56 OPERATORS of the nuclear power plant, I can't --
57 LTD.

1 MR. MARSCHALL: Actually, the only thing that even comes to
2 mind with commercial nuclear power plant operation hasn't been something
3 that we've been concerned with with the operators of the plants.

4 But they don't manufacture the parts for their equipment,
5 and there have been problems with people who are also governed by our
6 regulations that manufacture the parts for the safety equipment that
7 didn't manufacture parts to the standards that were required, and
8 furnished these parts with a documentation that allegedly would lead you
9 to believe that they were the proper parts made to the right
10 specifications.

11 And actually it was the licensees that found the problems
12 with these parts. They put them and they tested them and they failed.
13 And they began to wonder, because of the regulations that we have, the
14 self-checking regulations, they looked at them to try to figure out what
15 was wrong.

16 And they're the ones that discovered that there were
17 manufacturers out there that were manufacturing poor quality parts.

18 MR. MADISON: Part of the process -- and we're in a
19 trust-but-verify mode, even with the Performance Indicators.

20 The licensee reports those numbers to us. They're a
21 licensee, they collect the information, they report that information to
22 us in the Performance Indicators.

23 But as a part of the inspection program, we go out and
24 verify, on a spot-check basis, that the information is accurate.

25 We're not expecting to find a lie. We have found during the
pilot program, that there had been some misunderstandings as far as the
guidelines, which has helped us improve those guidelines.

And that's part of the learning process we've gone through
in the pilot program and we expect to see that continue during the
initial implementation.

With all the aspects of the program, with inspection
activities, you know, we still accept anonymous allegations from anybody
out at the plant.

All the people operating out at the plant, my personal
opinion is that it is very difficult to lie in this business and get
away with it.

MR. WASKOWIAK: Do you inspect the suppliers? If you have a
contract with a gentleman or a company that makes valves?

MR. MARSCHALL: We do some of that, yes, but the lion's
share of the inspection of suppliers is done by licensees.

The licensees have the license to operate the plant, they
have the responsibility to make sure that the parts are manufactured to
certain standards.

And they have the responsibility for ensuring that people
that supply those parts to them, supply quality parts. So, although we
do occasionally do some inspection, I think in recent years, it's
probably been more in response to some kind of an identified concern.

But those concerns are largely identified by folks like the
folks that work here at Cooper that go out to the location where the
manufacturers have parts. I mean, the manufacturer is required to have
a self-checking program of his own, and they go out there to make sure
that the manufacturer's self-checking program is up to the regulatory
ANN standards.

RILEY And they look at the process and make sure that it's
& following the process. So, the licensees really do most of that, and we
ASSOCI some spot-checking of it.

ATES, MS. ROGGE: What's the relationship between the resident
LTD.

1 inspectors and the licensee, the plant, or the plant management?

2 MR. MARSCHALL: I'm not sure what you're asking. They're
like -- they're like quality inspectors, they're like policemen, in a
3 sense.

4 Their job is, in certain aspects, to enforce the law.

5 MS. ROGGE: But they're just onsite monitoring?

6 MR. MARSCHALL: They're onsite, they're paid by the
Government. They're really completely independent.

7 MS. ROGGE: But they're there all the time?

8 MR. MARSCHALL: They're there all the time.

9 MS. ROGGE: Okay.

10 MR. MADISON: They're rotated periodically to make sure
there's no loss of objectivity. They're monitored by the part of the --
part of Charlie's job is to monitor his resident inspectors and to make
11 sure that they're objectivity levels are still where he wants them to
be.

12 It's a very -- I was a senior resident on the site, at a
couple of sites, and it's not an easy job.

13 MS. ROGGE: There's tension there.

14 MR. MADISON: There's a healthy tension out there.

15 MR. SPECTOR: How about some others from the audience? Are
there any comments from anybody? Questions from anybody?

16 I think we've gone through the questions. I think Question
Number 9 was covered earlier.

17 What I'd like to do is ask this question a little
differently. Is there anything related to this program that you would
like to make sure that we take back to Washington, not to the President,
but to our office in Washington?

