

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Reactor Oversight Panel: Initial Implementation
Evaluation Panel - 6th Meeting

Docket Number: (not applicable)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Wednesday, April 25, 2001

Work Order No.: NRC-175

Pages 1-290

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005

(202) 234-4433

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

+ + + + +

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

+ + + + +

REACTOR OVERSIGHT PANEL (ROP)

INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION PANEL (IIEP)

6TH MEETING

+ + + + +

WEDNESDAY,

APRIL 25, 2001

+ + + + +

ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND

+ + + + +

The Panel met at the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Two White Flint North, Room T2B3, 11545 Rockville Pike, at 8:00 a.m., Loren R. Plisco, Chairman, presiding.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

- LOREN R. PLISCO Chairman
- A. RANDOLPH BLOUGH Member
- KENNETH E. BROCKMAN Member
- MARY A. FERDIG Member
- STEVE FLOYD Member

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT: (cont'd)

2 DAVID F. GARCHOW Member

3 RICHARD D. HILL Member

4 ROD M. KRICH Member

5 ROBERT A. LAURIE Member

6 STEVEN A. REYNOLDS Member

7 RAYMOND G. SHADIS Member

8 JAMES M. TRAPP Member

9

10 ALSO PRESENT:

11 FRANCIS X. CAMERON, Facilitator

12 DAVE HORN, OIG

13 ROGER HUSTON, Licensing Support Services

14 JOHN MONNINGER, Designated Federal Official

15 BOB MOODY, OIG

16 CHRIS NOLAN, OE

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

I N D E X

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

<u>AGENDA ITEM</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
Introduction/Meeting Objectives and Goals	4
Review of Meeting Minutes and Items from	5
April 2-3, 2001 Meeting	
Discussion on Draft Panel Report	7
Lunch	170
Discussion on Draft Panel Report	171
Public Comments/General Discussion/Agenda . . .	250
Planning	
Adjourn	

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

(8:10 a.m.)

CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Good morning. Welcome to our 6th Initial Implementation Evaluation Panel meeting, and I think our last meeting, last scheduled meeting.

This is a public meeting. The meeting is transcribed. As far as we know, there are two members that couldn't make it -- Jim Moorman and Jim Setser -- and we're going to get their comments on the report electronically.

Objectives for today's meeting is hopefully to reach a consensus on the issues and the discussion in the draft final report that we sent out earlier this week, to discuss any issues or concerns with the report, and talk about any clarifications we may want to add to the report, to make sure our issues are clearly communicated and to make sure we got our points across.

As I mentioned at the last meeting, my personal goal is to finish up the report on May 4th, you know, take our comments today, John and I will prepare another draft, we'll send it back out to you, and then go through one more round of comments

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 electronically, and then finalize the report. But
2 May 4th is our target for our final draft.

3 As far as business, you should have the
4 summary of our last meeting, April 2nd and 3rd
5 meeting. It should be on your table there. And the
6 agenda for today, which is really essentially to go
7 through the draft report, collect comments.

8 What I'd like to do as far as how we
9 conduct business today is not spend too much time on
10 editorial comments. If you have recommended word
11 changes or editorial changes, I'd appreciate it if you
12 just mark those up and hand those to John in writing,
13 and we'll take care of those this week.

14 And, really, since we only have one day,
15 I really want to focus the time on discussion on, you
16 know, concerns or issues or -- with the report and
17 messages that we have in there, clarifications, you
18 know, what may be inaccuracies or things we may not
19 have communicated well, to really focus our time on
20 those kind of issues.

21 And I've asked Chip to keep us in line on
22 that focus for today, since we do just have one day at
23 this meeting.

24 And as far as going through the report,
25 what I'd like to do is walk through the issues one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more time. We've been through all of the issues once
2 except for the SDP issues. But I want to go through
3 those and then spend time on the SDP issues, since we
4 didn't spend much time on those at the last meeting
5 when we ran out of time.

6 And then focus on the cover letter and the
7 executive summary and some of the front-end
8 information that we've got in the report, and then any
9 other messages that might be missing or you think are
10 incomplete, talk about that, too.

11 Any comments, or is there anything else we
12 need to do today?

13 MEMBER FERDIG: I have a comment on the
14 report. I think we --

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Microphone?

16 MEMBER FERDIG: Oh. Well, my comment was
17 that whoever worked on this report I thought did a
18 good job of bringing all the materials together, and
19 I appreciate the effort.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I used a lot of
21 words from the panel members. You know, John and I
22 have been collecting, as best we can, the words of the
23 panel members. I think, you know, as we went through
24 those issues, I think as we collected those issue

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sheets we really just took the thoughts and comments
2 directly from there.

3 Thank you.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: And a personal note
5 before we get started, I have to recognize we have a
6 new father in the crowd here. And congratulations for
7 John and his new family member. Boy or girl? I can't
8 remember.

9 MR. MONNINGER: Baby girl.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Baby girl.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We're glad to have John
12 back.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Well rested, I'm sure.

14 (Laughter.)

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Any other comments or
16 issues, or anything else as far as business and things
17 we need to take care of today that I don't have on my
18 list? No?

19 What we're going to do is John is going to
20 try to keep track electronically there on the report,
21 on the screen in front, and I'll try and keep a hand
22 markup, too, so between the two of us we'll capture
23 everything as we go through.

24 I'd just to go through the issues, focus
25 on the issues first. A lot of these, like I say, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 spent some time on the last meeting. And we can start
2 with the Os in the main body of the report. Is that
3 page 3?

4 The first one, O-1, one of the issues that
5 had come up as we went through -- just scan through
6 the Ss. You have to flip some pages for this. But
7 once we read S-9, had to do with evaluation of the
8 SDPs and a review process. A lot of the issues that
9 were in that seemed to be embedded in this overall
10 process improvements and stakeholder feedback issue.
11 And it looked like it could -- you could roll that in
12 there. Just make sure that includes the SDP process
13 as part of that process improvement and review.

14 I think I sent that out in my e-mails, a
15 question to everyone, whether that looked like the
16 right thing to do or not as far as rolling that up.
17 Does that make sense?

18 MEMBER FLOYD: You actually do address it,
19 do address it somehow, a little bit in the issue
20 description, I see.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

22 MEMBER FLOYD: Process should also --
23 let's see, other elements such as SDP would benefit
24 from a similar approach.

25 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER LAURIE: Loren, in the -- as we go
2 through the issues and the priorities or -- as noted,
3 am I missing somewhere in the introduction a
4 definition of the priority? So we have priorities 1,
5 2, and 3, and --

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. We put that in
7 there. It's under the first paragraph under "Panel
8 Conclusions and Recommendations." It's halfway
9 through that paragraph. I tried to describe how we
10 went through this process, and it says --

11 MEMBER LAURIE: Okay. I see.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: -- issues placed in one
13 or two priorities.

14 MEMBER LAURIE: Yes. Okay.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's where we tried to
16 capture that.

17 MEMBER HILL: Loren, in several places it
18 talks about what the PPEP recommended, and it just
19 kind of seemed awkward. We didn't address -- you
20 know, it says, "PPEP recommended this." And we don't
21 say whether they did it or didn't do it or is there a
22 recommendation that -- I just -- it's just kind of
23 hanging there. I don't know -- I kind of didn't know
24 how it fit in.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Well, we had gone
2 through all of the PPEP recommendations and where they
3 were in the status. And what I tried to do in a
4 couple of these is capture ones that, really, the
5 issue is still open and PPEP had raised it as an
6 issue.

7 And even though work had been done on it
8 and progress had been -- in a lot of cases progress
9 had been made, we are trying to highlight that PPEP
10 had also raised this same issue and concern really to
11 reinforce -- was trying to reinforce our comment, but
12 this -- the previous panel had also raised this as an
13 issue that needed to be addressed or continue to be
14 addressed in the process. And that's what I was
15 trying to capture.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: And that we concur that
17 that is still -- there are still these things, then,
18 to do.

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right. I was using it
20 as a reinforcement. We had this issue, and also the
21 PPEP had the same issue, and then go into our
22 conclusion. Maybe that's not clear. Maybe there
23 needs to be some transition.

24 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes. Maybe a little
25 transition on --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER HILL: A transition would be good.

2 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: But there's a number --
3 you'll see it's certainly not every one of them, but
4 there's a number when we went back and looked at the
5 presentation we had on the status of the PPEP issues
6 that the staff gave us, the ones that are still --
7 still working or still an issue to be resolved, I
8 tried to capture that. That it's not just an issue
9 this panel came up with; it existed in the previous
10 panel, too.

11 That's the message I was trying to get
12 across, that it's not just this year, it also existed
13 after the --

14 MEMBER FERDIG: Was any --

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: -- as an issue.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: -- credibility, I think
17 that's a good thing to do in a transition comment, to
18 just explain. That would help.

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And maybe we can --
20 maybe just a clarification, again, up in the front on
21 how we did that.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: That might be better. So
23 we will go in line for final consensus at least on the
24 substance of the issue as --

25 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: -- so this will be our
2 last time --

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. This is our last
4 time. Actually, I think we got consensus on all
5 except for the Ss our last meeting. But I did -- we
6 did some rewrite and clarification and that -- and in
7 a couple of cases we added some examples. That's why
8 I wanted to go through them one more time.

9 So Os -- we'll make sure that the issue in
10 S-9 is captured, and we'll add some words to make sure
11 that is clear, and then pull S-9 out.

12 Any other comments on O-1?

13 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. There's a reference
14 in O-1 to the frequently asked questions. And I
15 didn't recall seeing it referenced anywhere else, but
16 I did recall quite a bit of conversation. And I may
17 -- and I may be confusing it with conversation that
18 took place in the workshop with the way that licensees
19 were using the frequently asked questions.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes, that's still in
21 here. That's under P-4.

22 MEMBER SHADIS: Okay.

23 MEMBER HILL: Taking a specific and making
24 a generic application?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes, that's under P-4.
2 Yes, it's actually the last sentence under the
3 description of P-4 is that thought about where the
4 inspectors know some licensees would use site-specific
5 answers out of context. That's under P-4.

6 That thought was really specific to PIs of
7 how the FAQs were handled in the PI process and our
8 recommendation there, at which -- which actually that
9 first revision that's going through now is to
10 incorporate those FAQs back into the main document.
11 And that's still captured there.

12 And the thought in O-1 is really more the
13 process of the FAQs, looking at that in other parts of
14 the oversight process to use -- use that approach.

15 So any other issues with O-1? Do we have
16 consensus on that?

17 MEMBER FERDIG: This may come in the
18 classification of editorial, but I had just taken the
19 last part of the sentence under the issue description,
20 "This practice should also include a mechanism for the
21 public to retrieve information on past questions and
22 answers, and ensure lessons learned and feedback
23 information is shared across regional boundaries."

24 I didn't see that -- the "sharing across
25 regional boundaries" concept included in the actual

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 recommendation statement. So I just made a note that
2 that I think is a recommendation and should be stated
3 as such, just the same phraseology.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: Or just put "internal and
5 external stakeholders" in your panel recommendations.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes, I think that's what
7 we had intended.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: Just say "internal and
10 external stakeholders."

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Where it says "give
12 feedback," that one?

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

15 MEMBER GARCHOW: Or multiple avenues for
16 all internal and external stakeholders.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

18 MEMBER FERDIG: That would do it. I just
19 like that concept and want to make sure that it's not
20 overlooked.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Anything else,
22 O-1? O-2? Yes. I was going to say, I saw your
23 e-mail yesterday, and I know you had some comments on
24 that one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER KRICH: Yes, just a -- I thought it
2 was important to address the issue that had come up a
3 number of times regarding the ability to differentiate
4 plant performance. I thought it was -- it's a good
5 comment, and I think we have -- it gets addressed by
6 this particular item on page -- we need to maybe
7 reformat the web page so that you can start off at
8 high level and then go down.

9 And I would just like maybe to add some
10 recognition here that this does -- this is our attempt
11 at least in addressing that issue, or at least
12 recognize that issue. That was my only comment.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Because it really shows
14 up nowhere else. When I was reading through that, I
15 saw your comment from the previous meeting, and we
16 didn't really grab it anywhere.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I know your
18 recommendation was --

19 MEMBER KRICH: Just to add a sentence --
20 a phrase there.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: After locale?

22 MEMBER KRICH: Exactly.

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Is that where you -- and
24 it says, "And differentiate the performance of one

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plant from the others," is what the recommendation
2 was.

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: Where were you putting
4 that sentence in, Loren? What page?

5 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: His recommendation was
6 that that one sentence ends in locale, which is --
7 it's already a long sentence.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: Is this --

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Top of page 4, first
10 paragraph. After locale just say, "And differentiate
11 the performance of one plant from the others." So you
12 think that has captured that thought?

13 MEMBER KRICH: Yes, thank you. That is
14 kind of a long sentence.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. I was --

16 MEMBER FLOYD: That was -- what about
17 something like, "A high-level summary would also
18 provide an easy means to differentiate plant
19 performance."

20 MEMBER KRICH: That works. That works.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Something like that.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: High-level summary would
23 provide?

24 MEMBER FLOYD: Would also provide an easy
25 means to differentiate plant performance.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: We've got somebody writing
2 as we speak.

3 MEMBER HILL: He's writing faster than we
4 speak. He's a line or two ahead of us.

5 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Anything else on
6 O-2?

7 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes. On the panel
8 recommendations themselves, I notice the statement
9 that says, "Engage the NRC's Office of Public Affairs
10 to identify methods for improving public communication
11 outreach efforts." I don't know whether that is
12 implied, or whether my suggestion is implied in that
13 statement or not, but I would like to see the
14 representatives of the public engaged in that process
15 of figuring out what are the best ways to present the
16 information.

17 Often times we make presumptions without
18 asking. I think there would be a way of engaging the
19 public or representatives of the public in that
20 conversation, and perhaps that's the method that the
21 Public Affairs folks would use.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: Would it help you to say
23 "identify methods utilizing stakeholder input"?

24 MEMBER FERDIG: That'll do it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: For improving public
2 communication.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Say that again.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: Identify methods -- I'm
5 on the second sentence in the panel recommendations --
6 Public Affairs to identify methods utilizing
7 stakeholder input for improving public communication.

8 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Just one point of
9 information on that sentence in terms of the
10 organizational unit. The Deputy Executive Director
11 for Management Services now has -- say, the EDO has a
12 full-time communications person working for the EDO
13 under the Deputy Executive Director for Management
14 Services. And a lot of the communications work is
15 going to be done there rather than Office of Public
16 Affairs.

17 So just to make sure you don't get
18 crosswise in the internal turf battles, you may want
19 to make that broader than Office of Public Affairs.

20 MEMBER KRICH: There's turf battles within
21 the NRC?

22 MR. CAMERON: I know it's a little bit
23 hard to believe. I know it's hard to believe, but --

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. And I think that's
25 kind of -- because we had the presentation from Public

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Affairs, as far as their interactions they have had to
2 date. That's probably why it was just focused on
3 Public Affairs, but I think you're right.

4 Again, this may cross over anyway to our
5 comment about not tell them how to do it, but what
6 needs to be done.

7 MEMBER FERDIG: Right.

8 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. OPA was largely
9 limited to dealing with the media.

10 MR. CAMERON: And that's been their
11 traditional and primary role, really. And that's why
12 the communications, the -- how best to do public
13 outreach, how best to get information from
14 stakeholders on these issues, has been done in other
15 parts of the agency rather than Public Affairs.

16 So although you might not -- you might
17 want to keep them in there, I think you should
18 probably say, "Refer to something -- some other
19 mechanism within the agency."

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, why don't we just
21 start with identify methods and not say who. And just
22 say identify methods using stakeholder input for
23 improving public communications.

24 MEMBER FERDIG: That'll do it. That's
25 right. Good.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: You don't have the
2 directive.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Thanks, Chip.
4 Anything else, Overall-2? Overall-3?

5 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think on the bottom of
6 the first paragraph where we talk about false
7 negatives and false positives, we may need to put some
8 more words in there to explain what that means. We
9 understand it here, but I just -- reading through it
10 it's not clear what does that mean. I can't think of
11 the word. Might want to go --

12 MEMBER BLOUGH: I agree, because,
13 actually, in Region I we use false negatives and false
14 positives kind of in the opposite way that this panel
15 is using it.

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Any suggested
17 words, or do you -- John and I will take a shot at it.

18 MEMBER GARCHOW: Why do we even need to
19 bring that terminology in? Because we talk about the
20 unintended consequences, which sort of bounds it
21 anyway. And it's not like there's any -- there's no
22 one thing that's a go/no-go in this program. Either
23 we spend a lot of paragraphs explaining it or --

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I think the
25 defender of the thought is not here. I know that was

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one of his more significant issues, and I think we
2 agreed with him on the thought.

3 MEMBER HILL: I think false positives, as
4 we discussed, was a whole lot more than the unintended
5 consequences.

6 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think it's a good
7 issue.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. I think it's a
9 good issue, too. And I thought we had some consensus,
10 but I think you probably do need to clarify exactly
11 what we mean or provide an example.

12 And I think this thought is somewhere
13 else. I'll have to go back and look now. It is in
14 several of the other issues. A false negative
15 thought --

16 MEMBER HILL: Under Panel Recommendation,
17 the second sentence says, "This would include
18 integrating with minimum insights and the overall
19 assessment of industry performance." That sort of
20 says there's something out there that has -- that does
21 an overall assessment of industry performance. Is
22 there?

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

24 MEMBER HILL: Is that identified?

25 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER HILL: Okay.

2 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I think they're going to
3 -- what's called the agency action review meeting at
4 the end of the year after the --

5 MEMBER HILL: Okay.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: -- one year, they're
7 going to do a review of overall industry performance.
8 They'll look at performance indicators from an
9 industry standpoint across the board for -- to look
10 for industry trends, and that's why there might be
11 some value in looking at long-term -- you can look --
12 maybe make some conclusions on the effectiveness of
13 the program by looking at overall performance
14 indicators, and that's the intent.

15 MEMBER HILL: Okay.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: I just have a question of
17 clarification. In the issue description, you talk
18 about whatever the answer is there must be a
19 validation process. Is that reference to the
20 validation process, then, covered with the
21 recommendation which is to establish a structured
22 ongoing process to evaluate long-term program
23 effectiveness, or is there another part of what would
24 include a validation process on top of that?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. The answer really
2 had to do with going back and testing the presumptions
3 and what the answer to that --

4 MEMBER FERDIG: And to test the program
5 assumptions. So that's -- it just wasn't clear to me
6 whether that intent in the description was reflected
7 in the recommendation itself.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Yes. It's the
9 part about testing program assumptions.

