that they say they are implementing, because they're implementing portions, but I didn't see that as a concern. Did I address your question?

MS. MIRINGU: Yes. The forth item on the document, as a community member, how do I keep from hearing these things on implementing, yet I don't have the confidence that they're doing what they should have done for a very long time, so how -- how are you, as a panel, insuring that the community develop confidence?

MS. LIPA: Well, that's a good question, too, and that's part of the reasons why we're having these meetings here in this community. Other plants in the past, they had some near Chicago, some near the headquarters from here. We're trying to have most of them here because we understand it's important to the local community.

The other thing is we're going with a daytime meeting and evening meeting to try to catch whoever is interested that can't come during the day because they're working, I know, so this way they have two choices. We're trying to continue to have them ongoing. We have information available on our website. We're trying to do as much interaction with the Licensee out in the public so you can follow

along with what we're doing, but you probably won't see much submitted from the Licensee's side other than what's on our website that they have submitted as far as initial correspondence. That's all on our website, and a lot of this is stuff they're doing and stuff we're looking at, so there won't be a lot of results for you to independently check. Do you want to answer that?

MR. DEAN: Not at this point.

MS. LIPA: Eventually, we will be doing our inspection. We'll document those reports. There will be published results. There just hasn't been much yet, I understand that.

MS. MIRINGU: The other thing is to inform the public about these meetings. We need time, two weeks at least to know that a meeting is coming up, so I would ask that this panel make sure that communities have enough time from the time there meetings are announced to the time when they actually take place.

MS. LIPA: Well, and our policy is to put a meeting notice out 10 days ahead of time.

MR. DEAN: At least.

MS. LIPA: At least, and I know that for each of the meetings we have had pretty

widespread, at least through the Press, that they have been aware of our -- the dates for our next meeting. Our plan is to put on our website the date of the next meeting -- we don't have it yet, but as soon as we have that firmed up, we try to get that information out to the public.

MS. MIRINGU: Thank you.

MS. LIPA: Does anybody else have anything?

MR. HELD: My question is, what assurance do we have that after all this monkey business is gone through and you do get the thing working again, what assurance do we have that you won't do it again? That's all I have to ask.

MR. DEAN: Sir, can we -- just for the purposes of the record --

MR. HELD: Pardon me? I'm hard of hearing.

THE REPORTER: Your name?

MR. DEAN: Could you provide your name in the microphone?

MS. LIPA: Yeah, can we get you to state your name?

MR. HELD: I've got it written down.

MS. LIPA: Yeah, but just state it and spell it for us.

THE REPORTER: Just tell me your name.

MR. HELD: Pardon me?

THE REPORTER: Your name?

MR. HELD: My name?

THE REPORTER: Yes.

MR. HELD: Russ Held.

THE REPORTER: Okay.

MR. HELD: Okay?

THE REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. HELD: Thank you.

MS. LIPA: Well, and that's a good question, and I know we talked a bit today about -- the Licensee talked about they recognized the importance of putting into place corrective actions that are lasting corrective actions, and, certainly, it's our intent to really understand what the root causes were, and if we really have a good understanding of what the root causes are, then we can understand how the corrective actions match the root causes and whether that's really going to correct the problem, so that's the challenge that we have as a panel is to assess that.

THEREUPON, Mr. Jacobson conferred with Ms. Lipa.

MS. LIPA: Yeah, the other part is we do have a -- the Agency has a task force that was established in April or May, and they are doing an independent look at the Agency's activities over the years and what we have done and what we need to do, if there is anything we can learn from this condition to alter our inspection plans going forward, so that's another piece to the puzzle.

Did anybody else want to add anything?

That's a good question.

MR. DEAN: One thing I'd like to offer and -- and I think Howard was kind of hitting on this a little bit earlier in terms of, okay, there was this event, a Licensee is -- is extending a lot of effort and money and resources and trying to understand and correct the issues and so on, so forth. The NRC has reacted pretty aggressively because of the fact that you have this thing that perhaps somebody somewhere should have put together and, you know, there's a piece of the NRC regulation and a big piece, you know, of not understanding and being able to thumble through this issue before it got to where it did, and so we're spending a lot of

efforts and the Task Force is trying to help us figure what can we do better, you know, what mistakes do we as a regulator make, and so attitude and response on the part of the Agency, I think, is helpful. Okay? Mistakes may have been made, and so we have to figure out what those mistakes were and why were they made so that we can improve our processes or we can improve our training or whatever needs to be improved to assure that something like this doesn't happen again.