18 Yes, Annie?

19 MS. THOMAS: I think educating the public to where they can
find out the information, where they can find out the information, make
it on layman's terms as much as possible. I realize that's pretty hard
to do in a nuclear industry, but I think that's what it needs to be so
that the common person can understand it, know where to find the
information.

20 I think the WEB SITE is absolutely fantastic, and I think
something like that.

21 MR. SPECTOR: We have copies of this booklet.

22 MR. MADISON: This is what we call NUREG 1649, and it's a
new NRC Reactor Inspection and Oversight Program, so it's a plain
English description of the process. It needs a little work to be
updated, which is -- the Office of Public Affairs has been charged with
trying to update this in the very near future, but it's still a very
good description of the basics of the program. I

23 MS. THOMAS: I think it's good, but I still think that until
they were sent to us, we didn't know that they existed. So that's what
I mean when I say it's got to be out where the public gets it.

24 Get it to the library, get a news article, get a radio
interview with somebody. Get it out.

25 MR. DAVISON: The same thing with schools. You know, it
would be real easy just to send something out and invite teachers to
utilize the WEB SITE.

ANN MR. MADISON: All right, have teachers utilize the WEB SITE.

RILEY Roger?

& MR. GOOS: I think that unfortunately, in my opinion, we're
ASSOCI trying to compare -- ask people to compare a new car to one they've
ATES never driven.

LTD.

1 They don't know what the old process is, and you're asking
2 them to compare it to a new process. It's just like jumping int the
3 middle of a river, and the people on the bank over there are going, how
4 did you guys get over there?

5 And it just hasn't been publicized enough. It should have
6 been started years and years ago, and have been ongoing. Just like Andy
7 says, you know, the public almost has to be force-fed some of this
8 stuff, because some of them don't want to know what it's about, but yet
9 they'll turn right around and say, well, how come they don't tell us
10 what it's about?

11 And it's really, really a difficult process for these guys,
12 let alone you guys, because how many people even know what NRC stands
13 for?

14 And until they understand what you guys are, you can maybe
15 compare it to the health inspector in a restaurant. When the restaurant
16 is due, they come in and make sure everything is in place, make sure
17 they're going to operate properly.

18 Once they approve them on the fact that they can operate
19 properly, they back off and have periodic inspections with a walk-in
20 once in awhile.

21 That's how I relate to you guys. Am I right or wrong?

22 MR. HENDERSON: I think you're right, but working in public
23 affairs and trying to get people to come, you know we put out press
24 releases to try to get people to come to the old SALP meetings, and we
25 pretty much never got anybody to come.

 So we started holding them during the day when people
couldn't come, and, you know, it just got to be a thing between the
licensee and the NRC.

 MR. GOOS: And I think that's when you use more media.
You've got to get it -- you've almost got to force-feed the public, and
have it someplace using all the media to where they're going to read
something.

 MR. HENDERSON: Yes, but the other point I had to make
though is that, you know, when everything is going along pretty good,
and there's no accidents happening, and it's not affecting people's
lives that much in an adverse way, there's no fear involved -- you know,
the media likes to take bad news.

 If it's not bad news, it's not interesting, and so from my
point of view, if it's not in the news, that's pretty good, because that
means we haven't had any bad news lately.

 And it's difficult to sell a good news story. Your ideas
about having the reporters come and do a feature story about the plant
and maybe an outage that's gone real well. I know Jason Gertson at the
Omaha World Herald has done things about coming for relicensing and
plant shutdown or planned decommissionings and so forth.

 And he does -- periodically they get a new reporter up
there, and the guy gets interested and comes and does a story every
couple of years, and then it kind of goes away.

 And it's -- but, you know, from our perspective, I mean, if
things are running well, if everything is safe, if there's no bad news,
then it's hard to sell that story all the time on a repeated basis.