10 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Any other suggestions on
12 the examples or --

13 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, I've got a suggested
14 phrase to replace false negatives and false positives
15 -- that sentence. What about, "The final oversight
16 process must be focused on the preclusion of any
17 potential for not identifying issues of safety
18 significance while striving to minimize the number of
19 times that the significance of an issue may be
20 overstated"? Does that capture it?

21 MEMBER GARCHOW: And then after each of
22 those at the right place put in parentheses "false
23 negatives and false positives."

24 MEMBER FLOYD: You could. You could.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Because we do use that
2 later on.

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: But I like those words.

4 MR. MONNINGER: Do you want to repeat
5 that, Steve?

6 MEMBER FLOYD: Sure. "The final oversight
7 process must be focused on the preclusion of any
8 potential for not identifying issues of safety
9 significance (false negatives)."

10 MR. MONNINGER: I'll go back and put it
11 in.

12 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay. "While striving to
13 minimize the number of times the significance of an
14 issue may be overstated (false positive)."

15 MEMBER SHADIS: On one side of your
16 equation you have an absolute; on the other side
17 you've got a comparative kind of --

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Where are you, Ray?

19 MEMBER SHADIS: Well --

20 MEMBER BLOUGH: That's the way it should
21 be, because you'd rather -- rather have a few cases
22 where you exaggerate the significance as opposed to
23 hardly any cases where you undercall the significance.
24 So it should be you're leaning toward -- there is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 still a leaning toward exaggerating, try to get it
2 right, but if you miss you want to --

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's not as bad. I
4 did that intentionally, because if you're going to
5 have anything you'd rather have the other.

6 MEMBER FLOYD: In fact, the whole SDP is
7 set up to slightly exaggerate significance of issues
8 to make sure that you don't get false negatives.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: On the conservative
10 side.

11 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's pretty good,
12 Steve.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Does that address
14 it?

15 MEMBER LAURIE: I have to -- I'll have to
16 go back to something.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay.

18 MEMBER LAURIE: When you're ready to do
19 that.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Go ahead.

21 MEMBER LAURIE: I'll have to go back to
22 O-2.

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay.

24 MEMBER LAURIE: And the reason for the
25 delay is, since reading this, and the -- well, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 drafts since I've got -- I've been attempting to
2 formulate what my concern is, and I haven't been able
3 to do so. But there is not going to be any future
4 time, so let me deal with it now and see what, if
5 anything, we can do with it.

6 It goes to the question of public
7 confidence, which is a subject that we broached here
8 and spent some hours on. My concern is this: that I
9 think the basis for this whole program is a legitimate
10 basis. I think obviously industry, through their
11 experience, noted a concern and felt the process could
12 be improved. I think Congress shared that view. I
13 think NRC shared that view.

14 And I think the work done has been proper
15 work, and I think the subjects that we've discussed
16 have been proper subjects. And I concur with the
17 technical aspects of the report.

18 My concern is this. The next time
19 Congress looks at this issue it will not be because
20 they want to make the inspection procedures even more
21 streamlined. The next time Congress looks at this
22 issue will be because some incident occurred, and the
23 next Congress is going to want to know why in the
24 world did we liberalize inspection procedures because
25 then this wouldn't have happened.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 That's the way the world works. It's
2 cyclical. You've all been around for a long time, and
3 we can all expect that to occur.

4 In anticipating that, I'm concerned that
5 such would be damaging to the nuclear industry. And
6 I don't want the nuclear industry to suffer such
7 damage. I would like to see the nuclear industry
8 thrive, frankly.

9 And what that is going to take is a great
10 investment in the public confidence sector. That is,
11 should an incident occur, and the laws say it will
12 sometime somewhere, the greater confidence the public
13 has in the process when that occurs the least damage
14 will occur to the industry.

15 And that's going to take money and
16 resources to maintain public confidence, public
17 education. And we don't really denote that a lot. We
18 note that public confidence is important, and that
19 there will be attempts to work at it.

20 I would like to send a message that I
21 would like to see public confidence promoted through
22 continuing education, which means more money. I don't
23 know if this is a document that is appropriate to
24 recommend sufficient funding to allow the public to be
25 properly educated towards the activities of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 nuclear industry. But I would like to have somebody
2 think about that.

3 MEMBER FLOYD: I take it, Bob, you don't
4 think the last sentence does that in the
5 recommendation?

6 MEMBER LAURIE: No.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: Not enough?

8 MEMBER LAURIE: No. I'd like to see a
9 statement that says continuing public confidence is
10 critical to the future efforts of -- or the future of
11 nuclear energy and the public confidence in the
12 regulatory scheme. And, therefore, financial
13 resources, meaning more money, must be available to
14 serve this purpose.

15 I wouldn't want to play footsie with that
16 kind of language. I'd like to send a note loud and
17 clear that in order for this thing to work we have to
18 have money to educate the public. And that's really
19 all I'm asking for.

20 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. Bob, you probably
21 need to take that over to Department of Energy, unless
22 you --

23 MEMBER LAURIE: Well, maybe. But --

24 MEMBER SHADIS: The issue here is -- is
25 public confidence in NRC's processes, not public

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 confidence in what the industry is doing. Although by
2 extension if NRC is doing, in the public's eye, a good
3 job of oversight on the plants, you know, all that --

4 MEMBER LAURIE: I would agree with that.

5 MEMBER SHADIS: But you really need to
6 separate out NRC's missions not to promote nuclear
7 energy.

8 MEMBER LAURIE: I concur with that. And
9 my intent would certainly not be to fund a public
10 awareness campaign to promote the nuclear industry,
11 but, rather, my personal goals would be served if the
12 -- if resources were spent promoting the public's
13 confidence in NRC's ability to properly regulate, so
14 that the public feels safe, feels that they have a
15 proper degree of safety.

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Sort of an in-between
17 position, as I hear it, is that the public confidence
18 that I think the NRC has a role is accurately
19 communicating the true safety performance of the
20 industry. And to the extent -- and this process is
21 the process that the NRC utilizes to characterize the
22 safety performance of a plant or groups of plants. So
23 they build data to accurately characterize that. It
24 does build the public confidence.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And if all the plants weren't doing well,
2 it would build some public confidence, or if they're
3 all doing very well it would build a different public
4 confidence. But the NRC's role is to accurately
5 communicate where exactly the plants are relative to
6 health and safety of the public, which is what I
7 thought this recommendation was sort of getting at.

8 MEMBER LAURIE: I think it is intended to
9 do that. I'm not sure this language translates into
10 lay language that I would prefer to see, frankly.

11 MR. CAMERON: There's two issues here. I
12 may be able to give you a little bit of context on the
13 -- Bob used the term "public education." And there
14 may be a legitimate role for the NRC in terms of
15 education about radiation, reactor safety. But the
16 other word is information, I think, and it may be that
17 that's what you might be focusing on.

18 But whatever you decide about education,
19 information, and information on what, the other point
20 that you're making is that you really should -- that
21 the report should emphasize that resources are needed
22 to do this right, and the cost-benefit of spending
23 those resources is worth it in terms of ensuring
24 public confidence.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER LAURIE: I want to see a PR budget
2 or a public education or a public information budget.
3 And I know what -- I know that the last sentence goes
4 to that. Doesn't do it for me.

5 MEMBER FERDIG: Well, and I would just add
6 to that that I think this whole attempt to keep a
7 distinction between promoting nuclear power versus
8 engaging the public in conversation to enhance their
9 awareness of what the NRC does and the relative role
10 of the NRC and the industry in generating safe
11 electricity gets lost sometimes. And I think that I
12 -- I really endorse your comments, and I would like to
13 see that occur as well.

14 MEMBER BROCKMAN: What do you mean "gets
15 lost"?

16 MEMBER FERDIG: Pardon?

17 MEMBER BROCKMAN: What do you mean "gets
18 lost"? You said it gets lost sometimes, the
19 differential in the roles.

20 MEMBER FERDIG: Well, I think that, as
21 Ray's comment suggests, there's -- it is important to
22 the NRC that it not be seen as promoting nuclear
23 energy. That's the role of NEI and others who are in
24 that business. But at the same time, I think in
25 holding back from being seen as promoting nuclear

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 energy, there may be missed opportunities to engage
2 the public.

3 MR. CAMERON: Well, the phrase that you
4 used, too, was very articulate I thought in terms of
5 the public information versus public education. I
6 wondered if the panel members would -- if anybody
7 disagreed with the way you articulated the public
8 information that the NRC should be provided.

9 It seemed like that was right along the
10 alley that you were talking towards, Bob.

11 MEMBER LAURIE: Well, I concur with Mary's
12 comments. She is able to articulate far better than
13 I. I'm still dazed, so I'm operating on Budapest time
14 and I have no idea what day it is, what time it is.

15 (Laughter.)

16 So you know the concept, and then you all
17 deal with it. I guess bottom line is that with the
18 panel recommendation I would like to see the subject
19 beefed up to deal with the comments as Mary
20 articulated, noting the absolute essentiality of the
21 public information and education process.

22 And, again, I don't want to throw out any
23 fou-fou words. I want funding for that purpose.

24 MEMBER SHADIS: But, you know, you --
25 really, for the charge of this panel, you really want

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to focus on the reactor oversight process. And I'm
2 not sure that -- funding, you know, may be nice. I
3 know that different areas -- actual functioning areas
4 within the reactor oversight process are starving for
5 money. So, you know, to get the actual job done,
6 never mind money to talk about it.

7 And I also don't know that -- that the
8 focus on funding, if you get more bad information out,
9 is -- is where it needs to go.

10 MEMBER LAURIE: Ray, let me respond to
11 that. I think --

12 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, let me just finish
13 on this, if I may. There is -- there may be a
14 presumption that anti-nuclear or safe energy advocates
15 don't want to see NRC get credit for what it's doing,
16 or, you know, they don't want to see any positive onus
17 cast on the process.

18 And I don't think that that's true. I
19 think that -- that it comes down to a case where the
20 people who -- out there in the public who are tuned to
21 this process, you'll find the largest segment of them
22 are among the activists. And it is important to, I
23 think, convince activists that the oversight process
24 works.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So, yes, resources have to go there. So
2 far, we -- I don't think we've done it. I don't think
3 -- for example, in my case, trying to follow this --
4 and probably a little more closely than the average
5 member of the public -- I didn't see NRC explaining
6 their focus on baseline inspections very clearly, you
7 know, very evidently.

8 When we had our public meetings in the
9 plant sites to explain the ROP, all of the attention
10 was given to the way this was going to be displayed in
11 the website, and it looked like fun and games. The
12 fact that there's a strong baseline inspection program
13 being maintained wasn't accented at all. That's
14 something that would be important.

15 So I guess what I'm saying is the quality
16 of the information is -- from my perspective is what's
17 at issue, not whether or not there should be more
18 information. And, certainly, if you want the
19 confidence of the activist community, at least those
20 activists of goodwill, the NRC has to shy away,
21 purposefully shy away from getting the appearance of
22 promoting nuclear energy.

23 MEMBER FERDIG: Absolutely.

24 MEMBER SHADIS: We were, as a group,
25 dismayed at the content of the Commissioners' speeches

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 at the annual regulatory information conference,
2 because they really focused on forecasting a big
3 future for the industry. It was irrelevant, we
4 thought, to regulation.

5 Go ahead. I'm sorry to hold you that
6 long.

7 MEMBER LAURIE: I don't think I disagree
8 with -- well, I disagree with only one thing that you
9 commented upon, and that is whether or not it's
10 appropriate to comment in this document on funding for
11 public information and education purposes.

12 I believe public information and education
13 is a critical part of the ROP, that without it,
14 regardless of how many engineers can agree on
15 performance indicators, or when green goes to white,
16 or vice versa, it doesn't matter. Unless there is a
17 buyoff within the external stakeholder community, and
18 that would include folks such as yourself and local
19 government officials, for example, it will not work,
20 regardless of how many engineers agree that it's a
21 better system.

22 And that buyoff, the confidence doesn't
23 come free. It costs money to go out and communicate
24 with these folks. And all I'm suggesting is that --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and we don't have to get into promoting the nuclear
2 industry.

3 I understand that if I take the view that
4 I'd like to see more nuclear power, well, that's not
5 relevant to this. What's relevant is whether or not
6 the regulatory scheme works. And if it works, then
7 down the line it could promote an expansion of the
8 nuclear industry.

9 So I just wanted to make it more clear
10 that I feel that the program is unworkable unless the
11 external stakeholders accept the revised process as
12 legitimate. And in order for that to occur, financial
13 resources have to be spent directly on the education
14 aspect of the process.

15 MEMBER FLOYD: I have two sentences that
16 might help, one in the discussion and one in the
17 recommendation section. You've got the right
18 paragraph here. After that sentence that says, "The
19 staff has made improvements to the structure and
20 format of the web pages to address this perceptual
21 problem, to enhance public confidence in the process,"
22 I would suggest adding a sentence that reads something
23 like this, "It is important that the public have
24 confidence that the regulator has a process for
25 accurately assessing the safety performance of the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 plants and taking action, where necessary, and that
2 the process and agency actions be effectively
3 communicated to the public."

4 And then, in the panel recommendation,
5 maybe a concluding sentence, "Ensure sufficient
6 funding is available to appropriately educate the
7 public on the process and its relationship to the
8 mission of the agency in ensuring adequate protection
9 of public health and safety." Does that work for you?

10 MEMBER LAURIE: I think that it's very
11 well-stated. The only comment I would have is I'd
12 like to see it in caps. But that certainly -- it
13 certainly has --

14 MEMBER SHADIS: I would just say that the
15 language about plant assessment in the statement,
16 reactor oversight would probably cover more than plant
17 assessment.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: The phrase I used was "the
19 process for accurately assessing the safety
20 performance of the plants." They do that through the
21 oversight process.

22 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, that's true, but
23 there's more to the oversight process than assessing
24 safety performance.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, I said, "and taking
2 action, where necessary."

3 MEMBER SHADIS: How about --

4 MEMBER FLOYD: That's the enforcement
5 element.

6 MEMBER SHADIS: How about telescoping all
7 of that into the reactor oversight process?

8 MEMBER FLOYD: We could. Okay.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Why don't we put that on
10 there, and then we can see what it looks like.

11 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay. It is important that
12 the public have confidence -- you would suggest "in
13 the reactor oversight process"?

14 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes, whatever. Yes. In
15 the -- we're coming around full circle.

16 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes.

17 MEMBER SHADIS: I'm just thinking about
18 the performance of the --

19 MEMBER FLOYD: Why don't I do it as I
20 said, and then we can edit it.

21 MEMBER FERDIG: Right.

22 MEMBER FLOYD: It is important that the
23 public have confidence that the regulator has a
24 process for accurately assessing the safety
25 performance of plants, and taking action, where

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 necessary, and that the process and actions be
2 effectively communicated to the public."

3 MEMBER FERDIG: I think that works.

4 MEMBER FLOYD: Now, to pick up on Ray's
5 point, you could say something like, "It is important
6 that the public have confidence that the reactor
7 oversight process accurately assesses the safety
8 performance of the plant and prompts action, where
9 necessary." I think that --

10 MEMBER KRICH: Or includes -- yes,
11 includes an established process for taking actions.

12 MEMBER FLOYD: Is that the thought you're
13 trying to get in, Ray, or --

14 MEMBER FERDIG: To get the language of the
15 reactor oversight process in there.

16 MEMBER BROCKMAN: Have confidence that the
17 reactor oversight process provides the regulator a
18 means to accurately blah, blah, blah, blah, blah.

19 MEMBER FLOYD: There you go. Ray?

20 MEMBER SHADIS: Sure.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: Then, the only comment I
23 would make is that sentence probably needs to be the
24 lead sentence in that paragraph before you start

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 talking about the web page, which is sort of the how,
2 not the what.

3 MEMBER FLOYD: Right. Okay. That's a
4 good lead-in, yes.

5 MEMBER LAURIE: If you do that, then you
6 don't have to all cap it for me.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: So no caps, underlined?

9 MEMBER LAURIE: If you want to put it on
10 the cover sheet, that's okay.

11 MEMBER FERDIG: But I thought you wanted
12 the caps down in the recommendation.

13 MEMBER BLOUGH: When we get to the end on
14 how the report is put together, I would like to
15 revisit just that question of stuff like this. You
16 know, by now you're on page -- the seventh or eighth
17 page of text. There may be some way, taking the prior
18 one recommendations and just listing them or doing
19 something to give them a little more --

20 MEMBER FERDIG: Really punch them in the
21 first part of it. That was --

22 MEMBER BLOUGH: Yes. So I think that's
23 today, about 4:00 today we'll --

24 MR. CAMERON: Do you think that there's
25 sort of a disconnect here between -- I mean, this is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a very, very important, fundamental, overarching
2 issue. And then what follows it is all on the web
3 page, which is certainly only one small part, arguably
4 small part --

5 MEMBER LAURIE: Well, you're right, Chip.
6 I brought it up here because I didn't know where else
7 to bring it up. But it -- I think it's deserving of
8 its own comment somewhere, not necessarily in this
9 particular issue.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: It might be in the cover
11 letter or something.

12 MEMBER FLOYD: I think a separate
13 paragraph helps.

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's sort of a lead-in
15 to the web page. What was the recommendation piece?
16 Because maybe it's a combination of both, Steve,
17 that --

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, the recommendation --
19 I think the first sentence of the recommendation kind
20 of gets at this thought where, you know, you've got
21 this lead-in statement now, and now you have this
22 paragraph that says some of the things that have been
23 done, or that could be done to further improve it, and
24 then what would the panel -- the initial panel
25 recommendation I think is pretty good. It says

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 evaluate additional improvements to the oversight
2 process to improve and simplify public access to the
3 information.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: On the web page, though.
5 It's targeted at the web page.

6 MEMBER FLOYD: That was --

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: -- found them being far
8 broader than just making the world's best web page.