Now, is that a guarantee that there's not going to be an event somewhere -- somewhere else? That's not a guarantee of that, but it does -- I think it should at least provide you some confidence that we, as a regulator, and we, as the organization, is responsible for assuring public health and safety relative to operation of our power plants are trying to take an aggressive self-powerful look at ourselves so that something like this doesn't happen, so -- we can at least provide you with that insight, and I will say, you know, there are real people on this stage, okay, and are people that have dedicated their career here at the NRC to assuring public health and safety, and I can assure you that we take it as a very, very serious responsibility. I mean, Scott

Thomas, Senior Resident Inspector, who lives in the vicinity of the plant; John, down at Perry, he lives in the same area of the plant. He certainly was planning to operate safely, and that's why we have, you know, inspectors and inspection programs and why we have resident inspectors at the sites to monitor what the Licensee does on a daily basis and why we have the overall inspection program that inspects the plant operations and engineering to insure ourselves that the plant is -- that the plants are doing the things they're supposed to, to maintain public health and safety, so it would be great if we had a larger budget and more people and, you know, could watch everything that the Licensee does 24 hours a day, but we don't have the capability to do that so we have to be smart in the way we do that oversight, and that's why something like this in our efforts to try to understand why did this happen will help us do a better job of regulating the future.

MR. WHITCOMB: Howard Whitcomb, again. Miss Miringu raised an issue I would like to at least make a comment. I'm not a computer whiz, but I do hire a computer whiz. In accessing the NRC database, apparently is a science in and of itself. I am of the old guard where we used to have public

document rooms that no longer exist. Perfect example is the transcript from the June 12th meeting. I understand it's in the system, but it's almost impossible to download, okay, so access to that information, you folks make believe that us, the public have access, immediate access to that is not true, and that needs to be carried back. I have tried and I contacted the -- I guess the main PDR for the NRC in Washington. Those folks are helpful, but they're also extremely frustrated because they are having the same types of problems that the users, apparent users, are having out in the field, so I think it is important to know that the public document rooms used to have a lot more correspondence between the NRC and the Licensee, in fact, all of the docketing correspondence was maintained in the PDR. It's not accessible on the website, so there is a much more limited access to that information. I'd ask you to bring that back to your folks, see if there is some way we can somehow manage that information better.

MR. PICKETT: Howard, just make sure I understand, the transcripts should be available on our website.

MR. WHITCOMB: Yes.

MR. PICKETT: If you're trying to click on the website and download?

MR. WHITCOMB: They won't download. You can't get them to print out.

MR. PICKETT: Okay. I have read the transcript, it's 256 pages, and I can imagine it's a bear to try to download that, and this is the first I've heard that the public can't quite get to it. We made it available to the public and if you can't get to it --

MR. WHITCOMB: I understand -- I understand that that's what the frustration is. I don't know that too many -- I mean, for instance, in public -- or, in Oak Harbor we have the public library. We have a number of facilities, a number of the computer stations, but to sit down and read the document in its entirety is going too exceed all of their time limits for the users, okay, so I mean downloading it and printing it out, I think is what most reasonable people would do. They don't charge very much. It's only a nickel a copy or a page or something of that nature, so you could get it relatively cheaply, but you can't sit there and read 256 pages all at one sitting without bumping into their time limits, so what I'm saying is from a

practical standpoint while you have it on the Internet, on the website, it isn't really practical.

MR. PICKETT: You can't get it to.

MR. WHITCOMB: Right, exactly.

MR. MENDIOLA: Even if you can get to it you can't print it.

MR. WHITCOMB: Well, that's what my experience has been with that particular document, is I haven't been able to print it out.

MR. MENDIOLA: I would estimate that the one we have from this afternoon would be as long, if not longer.

MR. WHITCOMB: Probably longer.

MR. MENDIOLA: And probably just as difficult to print it. We'll take a look at that and see if we can do anything with it, but we're limited by the technology that we have and we're victims of the same technology. Maybe we can make it in smaller files.