 So it's kind of good news-bad news. You know it's good that
ANN you're not in the paper, but it's bad because people don't hear about it
RILEY and don't get interested, and these features aren't making it a topic
& for discussion.

ASSOCI MR. MARSCHALL: Bert's got some good points there, but your
ATES point is well taken, and we'll take that point back. And it seems to me
LTD.

1 that maybe the press is not the right answer, but it seems to me that
2 there have to be things that we can do to scratch the itch that you're
talking about.

3 MR. GOOS: Well, I'm kind of in the same boat, because I'm
4 an insurance policy for the County, and as long as nothing happens, the
question is whether I'm even -- why am I there? That's until something
happens.

5 And that's kind of like you guys. As you long as you do
6 your job and everybody does their job well, why are they there for?
What do they do? Who are they? That's until something happens.

7 We hope that never happens. So you're really in a Catch-22
8 kind of situation, and it is hard to get the information out to the
9 public, because they figure, well, there's nothing going to happen. Why
10 should we be alert to a situation and nothing is going to happen?

11 So they just ignore it. So I don't know what the vehicle
12 is, but what we have here basically is the media.

13 MR. SPECTOR: I have two people so far. I have Annie and
14 Larry, so we'll go for Annie first.

15 MS. THOMAS: Okay, the only thing I want to say is I don't
16 necessarily mean a story on the plant, because the plant does have good
17 PR. And I don't necessarily mean that.

18 What I mean is there needs to be education out to the people
19 that the WEB SITE is there so that somebody is really interested in it.

20 I don't mean a feature story on Cooper or a feature story on
21 Ft. Calhoun or any of the others. What I mean is people who really are
22 curious about what's going on need to be made aware that there is, yes,
23 there is a WEB SITE, yes, there is a booklet, and you can get some
24 information.

25 That's what I think people need to know.

MR. MADISON: We do need educate people more on what the
Agency, we, the Agency, does and what are processes are, and how we are
trying to do the job of protecting the public health and safety.

We've got to be careful, as you know, that we're not
necessarily doing the public relations job that the licensee should be
doing for themselves, but we should be talking about what our activities
are, and what we're doing for you, because you're our employer.

MR. SPECTOR: Larry?

MR. WASKOWIAK: Do you have a presentation that you can give
to the area schools, you know, like an hour presentation, and to explain
what's going on to the senior high level?

MR. SPECTOR: On this process?

MR. WASKOWIAK: New process, old process, whatever, but
that's one way you can reach these through -- the parents through the
students.

MR. SPECTOR: Okay.

MR. WASKOWIAK: Because the parents will listen to what
their students are saying.

MR. SPECTOR: That's a good idea. We'll put that one in the
hopper.

MR. WASKOWIAK: You need to get the students, because the
parents are listening. In this day and age of electronics, parents
don't know, and if the kids come back home and say, we're doing this,
ANN then, oh, well, that's good, what about buying a new computer for you?

RILEY MR. SPECTOR: Sure.

& MR. GOOS: I don't know whether it would be feasible or not,
ASSOCI but Cooper puts out a real good flyer through a calendar every year.
ATES And maybe they could work together.

LTD.

1 Maybe you guys could just put a definition of what you do.
 2 It might be a one-page tearout or insert or something in that calendar
 3 explaining what your job is in working with Cooper Nuclear Station or
 4 any other nuclear station.

5 Just have them put it right out with the calendar once a
 6 year. That covers a wide area.

7 MR. SPECTOR: How do you get the calendar? Is that the
 8 calendar that --

9 MR. WASKOWIAK: That's the one --

10 MR. SPECTOR: -- that little children have drawn pictures
 11 on?

12 MR. WASKOWIAK: Well, also, see, they mail it out to
 13 everybody in this area, basically for the people within the ten-mile
 14 emergency preparedness zone. Maybe that could be expanded and pushed
 15 out a little further into the public.