9 MEMBER FLOYD: Right. And I -- the last
10 sentence I had suggested was, if you're ready, "Ensure
11 sufficient funding is available to appropriately
12 educate the public on the process and its relationship
13 to the mission of the agency in ensuring adequate
14 protection of public health and safety."

15 MEMBER SHADIS: I'm deeply bothered by the
16 direction of this, because in the topic you start out
17 with -- you know, the heading is that public access is
18 important. I think what NRC needs to be able to do is
19 -- is put enough accurate information into the hands
20 of the public for the public to decide if this is an
21 effective process or not.

22 And it concerns me to be that the
23 information be accurate, that it be readily
24 accessible, that it be understandable. Those are the
25 kinds of things that -- that I think the informed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public is looking for. I don't think that any of us
2 care to be educated. We have a mandatory public
3 education system in this country. Most of us are glad
4 to get away from it.

5 I think, though, that when we do want
6 information, when we do want to know, we want to be
7 able to know things readily and clearly, you know,
8 have them available.

9 MR. CAMERON: If you remove the
10 educational term from the -- the term "educate" from
11 that last sentence, and incorporate it -- provide
12 information that's accessible, clear, accurate, would
13 that take care of your concern?

14 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. I think it would in
15 that end of it. But then, you know, reflecting back
16 on the opening line about the importance, it's
17 important that the public have confidence. Well,
18 that's true. Otherwise, we wouldn't have a goal or
19 objective of public confidence. I mean, that's --
20 it's redundant to say it here.

21 MEMBER BROCKMAN: I agree with your aspect
22 on that accurate, clear, accessible information is
23 available. But, likewise, it's just as important that
24 the public understand how it is being used by the
25 agency --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: How --

2 MEMBER BROCKMAN: -- how the agency is
3 using it to reach its determinations. If they don't
4 understand the process, they can never -- if you don't
5 make an outreach so that they understand what the
6 process is and how it's being used, I mean, you're --
7 they can't have confidence in the process.

8 There's two separate things you're talking
9 about, which is the public's information for them to
10 reach independent decisions. That is different from
11 the public's confidence that the agency has adequate
12 information to reach its decisions.

13 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes.

14 MEMBER BROCKMAN: And you need to have
15 both.

16 MEMBER SHADIS: Oh, I agree with you. I
17 -- you know, the problem is, I think, that -- you
18 know, the question he raised about -- first about
19 allocating money to do this, and then the whole notion
20 of the confusion of confidence in the industry and
21 confidence in the reactor oversight process. That
22 came through our conversation.

23 But, you know, I need to say that -- that
24 we're one year into the process. Almost everyone has
25 said we need more time to pick up and be able to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 actually critique this thing. There are things that
2 need to be adjusted to make it work better.

3 In the run of all this, NRC has expended
4 a great deal of effort to try to inform the public
5 about the reactor oversight process. We've had a
6 meeting at each plant, there have been stakeholder
7 sessions, and so on. And yet, you know, my assessment
8 would have to be that the public doesn't understand
9 this process. And it's not for the lack of resources
10 that have been pumped into it, into trying to make the
11 public understand it.

12 MEMBER BROCKMAN: I hear what you're
13 saying there, having been one who has been out and
14 given a whole lot of these meetings. One of the key
15 components that I would say is nobody has come to
16 listen. Not only is the horse not drinking from any
17 of the water, the horse hasn't even come to the pond.

18 So, and that makes it very difficult to
19 try to do this. I don't know how to solve -- how to
20 educate someone who doesn't want to be educated, or
21 doesn't see the need to be educated, informed, made
22 knowledgeable, whatever words you want to use.

23 I mean, we've got a lot of dilemmas there.
24 I think the point I hear is we need to continue that
25 outreach, and I'm going to take a little liberty with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Bob's things. It's resources, which is not
2 necessarily money.

3 I mean, people are money, so if you
4 correlate that -- but a lot of it is the investment of
5 time and personal resources as opposed to big dollars,
6 and to have -- that's why the communications plan I
7 believe was brought up in this arena, that you need to
8 have a plan that keeps on working. So that if two
9 years from now all of a sudden somebody wakes up and
10 says, "I want to know about this," there's a forum
11 that becomes -- that's available on some type of
12 aspect to make them knowledgeable of that at that
13 stage.

14 Now, that's notwithstanding, though, your
15 other point on information availability. That's also
16 a key component to public confidence. I believe that
17 they can have the information to independently reach
18 decisions, because it's possible that you will look at
19 an issue, and I will look at an issue, and reach
20 different conclusions. That's not necessarily bad, as
21 long as we understand the process about how we got to
22 that and then we can dialogue on that and move on from
23 there.

24 And I interrupted you, I think.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, just for the sake of
2 the transcriber, that's H-A-R-T, Biblical phrase.

3 MEMBER TRAPP: I was just thinking about
4 the concept -- like what Ken said, we tried it, and we
5 weren't real successful about it. And I think that
6 concept maybe should be taught, and that we should
7 look at ways to enhance -- I mean, I heard things
8 around the table.

9 Maybe a newspaper was the right method to
10 get people more information, rather than these
11 meetings. It seems like we have some good ideas, and
12 maybe we need to evaluate, you know, new methods to
13 get the information out rather than what we've tried.
14 And I think we have put a lot of funding and resources
15 into that.

16 MR. CAMERON: Can you try to capture this
17 generally, without getting into a lot of details? And
18 does Steve's sentence capture that, at least
19 forgetting about how you do that, but does this first
20 sentence up here capture that?

21 And, Mary, you wanted to add something to
22 all of this. It's important that the public have
23 confidence, process and actions be effectively
24 communicated to the public.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Ray, do you have a problem with this
2 phrase? Would you like to add anything to it?

3 MEMBER BROCKMAN: You need to add the
4 second part. Likewise, it is essential that the
5 public have clear, unfettered access to accurate
6 information to be able to reach its own independent
7 decisions on issues. That's the second part of what
8 we've just been talking about.

9 MR. CAMERON: Let's add that on, John.
10 I'm sure you got that, right? But let's add that on,
11 and then take a look at it and see whether everybody
12 agrees with it.

13 MEMBER FERDIG: And while he's writing
14 that, for me it's a continuum of making available
15 meaningful information. To someone who is as well-
16 informed as Ray and his colleagues, meaningful
17 information means a lot of factual data that they can
18 go and find and make decisions about, based on their
19 context and understanding.

20 Meaningful information for me requires
21 adding some of that context, so that I understand the
22 implications of what it is the NRC does and why,
23 relative to public safety. And I think it's all
24 important.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: I want to suggest that
2 there should be some way to address Bob's concern that
3 there be a focus on this. To me, the first sentence
4 simply restates the goal here. The goal is public
5 confidence, and it says, "A) Public confidence is
6 important." Well, of course, because it's a goal.

7 Maybe there needs to be -- maybe that
8 sentence should be that the reactor oversight process
9 is vital or essential to the reactor oversight
10 process, that there be public confidence. I don't
11 know. You know, maybe -- I guess I'm trying to get to
12 the point where you wanted to put it in caps, you
13 wanted to accent it, that you need a short sentence
14 that says, "This can't be overstated." Maybe that
15 would be the way.

16 MEMBER TRAPP: I still think strongly the
17 finding is is that in the first year of the oversight
18 process that we haven't communicated that well. And
19 I think there's agreement, and I think that's the
20 finding. And then you get the recommendation from
21 that that it's not working.

22 You know, nobody comes to these meetings.
23 We've had them across the nation. Nobody shows up.
24 So whatever we're doing isn't working, and that should
25 be --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BROCKMAN: And that's probably your
2 next sentence right there.

3 MEMBER FLOYD: Or you could reach an
4 opposite conclusion that the agency is doing an
5 effective enough job of assuring the -- nobody has to
6 worry about it. I mean --

7 MR. CAMERON: Let's go back. Let's keep
8 in mind Mary's use of the term "meaningful." Okay?
9 But go back to Bob to -- who started us on this, to
10 these two sentences, and whether that accurately
11 describes the point that you were trying to make.

12 MEMBER LAURIE: Well, it does. But I
13 would also concur that it is taken out of context and
14 probably doesn't belong in O-2. It probably belongs
15 somewhere else. But those sentences, if proclaimed
16 loudly and clearly, really go to the essence of my
17 biggest concern over the entire process.

18 If the verbiage is satisfactory, I don't
19 -- I don't really care what the --

20 MEMBER BROCKMAN: Would you not agree,
21 though, that a strong recommendation needs to
22 accompany that to bring your concern to closure?

23 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think he has a totally
24 different issue than O-2. I think he -- that's why

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're struggling here. The issue in O-2 is -- as we
2 stated, is public access to information.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: That's really what --

4 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think that part we're
5 struggling with is --

6 MEMBER BROCKMAN: O-0.

7 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Yes. O-0 or the issue.

8 MEMBER LAURIE: The answer, Ken, is yes,
9 and I -- I would like to see a statement or a
10 proclamation a lot more clearly stated.

11 MEMBER GARCHOW: Let me try this. The
12 force over the first year was public workshops,
13 including -- and the web page. I mean, pretty much
14 the information outreach, communication, education,
15 two major type of paths. I think what I'm hearing is
16 -- and that's how the public had access.

17 So, I mean, we could maybe reword the
18 problem statement to make this inclusive. So having
19 the access be at public meetings and web pages, while
20 both of those were good in their own right, the
21 conclusion it sounds like I'm hearing just listening
22 is we didn't go far -- that didn't go far enough to
23 provide the public confidence necessary for this
24 program to be successful over the long term.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 So we acknowledge the public meetings,
2 acknowledge the web page, but the recommendation is we
3 have to do more in different types of forums to get at
4 the issue that Bob raised. That's what I heard you
5 saying.

6 MEMBER FERDIG: So that's a separate
7 issue, then, also enhancing the web page, which is an
8 access to information.

9 MR. CAMERON: Is David suggesting, though,
10 that you may want to reword the statement of what this
11 issue is to capture the additional flavor that's being
12 added here. And perhaps after -- well, here's a
13 conclusion, right? However much remains to be done?

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right. And if you added
15 in the statement, though, "Much effort was expended
16 through public workshops, meetings and creation of the
17 web page," it just didn't go far enough. I mean, I
18 have a personal view whether that's true or not. But,
19 I mean, just sort of listening to what people are
20 talking about, that appears to be what's on the table.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: I've got a more
22 philosophical question. How do we know that the
23 public doesn't have confidence in the regulator? I
24 mean, we're making a presumption that they don't, and
25 we've got to try to educate them.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER LAURIE: I don't know if -- if the
2 language we're talking about offers any presumption
3 that there's no confidence. The point I was trying to
4 put on the table was confidence is essential. I don't
5 believe any of this language suggests today no
6 confidence.

7 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think that is
8 reflected, Steve, somewhat in the agency's goals. Our
9 agency goal doesn't say "develop public confidence."
10 It says "enhance public confidence."

11 MR. CAMERON: If you try to -- you'll be
12 here forever if you want to get on the point of
13 arguing about whether the public has confidence or
14 not. And I think some of the language that's been
15 suggested here, as Bob has suggested, doesn't
16 necessarily have to reach that issue.

17 What if you took the new phrase that you
18 have and used that to lead off the description of the
19 issue? Doesn't that state what's important, and then
20 you have -- the staff has made significant
21 improvements, but it hasn't gone far enough, and we
22 need these improvements, etcetera, etcetera?

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: And acknowledge the
24 public meetings and such in that statement, not just
25 going right into the web page.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BROCKMAN: And as opposed to saying
2 the public doesn't have confidence, but we have
3 indicators, we have points of fact. Attendance at the
4 meetings, with few exceptions, was minimal. Numerous
5 questions have come in concerning the accessibility
6 and information being -- and the way the information
7 is being presented. This raises questions. Go
8 further. Those are facts.

9 Ray, you've got to -- I mean, that's a
10 fact. There are some meetings that got good
11 attendance, and a lot that didn't. And those are the
12 facts that we saw out of this thing. Am I going to
13 say the public doesn't have confidence? I can't -- I
14 don't know, but I've got enough to say more outreach
15 needs to be done, because the indicators we have just
16 leave me lacking.

17 MEMBER LAURIE: Well, I guess in order to
18 wrap this up, because, you know, I'd like to move on,
19 it may be appropriate to move the language up. You
20 know, too, I would also suggest consideration of
21 summarizing this issue a little bit more firmly in the
22 executive summary. And if you want to consider adding
23 the concept in the cover letter that would be helpful
24 as well.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Not only is it an important point, but I
2 think it's an issue that the people's representatives
3 want to have comfort in. And it's something that they
4 would want to see.

5 MEMBER TRAPP: We don't really say
6 anything about public confidence in the executive
7 summary. Might be a good --

8 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes. I think it does --

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, the last paragraph
10 has a discussion of all of the outreach efforts.

11 MEMBER BROCKMAN: Do you think this is
12 your homework assignment, Loren, to try to get out a
13 next -- answer all of this, or do you still want to
14 try to write --

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I want to get back
16 and get this close and --

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think we're close.

18 MR. CAMERON: Yes. Can we go back to that
19 when you're done with that? Okay. You start off with
20 the statement that we worked up, that Bob started us
21 out on. I think David might be suggesting here that
22 besides mentioning the web page is that you mention
23 the meetings. However you want to phrase that, okay?
24 So that shows what -- what we have been trying to do
25 to address this important concept.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: They held numerous
2 workshops and public meetings.

3 MR. CAMERON: And that would -- okay. Why
4 don't you -- it may be inartful at this point, but you
5 can always fix that. But I think that -- okay. John,
6 that's good. John will capture it that way.

7 MEMBER SHADIS: Would anyone have any
8 objection in that first sentence to throwing out the
9 word "performance"?

10 MR. CAMERON: Right there? Safety
11 performance?

12 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. Just the safety of
13 plants as opposed to safety performance. Safety
14 performance --

15 MEMBER FLOYD: What distinction are you
16 trying to make?

17 MEMBER SHADIS: Hmm?

18 MEMBER FLOYD: What distinction are you
19 trying to make? I don't have any objection, but I
20 don't --

21 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, I can tell you that
22 there are what are called historical issues and design
23 basis things that the activists that I've spoken to
24 said when NRC sent the team to their plant and
25 explained the ROP, they were saying, "Oh, yes. Well,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what about what happened like last year, or two years
2 ago, whistleblower things?"

3 They are raising all of these issues that
4 they would have a hard time finding reflected in
5 performance indicators or in any of the rest of the
6 scale that you've got here. And they were defining
7 plant safety the way I define plant safety, and that
8 has a lot to do with whether or not the thing was
9 designed properly, whether it was built the way it was
10 designed, whether it was modified without a real good,
11 accurate engineering analysis -- you know, all of the
12 things that say is -- maybe the people are doing a
13 great job of running it, but is the machine basically
14 safe?

15 And having driven unsafe cars a long, long
16 time, I can tell you, you can go a long way between
17 wrecks, you know, so -- so from the public
18 perspective, I think plant safety is more than your
19 performance indicators.

20 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, I would agree with
21 that. I don't have -- with that context, I have no
22 objection. I just want to point out for the record
23 that when we're saying safety performance that doesn't
24 just mean the performance indicators.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 The oversight program does look at design
2 issues through the inspection process, and it covers
3 a lot of things. And it's not just -- if the word
4 "performance" to you just means performance
5 indicators, I have no objection to taking it out.

6 MEMBER SHADIS: It doesn't just, but I --

7 MEMBER FLOYD: That's fine.

8 MEMBER SHADIS: -- but I want to see -- I
9 would like to see the language moving away from
10 constantly focusing on performance.

11 MR. CAMERON: Okay. So you've got -- is
12 everybody clear with this? Loren?

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, one thing, I don't
14 think we captured Mary's thought. And I think Ray
15 mentioned it, too. Not only accurate information but
16 meaningful information, in that second sentence. I
17 mean, if it's accurate but useless information --

18 (Laughter.)

19 MEMBER FERDIG: Well, it's variable
20 depending on your audience.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Where it says
22 accurate and meaning -- or meaningful and accurate
23 information, the second sentence.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: If it's clear and accurate,
2 though, there is still -- if it's accurate, does that
3 necessarily mean that it's meaningful?

4 MEMBER FERDIG: No. Because what's clear
5 and accurate to him isn't going to be meaningful to --
6 or what's clear and accurate is --

7 MR. CAMERON: So if it is clear, accurate,
8 and meaningful -- you could use all three of those?
9 And you could take out the --

10 MEMBER FLOYD: To me, if you're accurately
11 assessing safety, I don't know how that could not be
12 meaningful. But --

13 MEMBER BROCKMAN: If an extra word makes
14 somebody happy, put it in.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Why don't we say -- why
16 don't we take out the "timely and clear," and just say
17 -- and then make it more general. Public access to
18 reactor or --

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: Now we just brought in
20 Bob's whole comment.

21 MR. CAMERON: All right. So can we move
22 to the third paragraph?

23 MEMBER KRICH: Can I make a suggestion?

24 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER KRICH: And this may, you know --
2 it's just an idea, so take it as that. Because we
3 could be here a long time rewording this thing. And
4 it occurred to me that we might consider having
5 something somewhat like statements of consideration.

6 In other words, a commentary section,
7 where we can generally agree on what's in the writeup
8 here, and then have a section of commentary where we
9 capture these ideas, you know, connect them to the
10 particular issue, so that the reader can go back and
11 look at the -- read the -- kind of the concise issue
12 and recommendation, and then also see some commentary.
13 Just an idea.

14 MEMBER BROCKMAN: If we're having
15 difficulty reaching agreement in the Cliff Notes,
16 we'll never come to agreement on the full volume of
17 War and Peace.

18 MEMBER KRICH: Well, yes, I guess that's
19 what I was trying to -- that's what I was saying, is
20 that the commentary could just be capturing the
21 thoughts of each of the members, and that's the
22 commentary. So we don't have to come to agreement on
23 it.

24 MEMBER SHADIS: I think that's in the
25 transcript.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. That's just what
2 I was going to say. I think the statement of
3 considerations is the transcript.

4 MEMBER FLOYD: I'd like to suggest that
5 we --

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I'd hate to go back and
7 try to reconstruct all of that for all of these
8 issues.

9 MR. CAMERON: I mean, you may not be far
10 from agreement here. If you take a look at this, you
11 may find that you are in agreement, and so Rod's idea
12 would be a good one if we're in a section where
13 there's a lot of disagreement.