MR. WHITCOMB: Well, I don't know. Is it the ADAMS system, is that what the acronym is?

MR. MENDIOLA: Yes.

MR. WHITCOMB: It ain't working?

MR. MENDIOLA: Well, I'm sorry, you're talking about the ADAMS system?

MR. WHITCOMB: I'm saying the ADAMS system generally, is that the system that you maintain all of your documentation --

MR. MENDIOLA: Right, ADAMS is our document system, but the transcript I'm told is only on the website right now.

MR. WHITCOMB: Right. Now, I understand, but that's two separate issues, but, I mean, the other is just trying to access just the regular documentation that normally is communicated between the site and the NRC which is open to the public, I'm not talking about any proprietary information. I'm talking about correspondence that typically would be open and available as part of the Licensee.

MR. DEAN: Yeah, I would offer in that regard, Howard, first of all, interact with the public document room is good and hopefully, they can direct you if you're having some issues. I would think on ADAMS, if you were to search on ADAMS for, you know, Davis-Besse you ought to be able to get a list of documents that have Davis-Besse title, which would at least give you a start. I mean, I'm not very good at ADAM searches either.

MR. WHITCOMB: Well, unfortunately,

you have to use docketing numbers, which most of the public doesn't have --

MR. DEAN: This gentleman behind you was -- did you have another -- you were frustrated the same way?

MR. YOUNG: The PDF file, whatever it means, versus the text file if you can deliver it in TXT you might have efficiency base server as well.

MR. DEAN: Okay.

MR. YOUNG: And that's primitive enough to handle just about any computer out there.

MR. DEAN: Okay. Anybody else like to offer a comment or observation or question or issue?

MR. YOUNG: My name is Richard Young. Everybody knows what happened also in 1992 where they had a study of manpower levels at the station conducted by Tim Martin. They reduced the manpower significantly, and I didn't see many changes improving that many advantages where the same level of efficiency and much detail being maintained, so my question is on the root cause the staffing versus workload considered as a major factor in increasing the likelihood of making inappropriate choices,

decisions or actions such as multiple simultaneity improprieties, that kind of thing. Are they too busy between '92 and now, it may have been a factor. I don't know if they have identified that one or not.

MR. DEAN: We're doing that as management and human performance and organizational --

MR. YOUNG: It's too early to ask, but I thought it might be a prompt.

MR. DEAN: I mean, certainly that's a potential factor --

MR. YOUNG: About the study.

MR. DEAN: -- that we would look for when the Licensee completes their root cause. They haven't got to that level of detail, I think, but that's something --

MR. YOUNG: I'll be watching.

MR. DEAN: Keep your eyes open.

MR. YOUNG: Thank you very much.

MR. DEAN: Yes, ma'am? I saw you edging up. There you go.

MS. KOCHER: Yes, I'm Cheryl Kocher. I'm from Port Clinton, and I was here two meetings ago, and I questioned you about the particles that were taken on the workers because the

monitors weren't working correctly at Davis-Besse, and I -- I'm asking this because I'm a health professional, and I work -- I'm a dental hygienist, and I have a degree to teach dental hygiene also, and I'm questioning a change in a lot of my patients' thyroid medication in the last couple of years. Probably 10 to 20% per day when I'm doing med history -- I have to take medical histories of their medicines and see if they have changed, you know, before we can work, and so I'm very interested in this, and what I was questioning is, when I came to you, I was wondering why no one has checked to see if other workers that were also working in that same containment area were notified that these particles could have gone to their homes? I don't understand why someone, and I assume -- I don't know -- I went to you once. I don't know who is the governing body that should be following this up because no one knows if there were 400 particles walked out the door, we don't know, and there are people in this community that very well could have taken them into their homes.

Someone and not Davis-Besse -- I don't want First Energy to be monitoring this, but I don't know who it is that would go in and check this, and I

don't know if it's you.

MR. DEAN: Okay. Let me -- actually, I'm going to ask you, Christine, or, Scott, maybe to address the issue about monitoring. My understanding is that after some of these issues came to light, the Licensee went back and evaluated a number of people that had the potential to be exposed, to check, you know, their occupational of the age of the exposure on the order of 40 or 50 people.

MS. KOCHER: Well, interesting, because I have a 20 year old patient that came in and he's now working at a marina, and I asked him where do you work -- he said, well, I'm working at a marina now.