16 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: That's really our calendar, Roger,
 17 and we'll take -- Paul is here and our EP organization covers things
 18 like that. And we'll take that suggestion.

19 AUDIENCE PARTICIPANT: I'll tell you right out front, as far
 20 as doing something in conjunction with Cooper, we probably won't,
 21 because we're very conscious about the independence. But that doesn't
 22 mean that we couldn't go to Cooper, for example, and get their mailing
 23 list and do something similar on our own. We just wouldn't do it in
 24 conjunction with the Cooper folks.

25 MR. MARSCHALL: It's part of the perception of
 26 appropriateness.

27 MR. SWANSON: How much media or how much information would
 28 you provide to the media on this new program? I mean, have they been
 29 running stories on it?

30 MR. MADISON: We have provided -- and we can talk more
 31 effectively maybe in some of the regions. We've kind of let some of the
 32 -- the Office of Public Affairs take charge of that.

33 But we have briefed selected members of the press. We held
 34 several briefings in Washington.

35 We've offered briefings for others. We've provided
 36 information through the local office of Public Affairs, and there have
 37 been some, including the press release for this activity that we're
 38 doing tonight. But that's not to say that we couldn't do more, that
 39 there may be more activities.

40 That's not to say that we couldn't do more.

41 MR. SWANSON: It may have to be a repetitive thing that you
 42 do over and over, because sooner or later, people are going to read it.

43 MR. MADISON: Part of what we're asking, too, is where will
 44 we get the most bang for our buck? What type of information should we
 45 put out, and who should it be focused at?

46 This is one of the reasons why we're doing this type of a
 47 process, is to identify who is the public? Is the public a collection
 48 of editors? Is it a group of -- like the Union of Concerned Scientists,
 49 or is it this group here?

50 Well, it's all of those and probably some others that we
 51 haven't mentioned. And we have to -- you know there are different ways
 52 that we will have to get to each of those groups to get the information

ANN out.

RILEY

& to get an ad spot on the Big 12 Championship Game.

ASSOCI

[Laughter.]

ATES,

LTD.

MR. SPECTOR: Well, if there aren't any other comments from

1 the audience, does anybody at the table have any other comments?

2 MS. THOMAS: Thank you very much for bringing this to us. I
3 think it's been educational for myself, I know, and I'm sure others feel
4 the same way. I appreciate it.

5 MR. HULTON: It has been for me, too. Thank you.

6 MR. SPECTOR: Thank you, thank you very much. We appreciate
7 your coming down here, and as I said, our process calls for additional
8 meetings, periodically, you know, to give the community updates as to
9 what's going on. Hopefully we'll be out here in the future, the NRC
10 will be out here.

11 MS. THOMAS: Not officially, but I just hope you'll be here
12 for information. We don't want you down here closing us down.

13 [Laughter.]

14 MR. MARSCHALL: We're here every day on official business.

15 MR. MADISON: I thank everybody for participating. I know
16 that there have been some fits and starts with the process, and there's
17 obvious a lack of information out there. We may not have been able to
18 come to the table fully armed and fully prepared to discuss each of the
19 questions, but I think in my mind, it's still been a valuable exercise
20 in that at least we've -- you folks have been invited to the table to
21 participate in helping develop the program.

22 I hope you also know that it was a genuine -- I was trying
23 to think of the right word -- a genuine invitation to the table to
24 participate and get involved in the development of the program, and in
25 having your opinions heard and appreciated.

And with that --

MR. SPECTOR: We would also like to thank the Auburn Inn for
the fine accommodations. One more thing: If any of you would like to
receive a transcript of tonight, we will have that available. You can
let me know after the meeting, and give me your address, and anybody in
the room, and we'll make it available.

MR. MADISON: Hopefully everybody in the room has signed in.
There was a sign-in sheet that went around. If you haven't signed in
yet, please sign in before you leave, so we have a list of all the folks
that attended.

MR. SPECTOR: Thank you very much.

[Whereupon, at 8:45 p.m., the meeting was concluded.]