14 But I think if you look through this
15 description now, the third paragraph is going to flow
16 about, you know, okay, this is -- much remains to be
17 done. Okay?

18 MEMBER FERDIG: And what's the
19 recommendation say?

20 MR. CAMERON: Yes. And that's where you
21 need to go to to capture the -- not the funding, but
22 the resource issue.

23 MEMBER BROCKMAN: The part on the
24 communications plan and the funding is now the back,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 and we've made that our number one thing we're talking
2 about. So we need to reorder the recommendations.

3 MR. CAMERON: So take this sentence --

4 MEMBER BROCKMAN: Keep going.

5 MR. CAMERON: Okay. And move them above
6 the web page?

7 MEMBER BROCKMAN: Make that the primary
8 recommendation, yes.

9 MEMBER LAURIE: Aren't you guys done yet?

10 (Laughter.)

11 MEMBER FERDIG: See what you did, Bob.

12 MR. CAMERON: This guy just gets in from
13 Budapest, causes a lot of problems, and now he's
14 giving your --

15 (Laughter.)

16 MEMBER FERDIG: I think it's a fundamental
17 question. I think the rest will go faster.

18 MR. CAMERON: What is that, Mary?

19 MEMBER FERDIG: I just think it was a
20 fundamental question underlying all of this. That now
21 we can move on to the --

22 MR. CAMERON: How do you guys like the
23 panel recommendation now, in light of the discussion?

24 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think it captures --
25 I'm fine with it. It captures, I think, what -- Bob

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could answer that, but I think it captures a lot more
2 of what Robert was trying to get at.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: You've still got the word
4 "educate" in there, and that -- that's not a huge
5 problem. It's not an absolute kind of thing. But I
6 just want to tell you that -- that, you know, maybe if
7 you can explain what you're doing in plain, simple,
8 understandable terms, and have that ready at hand, so
9 that when you have an incident at a plant where
10 there's a lot of public attention, like Indian Point-2
11 or something, people come up and they say, "What's all
12 this stuff you've written? What do you mean by these
13 assessments you've made?" You can say, "Here it is in
14 a simple chart. This is how we do -- and this is how
15 we spend our time," you know?

16 I mean, it -- what I'm saying is -- is
17 that not only do you have to make it accessible to the
18 public, but it's got to be good information. You
19 know, I mean, good, workable stuff. Right now you
20 don't have it, and we've all agreed on that.

21 MR. CAMERON: Can we take it -- in light
22 of what you're saying, can we take "educate" out and
23 just leave it as "inform" or -- and I've got to ask
24 Bob this specifically. Bob, what do you think? You
25 used the term "educate" initially.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER LAURIE: Yes. Well, I understand
2 the difference. I understand the concern. The word
3 "inform" adequately covers my essential points.

4 MEMBER BROCKMAN: Might I suggest just one
5 last little noolnick? We've dedicated the resources
6 and then we're ensuring they're available. That to me
7 seems like we're doing the same thing twice. Dedicate
8 the appropriate resources to appropriately informing
9 the public on the process. I mean, we -- it's
10 redundant.

11 MEMBER FERDIG: A little wordsmithing will
12 get that. That's editorial.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: To get to Mary's point,
14 it's not just appropriately inform. It's
15 appropriately enlist and inform, because what we did,
16 we had that whole conversation and we had the
17 meetings. They didn't come. So, you know, I think
18 Mary wanted to enlist the public appropriately, enlist
19 or engage.

20 MR. CAMERON: You might want to be careful
21 about the term "enlist," because that carries with it
22 that we're trying to capture the hearts and minds of
23 the --

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Or "engage."

25 MR. CAMERON: Engage. Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: And I just want to add
2 something that's niggling me here in terms of Ray's
3 point. I don't think the time to engage and inform is
4 when there is an incident that has attracted public
5 attention, who has been up to that point ignorant and
6 unaware. I think the time to do it -- and that was
7 maybe the first sentence that came out of Robert's
8 mouth -- is before those times.

9 So there is a public that has confidence.
10 They understand the foundation of this entire nuclear
11 arena, and they --

12 MR. CAMERON: Can we put "early" or
13 something? There's a time element here.

14 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes. It's not --

15 MR. CAMERON: David is shaking his head.
16 What do you think, David?

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think we're building
18 things that --

19 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay. You don't need to
20 say it. I just needed to say it.

21 MR. CAMERON: I think that's a point
22 that's well taken that, as Bob and others have
23 mentioned, it's --

24 MEMBER FERDIG: Right. I don't --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: It's too late to do this,
2 but there is a problem.

3 Anybody have anything else on that panel
4 recommendation that they want to add?

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Can you go back to the top
6 and just let's read the whole thing through?

7 MEMBER SHADIS: I keep thinking of
8 different ways to say this, so I can tell you the
9 words, you know. You tell us what you got, say it so
10 we can understand it, and we'll be the judge of
11 whether or not we like it, you know. I mean, it's
12 just -- tada -- you know?

13 MR. CAMERON: Well, maybe a footnote that
14 says as one member of the panel describes --

15 (Laughter.)

16 Steve?

17 MEMBER FLOYD: I'm happy.

18 MR. CAMERON: Anybody unhappy?

19 MEMBER BROCKMAN: You'll get another whole
20 round if you --

21 MR. CAMERON: I mean, about this.

22 MEMBER BROCKMAN: You get another whole
23 round if you --

24 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: You're going to get
2 another bite of the apple when we send this back out.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: You know, one thing that
4 we should -- that we -- it may be in here, and, I
5 mean, I read it through I think three times now. In
6 describing the process for coming to consensus, you
7 know, that if it's a question of, is this something
8 that you absolutely can't live with, I mean, if that's
9 the bottom line, then it ought to be described
10 somewhere, you know, because I don't want anyone to
11 get the notion that any of these are things that we
12 100 percent subscribe to, you know.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right. I've tried to
14 capture that thought, and maybe it wasn't -- you know,
15 I -- the way I tried to capture it is I think I made
16 a statement in there about, you know, there was
17 consensus reached, but the reason for someone reaching
18 consensus could be completely different.

19 MEMBER LAURIE: Is there a concern about
20 -- let's say Ray had a problem with this paragraph and
21 wanted to get across a point that wasn't fully
22 covered. Is there any difficulty with -- clearly, if
23 Ray were to send in a letter explaining his position
24 on the issue, and expressing his concern, then that's
25 part of the record.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Is there any difficulty in making
2 reference to that?

3 MEMBER SHADIS: I hope to get to that
4 later, because I did talk about a minority point of
5 view. And maybe later we can figure out how that
6 will, you know, be worked in or applied, or whatever.
7 But --

8 MR. CAMERON: But it may be important also
9 on Ray's point that if people understand -- say that
10 everybody -- you made a statement there was consensus
11 on this issue. It would be important somewhere for
12 people to understand that consensus does not
13 necessarily mean wholehearted support and endorsement
14 of the statement, but that the panel member could --
15 however you want to express, could live with that,
16 because you all have constituencies out there, and
17 that would help to explain some of this to the -- to
18 your constituency.

19 MEMBER FERDIG: Just put in a textbook
20 sentence.

21 MR. CAMERON: So I think John has captured
22 or put a finer -- you know, put a finer point on what
23 consensus means.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Okay. Well, we're ready to go on? Next
2 issue? Or -- and I don't know when you want to break,
3 Loren.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Let's go a little bit
5 longer and then we'll break.

6 We did -- I think we did 0-3, right?
7 We're on 0-4, cross-cutting issues. Any issues or
8 concerns with 0-4?

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: I thought we did sort of
10 agree with what the NRC brought in in their
11 discussion, that more work is needed.

12 MEMBER HILL: The only question I had was
13 down at the -- I don't know, the last big paragraph
14 says, "Early data obtained from initial implementation
15 suggests there's a correlation between cross-cutting
16 issues," and so on. It says, "For example, the number
17 of cross-cutting issue findings per plant appears to
18 increasingly move to the right in the action matrix."

19 Is that really -- I don't know where that
20 comes from, but I thought fault exposure hours was a
21 lot of what was causing things to change in the action
22 matrix, which wouldn't have anything to do with number
23 of issue findings per plant and --

24 MEMBER FLOYD: I can maybe help you out
25 with that. There were some 30-odd performance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 indicators that crossed thresholds. Only about I
2 believe eight of those -- seven or eight of those were
3 due to fault exposure hours. But then you also had an
4 additional -- what was it -- I forget the exact
5 number, 17 or 20, 21, inspection findings.

6 So the preponderance of the items were not
7 directly related to fault exposure, and yet you did
8 see that pattern/trend of CAP findings increasing as
9 you moved across the action matrix.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Somebody actually -- I
11 can't remember who -- showed us that chart in one of
12 their presentations.

13 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. Well, we did, and I
14 think the staff and Bill had something that was a
15 little bit different but similar in outcome.

16 MEMBER TRAPP: For clarification, though,
17 findings -- we used that fault exposure time. So you
18 could have findings that are white because of the --
19 you know, we're using the T over 2 to assess findings.
20 So, I mean, a subset of those could also be --

21 MEMBER BROCKMAN: That's true. It could
22 be. Just for within the group, we also don't have a
23 temporal relationship here, and know which came first.
24 Some of the findings that were on there could have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 occurred after they got the increased inspection from
2 having crossed the threshold.

3 All that -- yes. We don't know that all
4 the findings came up before they moved into that
5 category, because when you move into the enhanced
6 inspection category you get initial inspection.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: True.

8 MEMBER BROCKMAN: We just need to be a
9 little skeptical on --

10 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. Some of that -- but
11 we also heard a report, I believe, from Bill Dean --
12 we can go back and look at the record -- that said
13 that they looked at, in the annual PI&R review, were
14 there any plants that they thought were missed that
15 the staff thought had significant problems with the
16 correction action program where it wasn't reflected in
17 the PI&R, and the answer was no, and that the plants
18 that did get significant comments in the PI&R they
19 thought were indeed plants that had problems with it.
20 So that was not related to any particular inspection
21 activity, other than the PI&R inspection.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Consensus on 4?
23 5?

24 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Under "Issue
25 Description," the first paragraph --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Which paragraph?

2 MEMBER REYNOLDS: -- I disagree with.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Which paragraph?

4 MEMBER REYNOLDS: The first paragraph
5 under "Issue Description." It says "directly
6 undermines public confidence."

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's a little strong.
8 We did have a lot of talk on that, but maybe it
9 potentially or could cause or -- I was just looking at
10 some softer language. I had that comment, too. We
11 did have a lot of -- we had almost half of one morning
12 where we talked about the green/white threshold.

13 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I also have -- I
14 struggle with like a fair and competent regulator.
15 Why do we --

16 MEMBER BLOUGH: I'd just cross --

17 MEMBER REYNOLDS: -- that all of a sudden?

18 MEMBER BLOUGH: I'd just cross out that
19 sentence, because the previous sentence says it's
20 difficult to communicate. That's all we really know.

21 MEMBER SHADIS: But there was some
22 conversation with one of the stakeholders about this,
23 what it does to the whole process. I just think the
24 language in that sentence jus really went -- it went

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a little too far. I mean, this, you know, affects
2 public confidence in the NRC.

3 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Period.

4 MEMBER SHADIS: Period.

5 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Just don't say the rest
6 of it. I don't think it's necessary.

7 MEMBER SHADIS: You take that as a jab.
8 That was Dave Lochbaum's language, I think.

9 (Laughter.)

10 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Then I definitely take
11 it as a jab.

12 (Laughter.)

13 MEMBER SHADIS: So this -- that is the
14 goal that you strive for, is it not, to be fair and
15 competent in anything you --

16 MEMBER REYNOLDS: In all actions.

17 MEMBER SHADIS: Of course. And --

18 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Why do we need to state
19 it one time here? The white threshold, if you're
20 going to do it -- if you want to do it everywhere or
21 -- or not just one time. Really, it's this
22 green/white threshold issue, which isn't needed in my
23 opinion.

24 MEMBER GARCHOW: But this could impact
25 public confidence. That's -- "undermine" says the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 whole thing just falls down. That could affect or
2 impact. Take "undermine" out. That was quick
3 consensus.

4 MEMBER SHADIS: I don't care. So that's
5 fine.

6 MR. CAMERON: He can live with it.

7 MEMBER SHADIS: You guys have been very
8 nice to me in terms of my hypersensitivities, and
9 so --

10 (Laughter.)

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Anything else on 0-5?

12 MEMBER GARCHOW: Are we keeping score?

13 (Laughter.)

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Is now a good time to
15 break before we go to PIs? We'll take a 10-minute
16 break.

17 (Whereupon, the proceedings in the
18 foregoing matter went off the record at
19 9:39 a.m. and went back on the record at
20 9:55 a.m.)

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Is everybody
22 ready to get started again?

23 Okay. The next section is the performance
24 indicators. P-1, unintended negative consequences.
25 Any issues on that one? Consensus on P-1?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I'd ask that we back up
2 to the lead-in paragraph.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay.

4 MEMBER REYNOLDS: You say 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 --
5 7 lines down we start, "The panel has confirmed it was
6 one unintended consequence." I think we would say
7 it's a misunderstanding. That's not really the same
8 thing as we mean in unintended consequence. Maybe it
9 is, but I just -- it just struck me that -- is that
10 really what we mean by "unintended consequence"? I
11 understand that there is a misunderstanding, but -- I
12 don't think we ever --

13 MEMBER FLOYD: I think I agree with Steve
14 on that. That's not what we had meant by "unintended
15 consequence."

16 MEMBER REYNOLDS: It's not an unintended
17 consequence.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Right.

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes, it's really a
20 misunderstanding. But it does have unintended
21 consequences. I mean, it's not a glaring example of
22 one that may be related to safety, but it has -- we
23 were talking with the PSA guys on how all of the
24 effort and the going on, you know, debating
25 green/white, that the white bindings sometimes have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 protracted debates way in excess of their safety
2 significance.

3 And that is caused by the green/white
4 threshold and how we communicate those on the web
5 page, and the initial framing of the process did not
6 -- would have thought that, you know, the occasional
7 white or whites would be not nearly as impactful as
8 what they turned out to be in practice.

9 MEMBER REYNOLDS: But the threshold itself
10 didn't cause the misunderstanding. It's how well it
11 was communicated or how poorly it was communicated and
12 explained.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right.

14 MEMBER REYNOLDS: The threshold itself had
15 little to do with a misunderstanding. It was, in
16 fact, how well it was communicated.

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right. And I would agree
18 with that. I mean, that's what that debate was about.

19 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I don't -- it just
20 struck me that that was -- if it was up to me, I would
21 delete that sentence or rewrite it.

22 MEMBER FERDIG: Is there another example
23 that would be better?

24 MEMBER GARCHOW: We've already had the
25 green/white threshold issue.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's already in, yes,
2 so it's --

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: So I would say just
4 eliminate this whole -- it doesn't help this
5 particular one.

6 MEMBER SHADIS: You want to eliminate that
7 sentence that starts, "The panel"?

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes. Right.

9 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Because we've had
11 green/white thresholds.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. When we were
13 putting this together -- just as a philosophical note
14 -- we were debating whether we needed a transition --
15 you know, this first paragraph is what we had talked
16 about last time to try to capture some of the positive
17 comments in each of these areas, and then go into the
18 issues that we had. And whether we needed a
19 transition sentence there or not, I mean, it's really
20 more writing style, did we need that or not? Just to
21 transition to the issues.

22 That's what we were intending to do in
23 some of those sentences, but, you know, I think in
24 some cases it does only highlight one of the issues
25 out of five, and it's -- it may be not the best way --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 best thing to do. So I'd just highlight that one, and
2 we have five issues. We'll just take that out. Okay.

3 Back to P-1, issues with P-1? Consensus
4 with that? P-2? One of the things I noted myself
5 when I went back and read this, I think it captures
6 the thought under the issue description, but in the
7 end I wasn't sure what we were saying, whether it was
8 good or bad or what the issues are. I'm not sure that
9 came through clearly.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: This is one of the
11 biggest industry issues, the whole unavailability time
12 and --

13 MEMBER FLOYD: No, this is not so much
14 that. This is --

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: This is more the issue
16 that these aren't the perfect set of performance
17 indicators. This is what we started with. Let's
18 continue to work to do better and find better
19 performance indicators. I think is that -- is this
20 the issue?

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. Specifically, the
22 securities ones are not risk-informed, because when
23 you have a piece of equipment that goes down, so
24 there's really no degradation --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: I missed the transition.
2 I thought we were still on P-1.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. This is P-2. But
4 if you read through the description, in the end I
5 think you're still asked, you know, are we saying this
6 -- I mean, what are we saying the problem is? That's
7 -- I'm not sure that's clearly articulated there.

8 MEMBER FLOYD: I thought it was reasonably
9 clear.

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: You think it's okay?

11 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. That there are some
12 PIs that are not risk-informed. You should try to
13 make them risk-informed if you can, but don't throw
14 them out just because they're not, because they serve
15 some other purpose perhaps.

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. So leave it as is?
17 Okay. P-3?

18 MEMBER BLOUGH: I'm sorry. On P-2, under
19 the caution where the performance indicator may
20 provide useful information for enhancing public
21 confidence, that's not really the only reason. It may
22 be that, you know, it's just -- it's an area we know
23 that we should be looking, either through inspection
24 and a PI -- the PI may not be risk-informed -- that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 identifies outliers or identifies program issues, and
2 what not. So --

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Shall we say "useful
4 that supports another agency goal"? I mean, rather
5 than just highlighting this one goal. Is that what
6 you're saying? It could impact other goals.

7 MEMBER BLOUGH: That's what's bothering
8 me. It's not just the public confidence. It's --

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: There could be other
10 ones.

11 MEMBER BLOUGH: There could be others as
12 well. Yes.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: How do you want to say
14 that?

15 MEMBER GARCHOW: Want to add "and other
16 agency goals"?

17 MEMBER BLOUGH: It could really even be
18 supporting safety. Even though the PI itself isn't
19 risk-informed, the fact that you have an indicator in
20 that area and it causes, you know -- it causes
21 outliers to be identified and make some improvements,
22 there is an indirect positive impact on safety by
23 having it.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: You had a suggestion,
25 Ray?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: You could say, "The
2 performance indicator may provide information useful
3 for other purposes," parentheses, and then give a
4 couple of examples, "e.g. public confidence,
5 programmatic performance," etcetera.