I used to work at Davis-Besse, and I got laid off and now I'm working here, and so I was questioning this way they check you in and out, and he explained there were two times that they supposedly checked you, and they would brush it off, and then they could leave, is this correct? This is what he said to me, flick it off --

MR. DEAN: No.

MS. KOCHER: I didn't understand what he meant, but maybe it never happened, I don't

know, but, anyway, point being, he never was -- I said, well, did you realize -- and he was working there when this all happened, and I said did you realize -- I mean when the workers went in, I said, did you ever realize that the monitors weren't working, and he goes, what? And I said has anyone contacted you that -- you know, there were particles that were taken out that people didn't know about, and he didn't know -- and this is another point that is real big to me. You wonder why people aren't here from our community, we don't get much information, and looking back through -- thank goodness we have the website to go to, and for local people, Howard, I don't know if this is for you, to go to Googles.com and type in Davis-Besse, and you can get The New York Times articles, you can get The Wall Street Journal articles, you can get pictures. I mean, there's a lot there, but our local television stations and newspapers, the headlines sometimes, you know, for something this big that happened in our community, to me, it should have been this big (indicating) in our newspaper, and it was usually like down here and the principal was up here, which was a big thing to us, but this is huge. This was a huge thing, and that's why -- don't judge what's going on. Remember,

there's a lot of people that when we talk about this out in the open, I mean, just in someone's home, they just don't know to be here, and then they get -- I mean, they would be concerned, so we have to rely on you. You're our only link. First Energy isn't here, and if OSHA would come into our dental office and see that our autoplate wasn't working, but we could say to them, well, you know, in two months we're going on vacation, so if it's okay, can we fix it then? You know, they'd close us up in a second, and none of you that get work done would, I mean, you'd be really upset if you ever found out that a Government agency could be pushed. You should be doing your job. That's why you're here, and if you have to tell them they are doing something wrong, please do it. This is all we're asking. Thank you.

THEREUPON, there was an applause by the audience.

MR. DEAN: Let me just take the opportunity, though, to share with you -- you can go ahead and sit down. Yesterday I went through the containment with Scott and John, walked through the containment, looked at the damage to the reactor vessel head and looking at what they are doing

relative to trying to identify some of the things in the containment and just trying to get a good sense of, you know, what did it look like, what were they doing, what do they still have left to do, so on, so forth, and I just want to spend like maybe two or three minutes describing the process that I had to go through relative to radiation protection. Okay?

The first thing I had to do was I had to go to an administrative building and get what's called a whole body -- you stand inside this monitoring device and basically what they are trying to get a sense of -- well, before you even go into the plant what is your base line, you know, radioactive composition basically in your body, so I did that, and then to get into the particle plant where you do have radiation protection, first of all, I had to dress out in bleak anti-contamination clothing, so -- it's a full yellow suit with booties on both shoes, two sets of gloves, rubber boots on each foot, and that was just to walk through the general containment.

MR. THOMAS: Bill, you forgot the --

MR. DEAN: That's right, Scott. Thank you. I had to stop and get two forms of dosimeter. I had to get a dosimeter that you put

into a machine to ascertain how much radiation you were exposed to, but also one that reads out continuously so I can monitor the whole time I'm in there whether I'm getting any undue exposure, okay, so -- so that's the part going into the plant -- yeah, that's the part going into the plant. So now I'm in the plant. I'm almost out. I've got my dosimeter and we're walking around. We spent about an hour walking around the containment, going up and down ladders, looking at all sorts of things inside the containment, so now, I have to come out of containment. Well, they have this huge control point and they have all these drums of where you take off all the clothing, special clothing that you put on, you put the gloves and booties in here and your hood and overalls in here, and then you step out and then you monitor yourself, go on these special monitors where they read your -- you know, do you have any contamination on your body now that you've taken all this clothing off, and you have to go through several sets of that before you even exit the building, so I was monitored two or three times before I even was allowed to leave that area of the plant where I could go back on the clean side, so to speak, so --

MS. KOCHER: But if it showed up

on a worker's clothing in South Carolina, but, you know, I'm just -- what I was wondering was who was -- I was going to check who is going to check this, I mean, is this your job to go back --

MR. DEAN: Well, one of the issues we had with the Licensee when this issue came to light the fact that somehow these minute particles got off site, okay, and what happens was they were monitoring like I described my monitoring, they found that they had contamination. They took all of their clothes off, okay?