6 MEMBER SHADIS: That's good. I think
7 Steve's got it.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. P-3? This is
9 unavailability. Okay? Anything?

10 MEMBER FLOYD: I think we hammered that
11 one pretty well last time.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: P-4? Actually, we did
13 -- we talked a little bit about P-4 earlier. This is
14 the FAQs just specifically related to the performance
15 indicators.

16 MEMBER FLOYD: I can now report that
17 Rev. 1 has been approved by the staff, and so it's
18 gone to publication, so --

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And this is one of those
20 ones I think we had talked about earlier. It was on
21 the edge of whether we want to continue to keep it,
22 since action was being addressed. But I think this
23 was broad enough to say, you know, this is just the
24 first revision, to continue the process that we ought
25 to include it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Right. Yes, we already
2 have another backlog of about 30 or 40 FAQs, so --

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. So just to
4 reinforce that process, I think we did --

5 MR. CAMERON: I just wanted to raise a
6 point of information here. This is not the first time
7 that we -- we use the term "stakeholders," and then in
8 the next sentence we identify a particular type of
9 stakeholder -- that is, licensees. And the
10 implication is is that the use of the term
11 "stakeholder" is broader -- a broader group of
12 stakeholders than just licensees.

13 And I guess I'm sensitive to this in the
14 frequently asked questions area, because of some
15 comments that we heard from a former panel member, and
16 in some presentations about how responsive the staff
17 was to public stakeholders in terms of frequently
18 asked questions. And I guess I'm just putting it on
19 the table to see if there's any clarification
20 necessary, is it a problem in any way.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, that's what we
22 tried to capture --

23 MEMBER FLOYD: That's O-1.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: -- in O-1, and that's
25 why that example -- the frequently asked question that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we talked about earlier is in there, is that that
2 approach, you know, should be looked at for other
3 parts of the program, because this I think
4 specifically just had to do with the performance
5 indicator program.

6 MR. CAMERON: All right.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Even though that was --
8 that information was made publicly available, I think
9 the comments we had were other -- other questions not
10 related to PIs that had come up weren't handled the
11 same way, and they weren't as, you know, publicly
12 available and it wasn't easy to retrieve, and that's
13 why we have this comment in O-1.

14 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Good. I just was
15 concerned just with insulating the panel from -- from
16 criticism of its final report because something wasn't
17 addressed. But apparently you've addressed it
18 earlier.

19 MEMBER SHADIS: That was an issue in part
20 that I brought up at our last meeting, was that the
21 report itself didn't reflect -- in the language didn't
22 reflect input from stakeholders other than NRC staff
23 and industry. And I -- but I see, in fact, in the
24 body that it does reflect, at least at some places,
25 input from the public's advocate-type stakeholders.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 But, again, it's missing in the language.
2 You know what I mean? It's not openly identified as
3 coming from the public stakeholder, activist, or
4 whatever it may be. And, frankly, it doesn't bother
5 me all that much.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I was going to ask you
7 if we need to do more to do that. I mean, as far as
8 specific -- you know, in a lot of cases I purposely
9 didn't try to state exactly where the comments came
10 from. And a lot of times they didn't come from just
11 one person.

12 It was, you know, similar comments from a
13 different -- so a lot of times I just used -- tried to
14 use the word "stakeholders," because it came from
15 multiple groups, the comment. And it wasn't as
16 explicit to say exactly where those comments came
17 from.

18 MEMBER SHADIS: I think you would be
19 better served if, you know, public stakeholders or
20 something was at some point at least referenced, that,
21 you know, with -- you are trying to address the --

22 MR. CAMERON: I think everybody
23 understands the practical difficulties of trying to
24 identify where specific comments came from. But I
25 think that at a minimum what you might do is when

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you're reading the language, see if it implies if
2 stakeholders is being used as a code term for
3 responsiveness to the industry, rather than
4 responsiveness to a broad group of stakeholders.

5 MEMBER FERDIG: I had included some of
6 that in my editorial comments, that I think can be
7 emphasized in the executive summary part perhaps to
8 set the context for that as well.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Because the problem I
10 was having, a lot of times the comments we did get
11 from public stakeholders, we got the same comment from
12 everyone.

13 MEMBER FERDIG: Right. And to that
14 extent, you don't want to distinguish. Exactly.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And just to highlight
16 theirs, yes, it was difficult. Okay? Anything else
17 on P-4?

18 Okay. Inspection. And, again, just to go
19 back on what we did the first time, this last sentence
20 in the overview section was just a lead-in to
21 highlight one of the issues. Actually, it was the
22 only priority one in the inspection. That's why I had
23 that one in there, but we could take out that.
24 There's really no need to highlight one -- take that
25 last sentence off.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REYNOLDS: The last sentence seems
2 out of place.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

4 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Either ought to have a
5 space between it or not be there, one or the other.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It was meant to sort of
7 be a transition, but I think we didn't succeed in
8 that. Just take that out.

9 Well, I think now that I've looked at it
10 -- and we can look at the other ones -- I think it's
11 -- the transition is really not needed I think the way
12 we have it laid out.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: I would agree.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Anything on the overview
15 of inspection?

16 Okay. I-1, baseline inspection.

17 MEMBER LAURIE: The first sentence in the
18 lead-in paragraph under "Inspection" -- John, if you
19 can go back to the first sentence. "The new
20 inspection process has been effective in focusing
21 NRC's inspection efforts." Do you have to say on
22 what? Or is that clear to all readers what that
23 means? It's clear to me because I've read it, and I
24 understand the issues. Would that be --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: I guess it would be "in
2 improving the safety focus of the NRC's inspection
3 efforts" was the objective anyway.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. So we can say
5 that?

6 MEMBER HILL: You've got a suggestion up
7 there -- areas more important to risk and safety.

8 MEMBER LAURIE: Okay. Thank you.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. I-1? Okay. Any
10 comments on that? I-2, inspection report threshold.

11 MEMBER TRAPP: This might not be the right
12 time, Loren, but are we going to -- like I-1, can we
13 make that a priority one, so the important things come
14 first, or is that --

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. I was going to
16 suggest that at the end, resort, but when -- I was
17 going to do it before I sent it out, but I thought it
18 would confuse everyone, because I'd have to renumber
19 everything. So I thought for the purposes of this
20 meeting, keep the numbers the same and then I'll
21 resort, put the priority ones first in each section.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: Then we have consensus on
23 that or -- that seems to make sense. So you're just
24 saying that in each section the priority ones come
25 first?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes, that seems to make
2 sense. Yes, because we had some more discussions on
3 combination, so I wanted to get through all of that
4 before I resorted.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: Mostly in the ones we
6 hadn't reviewed yet.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Okay. I-2,
8 comments or questions?

9 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I have one on the last
10 paragraph before the panel recommendation, so it's on
11 Manual Chapter 2515 -- 1, 2, 3, 4 lines down on the
12 right-hand side it says, "Inspection -- under non-
13 regulatory observations" -- I think a lot of our --
14 it's not non-regulatory, it's just below the report
15 threshold. There's a lot of minor violations that are
16 reported and other observations, still within -- it's
17 just below the report threshold.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: I'd just take "non-
19 regulatory" off and just leave it at "observations."
20 Yes.

21 MEMBER GARCHOW: We're giving -- I would
22 say we're getting observations that are valuable that
23 aren't in that category as well. But I would want to
24 stop there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Good. Anything
2 else on I-2? I-3, physical protection. I did add one
3 new reference that -- in between our meetings there
4 was the -- and this was just a reference to the SECY
5 paper that we knew that this discussion was happening,
6 and there was a document that I could reference that
7 has that proposal.

8 Okay. Anything else on I-3? Okay. I-4?
9 I think in the original e-mail I sent out with the
10 issue sheets I had recommended we delete this one.
11 Since the issue has been raised, the new Management
12 Directive has been issued, and it -- I took a look at
13 it myself, and it looks like it addresses the issues
14 that we had.

15 I think most of these issues came up -- I
16 know Ken and I had some issues early on on -- there
17 was some confusion on how certain kinds of issues and
18 conditions would be handled, and that has been
19 clarified, because the original Management Directive
20 was just focused on events, and then we had some
21 actual conditions -- the Summer pipe crack issue. And
22 then the Cooper equipment qualification issue didn't
23 seem to fit very well, and that has been addressed in
24 the newest revision. So it can handle those kinds of
25 issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: So it's now in the
2 process formally?

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. And it was issued
4 on March 27th.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: So our corrective action
6 was done before the report was --

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. That's why I was
8 going to recommend we take it out, because what we're
9 recommending to have done is done. Okay?

10 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Unless you wanted to
11 keep it in there and say it's already been done. I
12 mean, because it was a recommendation.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Well, what I did
14 is, there's a number of things we've already taken
15 out, and I was trying to be consistent. I did put a
16 section I think in the executive summary, or maybe it
17 was in the front discussion that said, there were a
18 lot of issues that came up that we had early on that
19 have been addressed, and we didn't include those in
20 the report, because we had some issues -- I think
21 there were some enforcement issues, too, that we took
22 out.

23 Okay. I-5? No comments, issues? Okay.
24 Significance Determination Process. This one I expect
25 we'll have some discussion on, because this didn't get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the same scrub the other ones have in the previous
2 meeting, so --

3 MEMBER FLOYD: I've got a fairly extensive
4 recommendation to make. It sounds extensive; it may
5 not be that extensive. But I would almost recommend
6 that you combine S-1, S-3, and S-4 into the same
7 issue, because it's all related to the unavailability
8 largely of the worksheets, which have made the process
9 ineffective, difficult to communicate to the public,
10 and questions the quality of the NRC PRA tools.

11 I think you could easily roll all of those
12 three into one. With the addition in item number 1,
13 I didn't see Dave Lochbaum's comment, I think it was,
14 or maybe it was Ray's, about it was difficult to
15 always get to the conclusions or get to the logic that
16 resulted in an SDP conclusion and the inspection
17 report. And that needed to be more clearly
18 identified.

19 MEMBER KRICH: I had the same comment.

20 MEMBER HILL: I thought that was in here.
21 I thought this -- this sentence which says,
22 "Stakeholders have also observed the communication of
23 the basis for the final risk significance.
24 Determination is not clear to all inspection" --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: That's what I tried to
2 capture.

3 MEMBER HILL: It does not provide
4 sufficient information.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: I missed it somehow when I
6 red it. Thank you.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. That's what I was
8 trying to communicate there.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: So, Steve, your premise
10 would be that -- that if we had the worksheets done,
11 and they were available as -- in the process for the
12 stakeholders to see and utilize, and then referenced
13 in the reports, that --

14 MEMBER FLOYD: And the staff.

15 MEMBER GARCHOW: -- to get to this
16 determination, we use this -- this level 2 worksheet,
17 then all of this would be tied together.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Right.

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: Is that your premise?

20 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, that was my premise.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. There is linkage
22 between the timeliness and the problems and the lack
23 of the phase 2 worksheets.

24 MEMBER FLOYD: And I think also the
25 quality of NRC PRA tools is an issue, if you had

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 validated phase 2 worksheets where there was agreement
2 between the licensee and the NRC that the phase 2
3 worksheets were representative of their plant, then
4 you could probably reduce the amount of communication
5 that goes on.

6 And then you could put more reliance on
7 the NRC tools I think and get rid of, to some extent,
8 the public issue that the NRC is going to default to
9 use the licensees' tools because they don't have
10 adequate tools. That's my supposition.

11 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I like that. In fact,
12 they stand out as three separate issues. I mean,
13 they're related. But I think it's important to
14 highlight the importance of these and have them as
15 three separate issues. We may want to --

16 MEMBER FERDIG: Group them together.

17 MEMBER REYNOLDS: -- the fire protection
18 one behind it, so you --

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

20 MEMBER REYNOLDS: But I think it's
21 important to say -- to point out the phase 2
22 worksheets are not out there yet, and that the other
23 risk -- quality of the risk -- it needs to be there,
24 and the process of communicating. They're related,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 but they're also separate and distinct, and I think
2 haven't been pointed out in the original report.

3 MEMBER TRAPP: We're putting a lot of eggs
4 in the worksheet basket, because it's the part that's
5 unknown and we're saying, "Well, everything is going
6 to be fixed when we get these worksheets." I think
7 those that are here now are going to be -- won't be
8 disappointed.

9 MEMBER FLOYD: Really?

10 MEMBER TRAPP: Yes. I mean, the
11 worksheets are going to be applicable to maybe half of
12 what we review. A lot of the things that Lochbaum
13 gave us as examples were green findings that came out
14 of phase 1. He's saying he doesn't understand how we
15 got the risk assessment.

16 So if we had the worksheets, it's not
17 going to make any difference. You know, and the
18 number of things that we're actually going to use
19 those worksheets for is, you know, a couple of months
20 maybe.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And I think there are
22 some examples on this PRA tool issue that were really
23 phase 3 analysis issues.

24 MEMBER TRAPP: And we're always -- you
25 know, even when we get a white with the worksheets,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you know we're going to phase 3. You know, somebody
2 within the licensee's organization is going to
3 exercise their model. So a lot of times when we hit
4 phase 2 with those worksheets it isn't going to end
5 there anyway. You know, we're --

6 MEMBER REYNOLDS: And the other PRA tools
7 -- I mean, like for event response, we don't use the
8 worksheets. We use other risk tools.

9 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. But I think this
10 whole section was directly related to SDP.

11 MEMBER REYNOLDS: S-4 is talking about the
12 -- talks about quality of all areas.

13 MEMBER FLOYD: But I think it was intended
14 to be limited to the quality of PRA tools in an SDP
15 application.

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And what they use for
17 phase 3, I think was what the intention was.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes.

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And maybe it's not that
20 clear.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Because we have event
22 response somewhere else. Or maybe just talk about it.

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: So is the consensus that
24 we keep the three separate?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: That's fine. I can live
2 with that.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Just for clarity.

4 MEMBER FLOYD: Sure.

5 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I mean, even -- there is
6 some linkage, and maybe we can look at the words and
7 -- I did try to do that I think in the phase 2
8 discussion, that that is related to some of the
9 timeliness issues that are discussed in S-1.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: You might be able to weed
11 that story -- this might be the best use of your
12 preamble paragraph, to sort of set the stage on how
13 some of these are linked together before you separate
14 them into the individual discussions of S-1, S-2, S-3.
15 So there might be an opportunity for you to add a
16 couple of sentences above S-1 to explain how some of
17 these are linked.

18 MEMBER FERDIG: Help me with a question
19 about contextual meaning. I wasn't quite sure, just
20 because I'm obviously not clear on the technical
21 implications, but it does relate to the question Dave
22 Lochbaum raised about the perception of the -- what he
23 was characterizing I felt negatively as the
24 negotiation that occurs behind the scenes, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 changes what seems to be the case to what actually it
2 turns out.

3 Does this or the combination of these
4 three impact that perception, or does that show up in
5 another place? It's the idea of making information
6 available that helps the public reader understand the
7 logic, and I want to preserve the opportunity for the
8 conversations that occur between the regulator and the
9 licensee for getting smarter as they're going through
10 that process and understanding each other's
11 perspective in a way that does not appear to the
12 public stakeholder as compromise or negotiation.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: All right. Well, the
14 thought about the negotiation we should try to capture
15 in this second paragraph under S-1.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay. So is everybody
17 comfortable that that is -- that this will do that,
18 based on your understanding? That's all I wanted to
19 know.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. We tried to
21 capture what factually does, I mean, occur. I mean,
22 there is an interaction that does occur, and then how
23 that's being perceived and viewed.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: And the information that's
2 available to -- then, to the reader who might have a
3 question about the --

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right. Yes. Well, I
5 think the point at the end is that that needs to be
6 addressed.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: I need some education, and
8 maybe Jim can help. I think the understanding that
9 I've had in the meetings that we've been having with
10 the staff periodically on this issue is is that once
11 the phase 2 worksheets are -- come out, and they are
12 validated between the licensee and the staff, the only
13 time the phase 3 is really used is to -- not to argue
14 the numbers or the outcomes of the phase 2 worksheets,
15 but to see if there were some deficiencies in the
16 phase 2 approach that needed to be accommodated.

17 But you should still, after that
18 discussion is all over, be able to use the phase 2
19 worksheet to appropriately characterize and show the
20 linkage as to how the finding was, the way it -- why
21 the finding was what it was.

22 Do I have a misunderstanding of that or --

23 MEMBER TRAPP: That's a utopia view of --

24 MEMBER FLOYD: Utopia view. Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER TRAPP: The fact is is they've had
2 to make them very conservative screens so that we're
3 not missing things. So there's going to be a lot of
4 things where the worksheets will come up with a white
5 finding that then the licensees are going to be
6 willing to challenge because of the conservative
7 assumptions. So that's going to be one subset.

8 Another subset, from our point of view, is
9 we're going to come up with green next to whites,
10 where we know if we throw external events into the mix
11 it would probably be a white finding. So that's going
12 to be another phase 3. And they also don't work for
13 any system where you have a support system that has a
14 common -- you know, like two service water pumps
15 feeding into a common header. So there's going to be
16 all those type of issues.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

18 MEMBER TRAPP: So --

19 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

20 MEMBER TRAPP: -- I mean, we don't know
21 until we get there, but, you know, just guessing is is
22 that we're probably going to hit phase 3 on a large
23 percentage of the worksheet.

24 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay. Even after the
25 phase 2s are out and validated.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER TRAPP: Right. Because --

2 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

3 MEMBER TRAPP: Yes.

4 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

5 MEMBER TRAPP: I mean, that's just an
6 opinion. We don't know until we get there, but --

7 MEMBER FLOYD: Would the SPAR models
8 improve that? The SPAR 3-Is, when they're complete?
9 I guess they've got, what, about 23 of the 60 or so
10 out right now?

11 MEMBER TRAPP: Yes.

12 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, 63 I guess --

13 MEMBER TRAPP: You know, but now you're
14 kind of back into phase 3 space.

15 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

16 MEMBER TRAPP: That's our --

17 MEMBER FLOYD: I'm sorry to belabor this,
18 but is this where the agency you think is ultimately
19 headed, is maybe to do away with the phase 2
20 worksheets and go to the SPAR 3-I versions once
21 they're ready?