MS. LIPA: Most of them.

MR. DEAN: Most of them, and then they marched them over to the building where they got the whole body count and they tried to assess did they have intake 'cause their concern was did I breath in something, did I ingest something, and, if so, you know, they could do some things to flush it out, so on, so forth, and so that's the process that they went through, and, I think, if I'm not mistaken, the Licensee might have made in this regard was that they assumed the individuals had internal acquisition; is that right?

MS. LIPA: Right, so it masked.

MR. DEAN: So it masked the fact

that they might have had some small minute particles on their shoes or something, so that's kind of how these few particles got off site.

MS. KOCHER: But how do you know how few?

MR. DEAN: Well, you have to go back and do an assessment, and this is been part of what the challenge is, you know, when these things were finally discovered, they were finally discovered when these individuals went to work at another plant and they went through the same process I described, and they found, hey, you have contamination, and that's when the word got back to the Licensee and that's where we had some challenges in trying to convince Davis-Besse that this might have been their issue, and so, but when you take a look at what was remaining -- so this was like a month later, what was the composition of these particles, what was the intensity of them, and then you can make some judgment working backwards as to what actually was -- escaped the plant and our assessment to this point was, we haven't completed our analysis, but our assessment to this point was that very, very small levels, levels to the degree that even if all of the material was -- if somebody, for example, laid in the

bed that this one guy laid in and breathed in all the material that it would be extremely minimal exposure, well below -- I think below the limits, so -- but there's a challenge of doing that analysis and that's kind of what we're trying to work with the region in trying to find out how bad could that have been knowing all that. Okay?

MR. THOMAS: If you have another question, please ask it.

MR. DEAN: Yeah, please don't hesitate to ask a question if you have one.

MR. THOMAS: If I could add just one thing, I believe one of your questions was, how can we determine the number of people that may have -- well, as part of the inspection, it appears that due to the type of contamination they can isolate it to a specific activity, and, based on that, they can narrow who they followed up on, so I don't know if that helps at all.

MS. LIPA: Yeah, let me just add a couple things, because I think I spoke with you in May, Cheryl, and at that time I told you that I had been in containment before this whole thing was identified, and based on my understanding of the problem, it's kind of like the people past -- they

went to monitor No. 1, and monitor No. 1 said there maybe was a problem, so then they went to monitor No. 2, and monitor No. 2 was where the issue was where it wasn't working properly, but everybody who got through monitor No. 1 said you were clean, you were clean, so I knew I had been through monitor 1 and I was clean, so the issue is more with these people who had potentially internally something in their nose, like Scott said, they were able to tell from the characterization of the particles, it was people working on this particular job, so I'm pretty sure when they went back and pieced it altogether, they figured out what was the potential scope of people affected, but I think, based on my understanding I'm not concerned that everybody who passed through monitor No. 1 is a potential particle carrier. It's more the people who set off monitor No. 1 and how thoroughly were they assessed when they went over and had this more extensive assessment. I don't know if that helps?

MS. KOCHER: I'm just saying that most of the workers walked through the monitor --

MS. LIPA: You had to go through monitor -- even back then, you had to go through monitor No. 1, everybody does. If you set off

monitor No. 1, set off that alarm, they would send you somewhere else, and there's a small number of people that fell into that category.

MR. DEAN: Okay. And, Cheryl, if you're interested in chatting some more when we're done here, we'll be more than happy.

Is there anybody else that would like to chat with us?

MR. LODGE: Terry Lodge, again.

I have a question that the Union of Concerned Scientist's letter, dated the 15th of July, I don't know if you've seen it, mentions the possibility of microbes and the fact that water has penetrated the bifold barrier. I'm curious to know if the ground water is going to be the ground water in the vicinity of containment is monitored for the presence of radiation, and, if not, is it going to be, and I'd also like to know what -- what can be done about the seepage problem? As I understand it, it is -- it is a rather endemic problem when you have concrete types of porous materials and that it isn't necessarily going to be easily resolved. It is something that is rather widespread in the industry, a cracked reactor agent.

MR. DEAN: Let me take a shot

first at the issue of the hyperorganism induced corrosion --

MR. LODGE: Correct.

MR. DEAN: Okay, and this issue was raised with the Licensee today in the meeting and they assured us that they have -- they are testing and evaluating the ground water that does exist around the containment for that particular issue, so we'll wait and see what their test show, and on the second issue, I guess is more of a generic issue of ground water. I guess, first of all, I think most sights, if not all have smaller wells that are dug, the various parts so they can sample the ground water surrounding the plant, ascertain it if there is some radiation if that's perhaps being leached in the ground water, and that's true of all the plants.

MR. THOMAS: That's true.

MR. DEAN: So that -- relative to your question about radioactive to ground water, that's something that has to be monitored through the Licensee and probably by the monitoring program.

Relative to the issue of ground water and impact on concrete basemats, things like that, I guess I'm not -- I'm not knowledgeable too much about that other than the fact that I was involved at

Millstone several years ago when they had that question about basemat, and my understanding was that issue was -- was resolved to the satisfaction of our technical staff, though, it did -- it was a difficult question to answer.

MR. LODGE: How was it resolved at Millstone?

MR. DEAN: I can't remember. I think the Licensee, you know, they had to provide us some information regarding, for example, concentration of the aggregate or whatever was in the concrete in the basemat, and, you know, take samples of the surrounding area and provide us some engineering analysis relative to, you know, what did that mean in terms of percent degradation on the basis of capacity and certain level of degradation, being able to stand -- etc., etc., but, other than that, I mean, I'm just -- that's -- you've plumbed the depth of my knowledge on this one.

MS. LIPA: I did have a question for you, though. Earlier, and I meant to ask this then, you raised a couple of questions, I don't know if we answered all of them, but one of them you referred to was, you said something to the effect that the Utility or, you know, NRC, I'm not sure

which, had been deferring maintenance or cancelling inspections -- can you repeat that question or that statement?

MR. LODGE: I don't know if I can repeat the statement. What I was talking about was, as I understand it, as early as the 1990's, the Utility was talking about removing the installation and did not for cost reasons and was also going to cut larger view holes in that structure.

MS. LIPA: Right.

MR. LODGE: And did not.

MS. LIPA: Okay. Yeah, those are the modifications, and you're right, we got into that on the AIT inspection on April 5th where they were -- Scott showed you the small mouse holes, five by seven and three by five --

MR. LODGE: Right.

MS. LIPA: -- and the Licensee had it on the books to cut larger openings and do a more thorough inspection and more thorough cleaning, and that mod had been deferred, but that was the Licensee's decision. It was their own internal process. It had nothing to do with NRC, and I didn't know if your question was talking about NRC or the Licensee.

MR. LODGE: But if the Utility indicates the Agency is going to do something like that --

MS. LIPA: But they --

MR. LODGE: -- and then does not --

MS. LIPA: But they didn't even -- but we weren't part of that process. It was an initiative that they were considering, and they had some basis for doing it and apparently through the mod review, they decided not to do it and that's one of our issues, you know, if you seen the AIT report which is published, we call that missed opportunities in there and why that mod was deferred.

MR. LODGE: Okay, thank you.

MS. LIPA: Thank you.

MR. DEAN: Anybody else?

What time does the fair close down?

(Laughter).

Okay. If there's nobody else, the panel members will certainly loiter in the area. If anybody has any particular questions that they'd like to ask anybody personally.

We appreciate you coming out tonight and sharing your time with us. Hopefully we're able to

provide some information to you and give you a sense of our dedication and desire to assure you have confidence in the regulatory. Thank you very much.

THEREUPON, the hearing was adjourned.

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF OHIO )
) ss.
COUNTY OF HURON )

I, Marlene S. Rogers-Lewis, Stenotype Reporter and Notary Public, within and for the State aforesaid, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the foregoing, consisting of 63 pages, was taken by me in stenotype and was reduced to writing by me by means of Computer-Aided Transcription; that the foregoing is a true and complete transcript of the proceedings held in that room on the 16th day of July, 2002 before the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

I also further certify that I was present in the room during all of the proceedings.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and seal of office at Wakeman, Ohio this day of , 2002.

Marlene S. Rogers-Lewis
Notary Public
3922 Court Road
Wakeman, OH 44889

My commission expires 4/29/04