22 MEMBER TRAPP: I think that --

23 MEMBER FLOYD: Have you? Okay.

24 MEMBER SHADIS: I think this is -- this
25 conversation you two had just now is a good

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 illustration of the difficulty that's inherent in the
2 program in communicating how it works to the public.

3 I mean, you're talking about educating the
4 public, and, you know, people who are -- should be as
5 knowledgeable as anyone could possibly be are still
6 tossing a lot of variables around as far as, you know,
7 the ultimate determination of risk, which is what the
8 public is interested in. So good luck.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: But the ultimate
10 determination of risk isn't going to be throwing, you
11 know, inputs into a machine and then looking for an
12 outcome. The whole purpose of the SDP process
13 actually was to use it as an input, not as a
14 definitive output. And in that is that challenge of
15 how you have the intellectual exercise of using it as
16 an input in a way that's transparent to the public,
17 where they can see how that happens.

18 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. I had the
19 opportunity to address a breakout session at the
20 regulatory information conference on this. And I
21 tried to make the point -- and I didn't very well --
22 that, you know, simplicity ought to be a goal, and
23 that it's not just simplicity in the sense of avoiding
24 the technicalities and, you know, the subtle
25 ramifications. It's simplicity as -- as a thing that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 is sophisticated in describing what you're about. And
2 it doesn't seem like it's going in that direction,
3 particularly.

4 MEMBER TRAPP: You know, very complex
5 tools, very complex machines, and, in my opinion,
6 you're never going to get simplicity if you want the
7 right answer.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: That I agree with
9 wholeheartedly. And from a public point of view, I
10 think we need -- that's part of coming back to the
11 information and the education. As a public, we need
12 to understand the complexity of this process, and we
13 do not -- we need to not demand simplicity when in
14 doing so we are suggesting that the interaction that
15 has to occur to emerge to the right answer can't
16 occur.

17 And I don't want to have anywhere in this
18 recommendation to suggest that we're wanting to
19 shortcut that kind of interaction that has to occur
20 from clear understanding among the technical experts
21 who need to make those decisions.

22 MEMBER SHADIS: I don't want to start a
23 whole conversation.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: But the point we're
25 trying to address in this is -- is, in the end, we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 need to be able to communicate what decision was made
2 and what it was based on.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: And why.

4 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, and -- and as long
5 as you have as many variables in there as you do, not
6 only variables in the program, built-in variables, but
7 variables in perception, with NRC staff from one end
8 of the agency to the other, and differences in
9 perception between the industry and the NRC. You're
10 going to have an almost impossible job of doing it.

11 And, again, I just -- simplifying things
12 should not be confused with a lack of sophistication,
13 nor should it be confused with shortcutting. We've
14 already, you know, had plenty of shortcutting. We
15 don't -- that's not what is at issue.

16 But David before mentioned that -- the
17 OSHA horse, you know, and the more parts and pieces
18 you add to try to cover all of the bases, the more
19 unwieldy the thing becomes.

20 And sometimes there are ways of discerning
21 a clear path through things, and I think that, you
22 know -- and I'm sure it's not going to get reflected
23 in this document, but I think that that ought to be a
24 goal as the program is refined, to not pile stuff on
25 like what -- TMI action requirements or something, not

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 stack it up, but actually look for ways to -- to make
2 it more discerning. So that -- that's where I am with
3 that.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And I think from the
5 staff perspective, I mean, I -- our goal is the same.
6 I think we do want to simplify the process. And,
7 really, to put more in the hands of the inspectors, so
8 they can, in a timely manner, you know, make these
9 calls and move on, you know, and save the much more
10 complicated issues, you know, for the Senior Reactor
11 Analysts I think is -- is one of our goals.

12 And that's why we've been working on this
13 phase 2 worksheet, to try to help simplify the process
14 and make it where we can move it one level down and
15 have the inspector, you know, get the facts and
16 disposition the issue and move on in a timely manner.

17 MEMBER SHADIS: And I think that if you
18 look at it long enough, and it -- the notion of
19 discretion becomes acceptable. That there is
20 discretion in the background on all of this, and it
21 ought to be made clear that findings are not -- you
22 don't often have a clear, you know, line defining
23 these things, that you do have to at some point rely
24 on discretion.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right. And that's -- I
2 mean, the risk-informed versus risk-based I guess is
3 the argument. I think a number of us on the staff
4 have been concerned that we've gotten too -- we're
5 moving too far to the risk-based, and that's what has
6 affected the timeliness and made the issues more
7 complicated rather than, you know -- I mean, there are
8 uncertainties in bands, and there is some judgment
9 involved in making those calls.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: But it loops back around
11 to -- I mean, you peel the onion back. If we weren't
12 -- if we hadn't created a situation where, you know,
13 "white is undesirable," then you don't get into, you
14 know, 500 inspector manhours and utility personnel
15 debating the finer points of some risk impact, just to
16 determine whether the NRC may, in the next quarter,
17 come look at an area to see what the corrective
18 actions are. It just doesn't make sense.

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: And that's the outfall of
20 what's happened as an undesirable consequence of the
21 overreactions to whites, which never was at least in
22 the intention of the program design.

23 Now, you get into the yellows, well, then,
24 you would have expected to be exercising all of the
25 information the NRC would have available from its

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 models and engaging the licensee, and truly
2 understanding what is the risk. But we've created a
3 situation where we're engaging to that level on
4 whites.

5 MEMBER TRAPP: I think we have the poster
6 child for that issue ongoing, continuing on.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MEMBER KRICH: Let me go back a second.
9 I think your statement about the ultimate objective is
10 to make sure that the inspection report has a clear
11 discussion of what was the result and what was the
12 basis for that, and there was a --

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Well, that's
14 addressed previously in Dave Lochbaum's comment about
15 the -- I mean, there is a need, and I think we all
16 agree with it, that it's got to be clear, you know,
17 what -- what was the basis of the decision. And to
18 the point where someone can reconstruct how we got to
19 that answer.

20 MEMBER KRICH: Or at least understand it.
21 I think Dave made some good points in his presentation
22 where he showed -- gave some examples of inspection
23 reports where you couldn't figure out how they reached
24 the conclusion, and he gave an example of where you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 could. And my comment, I thought those were -- I
2 thought that was pretty good discussion.

3 I didn't -- I thought the recommendations
4 -- panel recommendations -- should reflect that, and
5 I didn't think it did as clearly as it could.

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: So what would you
7 propose?

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Do you want me to read
9 it? I have --

10 MEMBER KRICH: Go ahead.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: He faxed a comment
12 yesterday that what it would say was, "These lessons
13 learned from the initial implementation, that the
14 reactor oversight process, to improve the process for
15 determining the risk characterization of an issue so
16 that it is expedient, scrutable, and understandable to
17 all stakeholders." Is that the one?

18 MEMBER KRICH: Those aren't my comments.
19 That's pretty good. That's close.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Take credit for it.

21 MEMBER KRICH: No. I won't take credit
22 for what's not mine.

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And that does highlight
24 that issue that we were talking about, making sure
25 what's --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: Would that replace other
2 language in here, or is that simply added?

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It would replace this
4 kind of generic words about evaluating, communicating,
5 significant determination process conclusions in a
6 timely and open manner.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: Would you read it again,
8 Loren, please?

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. I'll read the
10 whole sentence. "Use lessons learned from the initial
11 implementation of the reactor oversight process to
12 improve the process for determining the risk
13 characterization of an issue, so that it is expedient,
14 scrutable, and understandable to all stakeholders."

15 MEMBER GARCHOW: That works.

16 MR. MONNINGER: Expedient, scrutable, and
17 what else?

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And understandable to
19 all stakeholders.

20 MEMBER FERDIG: And that fact -- it won't
21 inhibit the exchange that occurs at those stages,
22 right?

23 MEMBER KRICH: That was the other part of
24 it is he didn't want -- also did not want to inhibit
25 the exchange that goes on between the licensee --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: Right.

2 MEMBER KRICH: -- and the senior risk
3 analyst.

4 MEMBER FERDIG: And I don't know how -- I
5 guess I'm just asking a question, is that --

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Actually, it came from
7 Jim Moorman.

8 MEMBER KRICH: There you go.

9 MR. CAMERON: Is that "expediate"? Is
10 that -- expedite, isn't it? Is that what you mean?

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: He said expedient.

12 MR. CAMERON: Oh, okay.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: The lack of timeliness
14 has an impact on public confidence, based on some of
15 the --

16 MEMBER KRICH: Right. And that's to
17 address the time factor that was raised in the
18 discussion of the issue, where things dragged on for
19 -- I think that's appropriate.

20 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay.

21 MEMBER KRICH: Moorman is obviously a
22 great thinker, since he had the same comment.

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: And he has the same
24 modesty, too.

25 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Anything else on
2 S-1?

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: So now that we've changed
4 S-1 like we've changed it a little bit, and when we
5 read through here some of Steve's opening comments
6 sort of make sense. At least a lot of elements of
7 some of these ongoing ones, that we're just saying the
8 same thing in a different way.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's okay. If it
10 makes -- I can live with it. If it makes sense to
11 call it out as a separate issue, but have a similar
12 recommendation, that's all right.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay.

14 MEMBER BLOUGH: I have comments on the
15 preamble.

16 (Laughter.)

17 The --

18 MEMBER FERDIG: Too late.

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: Too late. Yes. I don't
20 think the preamble captures the labor that -- you
21 know, the SDP as part of the process that still has
22 the most -- is the most incomplete. In fact, to the
23 contrary, where we say in the middle of this preamble,
24 "The benefits associated with using an SDP to place
25 all inspection findings in a risk-informed context,"

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that implies that we can do that, and we can't even do
2 that yet.

3 So I would just -- the flavor that's in I
4 guess S-3 and S-7, about the fact that it's really not
5 -- the tool is not complete yet, I think needs to be
6 -- I'm not sure what the purpose of the preamble is,
7 but I think it needs to be reflected.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Based on our last
9 meeting, it was really intended to capture the
10 positive attributes of that part of the program,
11 because the bulk of the report is about the problems.
12 And as we discussed last time, that's what we're
13 trying to do, is we went back and looked at everyone's
14 positive comments and tried to capture -- okay, here
15 are some positive things about the program. But here
16 are all the problems.

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: I hadn't picked that up.

18 MEMBER FERDIG: I hadn't either.

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: I hadn't picked that up
20 until he just said it. I'm reading these preambles a
21 little differently now.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. We were trying to
23 provide some balance that -- you know, especially in
24 some cases there were, you know, a lot of positive
25 attributes, and they weren't really captured anywhere

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 in the report. So that's why we're trying to -- I
2 mean, they're brief, they're summaries.

3 MEMBER BROCKMAN: It brings a format
4 question up. I mean, we've been eliminating a lot of
5 the ones at the end of these paragraphs. Should we
6 maybe under each one of these things follow that lead-
7 in paragraph -- now the positive attributes, and
8 then --

9 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes. I think you need to
10 make it more explicit.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, actually, I think
12 I have a discussion in the front that says what this
13 is.

14 MEMBER FERDIG: How you say that.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: On this one, then, I'd
16 suggest redoing the last two sentences.

17 MEMBER BLOUGH: But the other preambles
18 tend to have some balance in them as well, in the
19 preamble itself. I mean, it's -- I don't think all of
20 the preambles are all positive.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: No. I think we just
22 started on the last half a dozen taking out the
23 negatives and thought that we were going to go back
24 and take a look at them.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The last two we took out
2 the transition sentence.

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: That could be the habit,
4 right? There is a writing on what the "however,"
5 comma, just --

6 MEMBER FERDIG: Can't help it.

7 MEMBER TRAPP: In the preamble, the last
8 part of the last sentence, that is challenging public
9 confidence as much as it's enhancing it. I guess I'd
10 remove that part and just keep it to the facts, in
11 that it's highly complex and time-consuming, because
12 I don't think we really have any basis to say that
13 it's challenging public confidence as much as it's
14 enhancing it. I don't know what that balance is, but
15 I would suspect it's enhancing it more.

16 MEMBER BROCKMAN: With all of the feedback
17 and everything that we've heard from states and
18 everything else, that I really think support this
19 statement greatly, I can probably take it out. But I
20 believe fully we have gotten enough information to
21 justify that statement.

22 MEMBER FERDIG: Or at least --

23 MEMBER BROCKMAN: If we're not going to
24 put it in here because we're listing the positives,
25 I'll live with that fully. But, I mean, we've gotten

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a whole lot of information. Just because I don't have
2 an equation to come up with it, I think it's a true
3 statement.

4 MEMBER BLOUGH: It suggests that you have
5 a meter or a way of balancing it, though.

6 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes.

7 MEMBER BLOUGH: That we really don't have.

8 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. I agree that it's
9 challenging public confidence, but I don't know if
10 it's challenging as much or more than it's enhancing
11 it.

12 MEMBER TRAPP: Just say it's challenging.

13 MEMBER BROCKMAN: I think with what we're
14 trying to do, delete the whole thing, because we're
15 listing the positives.

16 MEMBER SHADIS: The contrast -- it's a
17 challenge to public confidence. It is.

18 MEMBER FERDIG: I think it makes sense for
19 the preamble to hold something of a transitional
20 summary into what is to follow. And to that extent,
21 just for a writing objective. And I think that for it
22 to contain some examples of what has been positive
23 about the significant determination process could
24 include that, and I think it could also include some

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 summary transition, then, into -- I think to try to
2 keep it just positive reads weird.

3 So it can be the place where you include
4 that, but then you can transition into some of what
5 you're saying. But what I'm agreeing with is that you
6 not overstate, as is the case here, and you qualify
7 it. That it may hold the potential for challenging
8 public confidence as much as enhancing it, but to say
9 that it does is an overstatement.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think we need to either
11 wordsmith this to make it work or we eliminate it. I
12 mean, it's -- it doesn't quite work.

13 MEMBER FLOYD: I think we need to really
14 decide which way we're going to, because we've just
15 deleted some of those transitional phrases from
16 several previous ones. I guess my preference would be
17 to keep this opening fairly positive about, you know,
18 what we think the positive aspects are and leave the
19 issues as what we see as the major challenges,
20 because, actually, both of these thoughts that are in
21 these last two sentences are actually captured in the
22 issues.

23 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay. I can agree with
24 that, then. Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, public confidence, I
2 think that's really -- that is in this one --

3 MEMBER FERDIG: So we're going to call it
4 a positive attribute, then.

5 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I would say something
6 like that, because that's what it is. There's no
7 problem with stating a fact.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: It needs to be clear.

9 MEMBER REYNOLDS: And if it's clear to
10 state it every time -- we did it early on, and we
11 forgot it already.

12 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think that for the
13 reader, I think there's a -- I mean, ethics may be too
14 strong of a word, but I think we're -- we want to be
15 perfectly clear that we did an evaluation, we found
16 the positives, we found the issues. We're using the
17 cover letter to sort of provide the balance of saying,
18 you know, that the -- which are the issues and which
19 are the positives.

20 We're saying move forward with the
21 program. It sort of tells you that the positives must
22 have outweighed the issues. I think in the body of
23 the report I think you have to call that out.

24 MEMBER HILL: I guess my problem with
25 putting positives specifically here is we didn't go

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out and try and address all of the positives. This
2 isn't an accumulation of positives. These are some
3 things that kind of came up. So I think it's
4 misleading that that's all the positives there are, if
5 you state, "Here are the positives."

6 MEMBER REYNOLDS: What would you call
7 them, then?

8 MEMBER HILL: I wouldn't specifically --
9 I wouldn't do anything more than what we've done up
10 there. It was addressed earlier on. You know, we
11 addressed some of the positive comments that came up,
12 but our -- our challenge wasn't to go out and identify
13 all of the positives there are. So --

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: That would make another
15 assumption in the reader that isn't true.

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I'm trying to go back
17 and look at the words that we used in here. Yes.
18 It's under -- the third paragraph under "Panel
19 Conclusions and Recommendations." It says, "And
20 though the panel" -- page 2. "Though the panel
21 focused its efforts on discussing the areas needing
22 improvement, they noted many positive attributes and
23 outcomes. We have included some key positive comments
24 in the introductory comments associated with each
25 program element."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: That works.

2 MR. CAMERON: I think that was Mary's
3 recommendation.

4 MEMBER FERDIG: And I understand that it's
5 like how things -- you can say it once, but that
6 doesn't mean that it gets carried into the reader's
7 perception and to identify a label -- a section as
8 positive attributes.

9 MEMBER HILL: But if you look at the
10 words, most of those words -- I mean, you know, you're
11 going to see them positive. You're not going to see
12 them as a negative.

13 MEMBER FERDIG: Right. It's a toss-up.

14 MEMBER FLOYD: Limited positive comments.
15 (Laughter.)

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Steve, you usually come
17 through with the words we --

18 (Laughter.)

19 MEMBER FERDIG: Examples. Examples of
20 positive attributes.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I'll just suggest,
22 why don't we come back. We've got a couple more
23 sections, and we'll see how those read. And then
24 we'll come back and revisit that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MONNINGER: Did you reach an agreement
2 on deleting those last two sentences that are in bold
3 up there?

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: I'm comfortable deleting
5 them.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. I think to be
7 consistent with what we've done in the last two
8 sections, the one concern --

9 MEMBER SHADIS: That's not reason enough
10 to throw them out.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

12 MEMBER SHADIS: To provide, you know,
13 symmetry to your format.

14 MEMBER HILL: They are addressed in the
15 issues, though.

16 MEMBER SHADIS: People need to be assured
17 of that.

18 MEMBER HILL: It may be. But those were
19 -- those were questions that were raised over and over
20 again, and the impact in terms of the SDP is
21 significant. I think you've got problems with the
22 language in them, but I'm not sure that you want to
23 throw the thought out of your --

24 MEMBER TRAPP: Can you move those
25 sentences into S-1?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. I think that's -- I
2 think what we ought to do is look to move those
3 sentences and the issue itself. If it's not
4 adequately captured, then we ought to make sure it is,
5 but I think that's a better way to go.

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: Well, Richard, he
7 harvested those from the issue?

8 MEMBER HILL: That's what he said earlier.
9 That's what I understood.

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. I mean, the
11 thought certainly came from the issue. As far as the
12 exact words, that's --

13 MEMBER SHADIS: If the preamble -- what's
14 the purpose of the preamble?

15 MEMBER FERDIG: That's just what I was
16 going to say. Let's see if we can agree on that.

17 MEMBER SHADIS: If it's to give you the
18 flavor of what's contained in the rest of it, then it
19 isn't serving that purpose if all you have is, you
20 know, that spring is here and the flowers are on the
21 way.

22 MEMBER TRAPP: I guess I was confused why
23 we didn't put balanced preambles in the executive
24 summary up front, and then just have this be an
25 attachment of issues and leave it at that. You know,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 because it seems like we're -- that's all valuable
2 information in those preambles. It's kind of missing
3 from the cover letter.

4 MR. CAMERON: So you're saying that if
5 that -- if you move these -- if you move these
6 preambles into the cover letter, and the preamble
7 would express positive and negative, it would be a
8 summary that someone would read up front that would
9 give them a flavor for the whole report before they
10 got into the issue by issue?

11 MEMBER TRAPP: Sure. Because I think 95
12 percent of the people never get beyond the cover
13 letter and assume there's nothing in there. At least
14 I'm not radical -- 95 -- I put myself in the 95
15 percent category.

16 And then the attachment would just be,
17 "Here's the issues." You know, well, you'd express
18 what we feel on each one of the four categories. It
19 seems like that would be valuable.

20 MEMBER FERDIG: I could support that.
21 That would be --

22 MEMBER SHADIS: For those of us that are
23 depending on the content of the transcript, that gives
24 no comfort at all.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And the concern I would
2 have now is that if we move those to the front there's
3 really not heavy discussion of the issues in the
4 front. So then you're unbalanced. It's going to
5 sound rosy in the front, and then all of the issues
6 are in the back. I'm not sure if that's where we want
7 to go either as far as making sure it's a balanced
8 discussion.

9 MEMBER SHADIS: There's nothing wrong with
10 the structure you had, and there really shouldn't be
11 a question of positive and negatives. You get an
12 overall view in your cover letter, your introduction,
13 and then for each section you give an overall view of
14 that section and then proceed to -- down to the small
15 parts, which are the issues. Just --

16 MR. CAMERON: But positive and negative
17 both.

18 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, whatever falls out.
19 I mean, it may turn out that some of the things you
20 want to talk about have nothing but positives. It may
21 be that some of the things you -- have nothing but
22 negatives. It's just -- it's not --

23 MEMBER FERDIG: If we're reporting on our
24 perception of the ROP relative to that, which
25 includes --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: So that would mean you would
2 go back and add in many of those transitions that you
3 took out.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: But maybe we need to
5 recraft those, I think is how we do that transition.

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: But then that gets into
7 like the inspection. Everyone would say
8 notwithstanding, however, you know, you go into your
9 glossary and --

10 MEMBER KRICH: No, I don't think that the
11 individual sections are that extensive that we need a
12 summary introductory paragraph. In fact, if we do
13 that, and include the positives and negatives, it's
14 really not a summary because the positives aren't
15 defined, and there's no further definition of what the
16 positives are.

17 I have to personally vote for the original
18 concept, which is the introduction is to make sure
19 that the reader understands we have concluded, based
20 on what we know, that the process is generally working
21 and has good aspects to it. That's the introduction.

22 And there's a -- it's a short enough read
23 to read what the main issues are and what our
24 recommendations are, without having to summarize it up

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 front. So I would vote for leaving it with the
2 original concept.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And take out those
4 transition -- where we tried to do that.

5 MEMBER KRICH: Yes. And I -- with
6 deference to Jim's comment, also in the cover letter
7 I think your answer was valid, in that it would skew
8 it one way or the other. I think the reader is just
9 going to have to go through the detail to get the
10 information.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Any more?

12 MEMBER FERDIG: So where did we end up,
13 then? Does that mean that this intro paragraph in
14 each of these subsections will go away?

15 MEMBER KRICH: No. I was proposing that
16 we stick with the original concept.

17 MEMBER FERDIG: Which is what is here.

18 MEMBER KRICH: Which is to give the
19 preamble or the introduction is -- process is working,
20 here's the positive aspects that --

21 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay.

22 MEMBER KRICH: -- we, as a group, found.
23 And then read on for the issues that need to be
24 addressed.

25 MEMBER GARCHOW: That works for me.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: So keep these little
2 preambles under each section.

3 MEMBER KRICH: I think so.

4 MEMBER FLOYD: With the focus on the
5 positives, and then say -- yes.

6 MEMBER KRICH: I found it to be good,
7 because it gave some -- it gave the balance. I think
8 the reader needs to know that the group didn't -- in
9 the end, we didn't say, "Oh, this whole -- this part
10 of it is broken."

11 MEMBER FERDIG: Right. Right.

12 MEMBER BLOUGH: And they don't catch all
13 of the positives. But on the other hand, they -- they
14 give enough of a flavor, if they're labeled positive
15 attributes, you know, if they're labeled that, they
16 give enough of a flavor about what were the positive
17 things we found. So I would go along with that, as
18 long as they're labeled as such. If they're not -- if
19 they're unlabeled, then you -- then that -- it looks
20 like a synopsis, which is --

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It's not.

22 MEMBER BLOUGH: -- it's not. It's too
23 rosy as a synopsis, but it's -- it's illustrative if
24 labeled positive.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: I think you still have some
2 people who are not convinced that going along with --
3 with Rod's objective, as he stated it, that -- to give
4 an overall picture, that you wouldn't also need to
5 include some of the negatives as well as the
6 positives.

7 I get the feeling that, for example, Ray
8 thought the negatives should be in there.

9 MEMBER SHADIS: In ordinary expository
10 writing, your preamble isn't used to offset the body
11 of your material. It's just -- it's never done. I
12 mean, it's just like -- it would be unlikely.

13 So although I have noticed in -- there
14 have been some NRC inspection reports in times past,
15 especially on the big inspections, that all of the
16 news is bad news until you get to the conclusion. And
17 then you'll find out that it's really not significant
18 at all.

19 And so this may be the reverse of that, I
20 don't know. But it's a very strange approach, from my
21 point of view, and -- but it leads to the question of
22 what -- I mean, a positive comment doesn't necessarily
23 mean that there isn't going to be some advice for
24 action to follow, like, "This is working well. Do

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 more of it," for example, you know? We don't have any
2 of that in this report particularly.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: Sure we do. We've come
4 full circle around, at least once, maybe twice.

5 (Laughter.)

6 And everybody has got a good perspective.
7 But that's back to the point I was making. In the
8 normal writing document, the first paragraph is a
9 descriptive paragraph of what's to follow. And it
10 says, generally, what we want to say about that.

11 Now, the general statement that we're
12 making in this whole assessment is that we think the
13 ROP is pretty good, and that there are some issues
14 that need some attention. And we've highlighted them
15 carefully in this report. So it's not out of line in
16 that summary paragraph of expository writing in each
17 section to have a reflection of the good and a preview
18 of some of what's coming, and then to highlight in
19 specifics those issues.

20 So I don't know that we're all that far
21 off in what you have. And I don't know that it needs
22 to be labeled "positive attributes," as if it's
23 covering it in a more comprehensive way than we have
24 done.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER BLOUGH: I could go with your
2 recommendation. In that case, it is a synopsis, and
3 it doesn't need to be labeled at all.

4 MEMBER FERDIG: But just -- you could be
5 real sensitive to this conversation and make sure that
6 it --

7 MR. CAMERON: An example is that you would
8 leave -- under Mary's suggestion and Ray's suggestion,
9 is that you would simply leave this -- leave these
10 sentences in. And, of course, you would have to go
11 back and add in those transitions that you took out of
12 the previous "synopsis." That's I think what's on the
13 table.

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: I hope the ultimate
15 readers really appreciate the level of care we've had
16 in building these five sentences.

17 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes.

18 MR. CAMERON: The code for OSHA horse
19 is --

20 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes.

21 MEMBER HILL: You can give this
22 information a dozen different ways. We're kind of
23 getting down to preferences, really.

24 MEMBER FERDIG: And writing style.

25 MEMBER HILL: And writing styles.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, it -- things that
2 justify, you know, my notion of common sense -- I
3 mean, particularly --

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Can we go to something
5 as simple as we put these positives, and then each one
6 has a sentence at the end that says, "The panel
7 identified the following issues that need to be
8 addressed"?

9 MEMBER FLOYD: That's what I was just
10 going to say, because that's actually consistent with
11 what you've got in the cover letter now and the
12 executive summary, that says, "Overall, we think the
13 process is an improvement. However, we've identified
14 a number of issues that need additional attention and
15 consideration by the staff."

16 And, to me, each section now has sort of
17 that -- why we reached the conclusion that overall it
18 is an improvement, which is sort of the preamble, and
19 then there's the issue. So that's the two pieces to
20 me. I mean, that's consistent with the cover letter.

21 MEMBER FERDIG: Just don't hit the issues
22 too hard in that preamble, because --

23 MEMBER FLOYD: I don't even think they
24 need to be in there. To me, the two sections of each
25 section are, "Here's the things that we found

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 positive, that support why we think the program ought
2 to go forward. But here's the issues that need to be
3 resolved," which is the second piece. That's how your
4 cover letter is structured, and that's how your
5 executive summary is structured, with two layers.

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: So you would suggest we
7 would delete this?

8 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, I would suggest -- and
9 make sure that if -- if somebody thinks that the
10 thought that's up there isn't captured in one of the
11 issues, make sure it's there, but --

12 MR. CAMERON: Ray? Mary?

13 MEMBER SHADIS: I'm just -- you know, I'm
14 reading the first sentence, which says that, you know,
15 risk information can be used in a systematic,
16 practical, repeatable manner. Okay? And I focus on
17 repeatable, and then I go down to the body of it, and
18 -- and here's a stakeholder saying that it does not
19 provide sufficient information to be able to
20 independently reconstruct the analysis, which is to me
21 the definition of repeatable.

22 So -- all right, you know, fine. But what
23 you're saying at the top does not -- doesn't reflect
24 what you have in the body. It contradicts it. And so
25 somehow you've got to reconcile those --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, to me, the issue,
2 though, is I think it is consistent because it says it
3 can be, and I think it can be. The issue is is that
4 Dave pointed out examples where it wasn't, not that it
5 couldn't have been, it just wasn't. And that could be
6 remedied by giving guidance to the staff to make sure
7 you duplicate the logic train that got you to the
8 conclusion in the report, and then it would be.

9 MEMBER HILL: I didn't think Dave's
10 examples were things where something was wrong and not
11 repeatable. I thought it was that the general public
12 couldn't understand enough why it was different.
13 Those two thoughts are different in my mind.

14 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, couldn't reconstruct
15 it.

16 MEMBER HILL: The public couldn't
17 reconstruct it. It doesn't mean it wasn't done right,
18 though.

19 MEMBER SHADIS: That's true. But at least
20 -- at least some part of the interested parties
21 couldn't repeat it.

22 MEMBER HILL: Well, I guess my point, you
23 said that they conflict. There it says it can be done
24 in a systematic, practical, and repeatable manner.
25 The part that you said it conflicted with was that the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 public didn't have enough information to reconstruct
2 it themselves. I don't see that those conflict. You
3 know, they are two separate facts.

4 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, that's true. You
5 could repeat it over and over again, so the public
6 could reconstruct it. I understand that.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: It could be correct, and
8 the public might not be able to reconstruct it, and it
9 would solve that problem different than in the manner
10 that you would --

11 MR. CAMERON: You seem to be getting off
12 on a new issue. Is what's stated here, whether it's
13 positive only, or whether it's positive and negative,
14 is that reflected in what follows? Which is sort of
15 a different issue than you're struggling with, which
16 is, what is the scope and nature of this so-called
17 preamble?

18 Not to minimize the fact that you do want
19 to make sure that whatever you have up here is
20 consistent with what you have here. I think you need
21 to look at this report from that standpoint.

22 But I guess what's on the table here is
23 positive only, positive and negative, not all
24 positive, not all negative, but giving people an idea
25 of what's to follow, or positive but a transition

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 sentence that would be in every preamble, which is a,
2 "However, the panel identified the following."

3 The "however, the panel identified,"
4 that -- is there enough people that you all would
5 agree that maybe we do the -- this positive, and then
6 a transition sentence?

7 MEMBER FERDIG: I think if you make that
8 positive you have to label it as such, and I think
9 when you label it as such you give the implication
10 that you've done an analysis to identify the
11 comprehensive positives.

12 I would propose that we call this preamble
13 in each section a descriptive paragraph that's going
14 to reflect generic descriptive language, some of which
15 is likely to be positive and some of which is likely
16 to indicate that there will be more to follow in
17 detail about issues that were noted, and trust our
18 writers to write a descriptive paragraph as such,
19 knowing that we want you to include positive
20 commentary and not get into the detail of the issues
21 because that will follow.

22 MR. CAMERON: And would you -- as an
23 example, would this be a good example of that type of
24 descriptive writing? So that people can understand
25 exactly what you mean?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: I'd volunteer to work an
2 example over noon. I can't do it now. I mean, I
3 think we're talking about something we can't know
4 because we haven't seen it yet.

5 MEMBER BLOUGH: I liked Chip's question
6 here, though, because I was trying to understand what
7 you said, and his question gets to the heart of it.
8 Would you keep some of that highlighted text in there
9 in some form in your proposal? I thought the answer
10 was yes, you would keep some of that. So the
11 descriptive paragraph is kind of a synopsis of the
12 area.

13 MEMBER FERDIG: Right.

14 MEMBER BLOUGH: And it'll whet the
15 appetite about the issue.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes.

17 MEMBER BLOUGH: Follow -- not describe
18 them, but at least allude to them.

19 MEMBER FERDIG: That would be my
20 suggestion.

21 MR. CAMERON: Ray, do you have a comment
22 on this? And if we need to have Mary and someone else
23 do an exercise over lunch and bring it back to the
24 group, we can do that. But, Ray, did you have a
25 comment?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: I think it -- your overall
2 conclusion is the program is working. And I think if
3 you're going to throw out the -- any negative remarks
4 in the preamble, and you're going to repeat for each
5 topic area how that's working, all well and good.

6 But then you ought to, in your cover
7 letter or in the frontispiece, or somewhere up front,
8 say that this is what you're doing, say, you know,
9 that -- that you find that, overall, you know, that --
10 that the program is working, and we have identified,
11 you know, specifically areas that we think are working
12 well in each of the following topic areas, and have
13 also included whatever issues that need to be
14 addressed -- that still need to be addressed.

15 If you said that up front, then you lay
16 out, you know, what you're doing. So --

17 MEMBER HILL: I think that's basically on
18 page 2, and it refers to this paragraph as being
19 introductory comments associated with each program
20 element.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. If we need to
22 highlight that some more and make it more clear,
23 that's fine.

24 MEMBER SHADIS: It doesn't say --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER HILL: In the next-to-the-last
2 paragraph it says, "Though the panel focused its
3 efforts on discussing areas needing improvement, they
4 noted many positive attributes and outcomes. They
5 included some key positive comments in the
6 introductory comments associated with each program
7 element."

8 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, no, it does. It
9 does, yes.

10 MEMBER HILL: And then the following five
11 sections provide the consensus, conclusions,
12 recommendations, with respect to them. You know, it
13 kind of leads into giving introductory comments and
14 then giving issues. So I -- it sort of says that.

15 MEMBER GARCHOW: Would you say, then,
16 delete the highlighted text or not?

17 MEMBER HILL: Me? Yes, I would say delete
18 the highlighted and have that transition there,
19 because the highlighted is just kind of a repeat of
20 the issues.

21 MR. CAMERON: Ray, Mary, is that -- if we
22 delete this, but there's always this transition, and
23 what Ray was concerned about in the cover letter seems
24 to be in there. Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And the last comment, we
2 need to make sure those thoughts are embedded within
3 there.

4 MR. CAMERON: Exactly. And I'm not sure
5 that the so-called negatives are in there.

6 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I'd cut it, but don't
7 delete it. It needs to go in the body, because that
8 first one is not captured in here.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: So, Randy, you started
10 this 40 minutes ago, saying, "Let's go back to the
11 preamble." Has your concern been addressed?

12 MEMBER BLOUGH: Well, I had a question
13 about the preamble, and the whole discussion the last
14 half hour was on whether my question was relevant or
15 not. And it turns out, the way we came out, my
16 question wasn't relevant. So I'll get to it later.
17 I'm okay.

18 MEMBER LAURIE: Well, if you're okay, then
19 I'm okay.

20 When you go with the last sentence,
21 however the panel identified the following issues, and
22 then I assume the issues we're talking about are S-1
23 through S-9. Then, the language has to be changed in
24 order -- either that or put a semicolon at the end.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 You may want to say, "Identify the issues as denoted
2 below." Otherwise, you --

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: I appreciate the call for
4 grammar. It's a lost art.

5 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Ready for S-1?

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think we did S-1,
7 didn't we?

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well --

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think we went back to
10 the preamble after --

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. We need to make
12 sure those two sentences are captured.

13 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I would suggest that the
14 second sentence should be the second sentence of the
15 issue description, the first paragraph for S-1.

16 MEMBER HILL: Where are we at now? I'm
17 lost.

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We've got the two
19 sentences we're going to take out here and make sure
20 they're -- that those thoughts are embedded.

21 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Can we leave them with
22 you, or have we got to go work through them ourselves?

23 MEMBER FERDIG: We can do that.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: You got it captured,
25 John? We saved those --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MONNINGER: I have them on a separate
2 document, but I didn't insert them.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. We'll get that.
4 Okay. We're done with S-1? S-2, fire
5 protection SDP? S-3, phase 2 worksheets?

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: Mr. Trapp, did we capture
7 your -- the SRA's concerns? I mean, this was the
8 centerpiece of your presentation to the Board.

9 MEMBER TRAPP: Yes, I think so.

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. S-4? This is one
11 we did have a lot of discussion, and I want to make
12 sure we have captured the thoughts on this one.

13 MEMBER FLOYD: I think you got, unless I
14 read it wrong, less/more reversed on the top of
15 page 16.

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: This is S-4?

17 MEMBER FLOYD: I'm sorry. I'm looking at
18 a printed version that I took off the website. I beg
19 your pardon. The pagination is probably a little bit
20 different. Actually, there's only one paragraph.
21 Yes, okay. The sentence that starts, "For some
22 findings that reach the phase 3 analysis stage, the
23 licensees with state-of-the-art tools felt penalized
24 when the staff used their less sophisticated results
25 to determine more significance of an issue."

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And the concern was based on the notion of
2 predictability, since it may have been more with a
3 less sophisticated tool.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. It's swapped.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, okay.

6 MEMBER HILL: That's more or less a good
7 catch.

8 (Laughter.)

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: So you think that
10 captures it, Jim?

11 Okay. S-5, physical security, SDP?

12 MEMBER KRICH: I want to go back to the
13 second -- this --

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay.

15 MEMBER KRICH: The issue has to do with
16 the quality of NRC PRA tools. There was a discussion
17 also about the quality level of the licensee's PSA and
18 having some consistency on that. And maybe I missed
19 it, but is that captured somewhere else?

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: We came to a different
21 spot on that. I thought that the PSA tools of the
22 licensee relative to this process, although provides
23 input for phase 3, that the consistency because the
24 PSAs are not a regulatorily required document, the
25 consistency that the NRC could put in their process

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 was in their control through the tools they give the
2 risk analyst. That was sort of how we got around
3 that. I remember we had a pretty healthy discussion
4 for about an hour on that.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: And that's pretty much what
6 the panel said, too, the SRA panel. That they used
7 the licensees -- where the consistency comes in is
8 that they're applying the tools -- their tool
9 consistently once they understand the differences with
10 the licensee model. They've got the final call.

11 MEMBER KRICH: Okay. I was thinking more
12 of Lochbaum's comments I guess on consistency for the
13 licensee. But I agree, and I think that's
14 appropriate.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Anything on S-5? Okay.
16 S-6? Just for consistency --

17 MEMBER REYNOLDS: On S-6, the first
18 paragraph, the very last sentence, "There is a
19 potential to public confidence." We don't have that
20 as a primary program goal. We believe that we ought
21 to add it as a primary program goal -- public
22 confidence.

23 We don't talk in this issue description
24 about unnecessary regulatory burden, efficiency,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 effectiveness -- using those words -- but we do point
2 out public confidence. Period.

3 If we leave that, I would say -- if we go
4 back up to program goal, add in public confidence.

5 MEMBER FERDIG: I think it --

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: So just consistency on
7 how we're tying each issue statement to the goal
8 that's impacted?

9 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Yes. Because the only
10 goal that will be highlighted is public confidence,
11 and we don't state it up there.

12 MEMBER KRICH: There was also on the --
13 and it may be that we've put it in another issue. I
14 may have missed it, but the issue that came up about
15 ALARA, the screening criteria for the ALARA SDP as the
16 potential unintended consequence of -- causing you to
17 overinflate your estimate.

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. We didn't capture
19 that, and we can talk about that when we get to S-8.

20 MEMBER KRICH: Okay. I'm sorry. You're
21 on?

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We're on 6.

23 MEMBER KRICH: 6.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER KRICH: I was just trying to move
2 things along.

3 (Laughter.)

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Anything else on 6? 7?

5 MEMBER BLOUGH: Well, on 6, what are the
6 goals now under 6? Issue 6 is priority two, and the
7 primary program goals are what? Did we change those?

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We added public
9 confidence.

10 MEMBER BLOUGH: Because it's also -- it's
11 also maintain safety, just as much as public
12 confidence. You know --

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. I didn't include
14 it in all these. I think we talked about this last
15 item. I really hit the ones when we went through our
16 voting process that were the ones that -- above and
17 beyond I think -- I think what we used with nine. You
18 know, if we saw at least nine --

19 MR. MONNINGER: Nine votes.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: -- or where there were
21 ties, we tried to capture them all. Because in most
22 of these cases, if you look across, almost every one
23 is checked, someone checked. And there's a lot of
24 overlap in them, and we just tried to highlight the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 primary ones on these. I mean, we can go back and
2 relook at that.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: I wonder how we'd vote
4 today.

5 MEMBER BLOUGH: Well, I would -- yes, this
6 one -- the two issues are -- if we appear
7 inconsistent, we're going to erode public confidence.
8 So that's public confidence. And then, the sentence
9 before that says, you know, it -- if the licensee's
10 root cause evaluation hinders us from defining a
11 performance issue, we might not be able to
12 appropriately put the significance on the issue, and
13 that's safety. So those are two -- there's nothing
14 about efficiency and effectiveness in here now.

15 MEMBER FERDIG: And that's a valid process
16 issue. You know, we evolved.

17 MEMBER BLOUGH: We evolved.

18 MEMBER FERDIG: So maybe we've gotten to
19 a place --

20 MEMBER BLOUGH: The issue is different
21 than when we voted on what category it is.

22 MEMBER FERDIG: I think if that makes
23 sense, we are -- I would concur. No reason because we
24 said it two months ago or three months ago in a vote

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 that was nine to two that it necessarily makes sense
2 here.

3 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think I would agree
4 with Randy.

5 MEMBER FERDIG: In fact, as a writer, I'd
6 go back, now that we're all agreeing on the detail of
7 the content, and make sure that those labels really
8 match what we ended up saying.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, we didn't make a
10 conscious effort to try to make sure every sentence we
11 wrote matched back, because some of them are implied.

12 MEMBER FLOYD: I'm not sure it really
13 matters, to be honest with you. I think it's the
14 issue description and the recommendation that counts,
15 and what bin it was put in is probably immaterial.

16 I'm kind of in Jim's camp. If we get 95
17 percent of the people to read the cover letter, that's
18 great. I don't think hardly anybody is going to look
19 at which goal we attributed a particular issue to.

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: In some respects, that
21 was almost an internal process we utilized to help
22 steer the committee to be effective as opposed to
23 providing some insight for the reader.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And it helped us
25 prioritize the issues.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right.

2 MEMBER TRAPP: So what would we lose if we
3 deleted that?

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I think it does
5 add some characterization to why we thought it was
6 important. But to link it back to the goal -- but I'm
7 not sure -- I mean, I'm not adverse to changing them,
8 because I think if it impacts any of the goals that's
9 what's important and why we're raising it as an issue.
10 As far as which particular one, I don't think is as
11 important.

12 MEMBER BLOUGH: What I'd suggest is just
13 if we see what we think is an obvious mismatch, you
14 know, we'll throw it up and see if people can --

15 MEMBER FERDIG: That's exactly what I was
16 going to say.

17 MEMBER BLOUGH: -- live with us changing
18 it, and if not we'll stick with what it is, and not
19 spend a whole lot of time on it.

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: I'd actually empower John
21 or Loren to go back and just catch those
22 inconsistencies and match the goal with them. I
23 wouldn't need to necessarily have -- I personally
24 wouldn't need --

25 MEMBER FLOYD: That's fine with me.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: -- to debate that point.

2 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: For this one, which one
3 do we think it is? I mean, public confidence we
4 added.

5 Okay. S-7?

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: This is another issue
7 that Jim had with his group.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: Do we inadvertently --
10 are we sending a message -- and it may be an advertent
11 message. I mean, it may not be an inadvertent
12 message. That when you get to the SDPs, you know,
13 there is double digits of issues where in the other
14 areas there is one, two, three, four. And does that
15 send a message that we either do or don't want to
16 send, as a panel member -- as a panel?

17 MEMBER TRAPP: When you look at the
18 program -- we went back to this before, but when you
19 look at the program, what has really changed? And the
20 only thing that has -- I mean, we did inspect it
21 before, and we assessed before, and those pieces were
22 kind of already in place. The big difference is the
23 SDP.

24 So I don't think it's any surprise that
25 most of the problems are coming out of the new part of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the program. And that's where most of our issues are,
2 so --

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: I'm just throwing that
4 out. I didn't have a view one way or the other. I
5 just noticed as I read through here there was
6 something different about this category. It goes on
7 and on.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I think it's where some
9 of the key issues are.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes.

11 MEMBER BLOUGH: I think substantial work
12 is needed to complete the suite of SDP tools. And so
13 it's represented here by the --

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: I'm comfortable with
15 that. I just wanted to throw that observation out.

16 MEMBER TRAPP: We actually had an SRA
17 counterpart meeting last week, and when we discussed
18 what was the FACA panel's findings they were all very
19 pleased because they -- I mean, the idea of that panel
20 was they wanted to go and get all of these ideas to
21 management, and they were very pleased to see that
22 these were captured in another venue by the FACAs.
23 There was nothing new that we came up with last week
24 that hasn't been captured here.

25 MEMBER GARCHOW: Great.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: I like the way the
2 recommendation is worded personally, because if you
3 read the issue description, I mean, one could
4 logically lead to the conclusion that we need an SDP
5 for every regulation that we have. And I don't think
6 we want 180 SDPs out there. You don't need it for
7 every one.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: S-8? Ray?

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: Back on S-7, we had some
10 talk in Atlanta about, you know, the need for, you
11 know, other efforts to proceed, that, you know, the
12 gap between the risk-informed oversight process and
13 the deterministic regulations -- that gap causes some
14 issues to occur. And one of the issues that occurs is
15 S-7.

16 And when I read this, I didn't read in the
17 cover letter -- I mean, we're totally silent on this
18 mismatch that exists between the regulations and how
19 we --

20 MEMBER FLOYD: I actually saw that
21 somewhere.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: Where was that?

23 MEMBER KRICH: That was picked up in
24 another writeup, Dave, I believe.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It's in the executive
2 summary. It's in the executive summary. That's why
3 I tried to capture that thought, because that was
4 really an overreaching thought that affected a number
5 of areas.

6 MEMBER KRICH: It was a good writeup.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It was good.

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: I missed it.

9 MEMBER KRICH: Now can we get to S-8?

10 (Laughter.)

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: S-8? And your comment
12 was that there's another potential unintended
13 consequence having to do with the screening criteria
14 for jobs and overestimating exposure that is not
15 captured.

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes. This was the
17 discussion. It's not sure whether this SDP is a
18 measure of dose performance or dose estimating.

19 MEMBER FLOYD: That should be added.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: So after -- actually,
21 insert before the last sentence of the description,
22 "Another potential unintended consequence of the ALARA
23 SDP" --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REYNOLDS: So we want to state in
2 here that the licensees are willing to overestimate so
3 they don't get a problem here?

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Let me finish. Is that
5 it may cause licensees to overestimate exposure during
6 ALARA planning.

7 MEMBER REYNOLDS: As long as you guys are
8 willing to make that statement.

9 MEMBER FLOYD: Certainly could drive
10 somebody to do that. I mean, whatever you measure
11 gets managed. I mean, it really does, so the trick is
12 to try to get indications and SDPs where if they
13 manage them you get a positive outcome instead of a
14 potential negative outcome.

15 MEMBER HILL: There's no difference in the
16 unavailability.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: No, it isn't. Or the
18 unplanned power change one. Same thing.

19 MEMBER KRICH: It's not a -- I think
20 Steve's point is -- I agree with what you've got here.
21 I just think that Steve's point -- it's not a matter
22 of we're consciously trying to game the system. It's
23 that what'll happen over time -- potentially over time
24 is that people will just naturally kind of move in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 direction to avoid getting hit. It's not a -- I don't
2 see it as a malicious --

3 MEMBER REYNOLDS: So that the message gets
4 across that -- and I stumbled with the one earlier --
5 is that the licensee is going to change what's the
6 practice, just so they stay out of the --

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: But you wouldn't want to
8 design an oversight process that had that potential,
9 or you'd want to be conscious of it. And I think all
10 of our dialogue is around the oversight process. You
11 wouldn't want to have it be inadvertently driving
12 thinking in a way that isn't towards safety, I'll say,
13 because in the end we're measured on our dose
14 performance and other venues.

15 So this discussion -- I mean, the job has
16 whatever dose it has, and we keep track of industry
17 collective exposure. So, you know, we have a metric
18 for that in another venue. This SDP essentially just
19 is almost measuring your ability to estimate, as much
20 as it is --

21 MEMBER BROCKMAN: We're not saying it will
22 occur, but I think everybody around the table agrees
23 that it is a potential, so we should say it's a
24 potential.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER HILL: Perhaps the way to say it,
2 though, is rather than overestimate, to say that it
3 may cause some licensees to estimate exposure in a
4 very conservative manner, or something. Kind of like
5 the way you say that the sheet 2s or phase 2 sheets do
6 -- you know, that they're set up.

7 Because if you go look at it and say,
8 "Well, how long can it be done?" Well, I'm going to
9 add a little bit of extra time here just in case
10 something happens. I don't necessarily -- I think
11 that's different than saying, "Oh, I'm just going to
12 add 50 percent more dose."

13 MEMBER FLOYD: That's a good point,
14 because, I mean, some of the feedback we get from the
15 licensees is is that the current ALARA program, pre
16 the oversight process, intentionally almost
17 underestimated the dose level. But to put pressure on
18 the staff to constantly look for ways to reduce it
19 and --

20 MEMBER KRICH: It became a mechanism for
21 reducing it.

22 MEMBER FLOYD: Exactly.

23 MEMBER KRICH: I agree with Rich's words
24 about conservative rather than overestimate. I think
25 that's --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Did you get those, John?

2 MR. MONNINGER: Yes.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. So you're all
4 comfortable with those?

5 MEMBER KRICH: Thank you. I feel better
6 now.

7 (Laughter.)

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's one of my
9 objectives.

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. S-9? This was --
11 I think one of my questions to you is, should this be
12 rolled up into O-1, or should it be separate?

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: And this is just part of
14 the self-assessment?

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. To look at the
16 whole process, and this issue was specifically looking
17 at the effectiveness of the SDPs, and should we roll
18 that into O-1 or keep it separate?

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: I thought we already
20 agreed it would roll in as long as you picked up the
21 verbiage and the flavor.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay.

23 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think there was a
24 semantics issue when you were writing it. We talked
25 about SDP and SDPs. We need to be careful. There are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 several SDPs. We're talking about more than one.
2 Let's make sure we're clear.

3 I just wanted to point out, we talk about
4 evaluation of SDPs, and our conclusion was SDP. Why
5 don't we just focus on the one SDP of the several?

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: Well, even that becomes
7 -- because SDP is -- I mean, it's a determination
8 process. It doesn't even work --

9 MEMBER HILL: I can see rolling this up.
10 But why wouldn't it roll up into O-3, long-term
11 program effectiveness? Why would it not roll up there
12 instead of O-1? Because you're talking about a formal
13 process to review the effectiveness, and O-3 is where
14 you talk about having, on a periodic basis, an
15 independent assessment of the process.

16 It would seem like it would fit better in
17 O-3 instead of O-1. O-1 is more communications, and
18 so, you know, the stakeholders --

19 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think I agree with
20 you, especially if you look at the recommendations for
21 O-1 and O-3. It fits better with our recommendations.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: O-3? Okay. Want to try
23 to finish the As here before we break for lunch?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MONNINGER: Can I just go back to
2 those two sentences? You and I were going to take a
3 crack at making sure those two sentences --

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Are captured within the
5 appropriate discussion. We need to make sure that
6 gets where it belongs.

7 Okay. Assessment? Okay. We come back to
8 our original -- our question from the last on this
9 first introductory paragraph. How do you want to do
10 this?

11 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, consistent with our
12 previous approach, you'd take out the last three
13 sentences, but --

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And put that --

15 MEMBER FLOYD: And make sure to capture it
16 in the thoughts.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Okay.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Actually, I'm not even sure
19 I agree with one of them. But, so I might not want to
20 see it put in, and that's, "The guidance concerning
21 agency decisions is emphasizing risk-based criteria as
22 opposed to risk-informed."

23 I didn't think we had ever quite gotten to
24 the point of saying it's risk-based. I mean, even the
25 SDP is more risk-informed than risk-based because it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 looking at bands of orders of magnitude thresholds,
2 and you're not getting down to the precision of
3 arguing about whether it was nine times 10^{-5} or four
4 times 10^{-2} .

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's only for the
6 reactor ones anyway.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I would say from the
8 staff perspective I think -- I think what Ken and
9 Steve -- I think we have drifted over there.

10 MEMBER BROCKMAN: There's a difference in
11 nine times 10^{-6} and 1.1 times 10^{-5} .

12 MEMBER FLOYD: Is that what this sentence
13 means?

14 MEMBER BROCKMAN: It's part of it. The
15 only significant digit in a PRA is in the exponent's
16 position, and that's debatable.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: So you're not a believer?

18 MEMBER BROCKMAN: I'm a believer. I'm not
19 a precisionist. I am a believer.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We'll take a look at
21 those.

22 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay.

23 MR. MONNINGER: So that was cut those
24 three lines and you want to --

25 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. MONNINGER: -- make sure they're
2 incorporated into --

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We'll do the same with
4 that one.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: "However, several
6 issues."

7 MR. MONNINGER: So when we cut those other
8 issues for PIs or overall, you want to --

9 MEMBER BROCKMAN: Make sure the thought is
10 captured. Just verifying that the thought is
11 captured.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. A-1?

13 MEMBER TRAPP: Back in the commentary, do
14 we really -- the first sentence is very condemning of
15 the old process. It says it has eliminated the
16 arbitrary and subjective commentary that was common in
17 previous SALPs. Is that -- that seems a little harsh
18 to me, that we were arbitrary and subjective.

19 MEMBER KRICH: It left out capricious.

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: It left out a few words.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MEMBER KRICH: Depends on which side of
23 the inspection report you're on.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: I think even Dave Lochbaum
2 made several comments about how he thought it was
3 fairly arbitrary and subjective as well.

4 MEMBER SHADIS: Arbitrary connotes
5 carelessness.

6 MEMBER KRICH: I would have no trouble
7 with taking out arbitrary and --

8 MEMBER SHADIS: Subjective is something
9 that goes to discretion and --

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Just take out arbitrary.

11 MEMBER FERDIG: Everything is subjective.

12 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. But we don't got all
13 week.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MEMBER GARCHOW: I don't even see that the
16 -- talking about the commentary? I mean, that's --
17 that's such a minor part of the assessment process.
18 Just say "subjective nature of the previous oversight
19 process" and just leave it at that.

20 MEMBER SHADIS: Elements. Subjective
21 elements.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: Has reduced -- because
23 there's still some subjectivity in this. Reduced the
24 subjectivity that was in the previous process.
25 Reduced some of the --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: How about "reduced
2 subjective -- the number of subjective elements" or
3 the --

4 MEMBER FLOYD: That's fine.

5 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. Because it was not
6 all subjective.

7 MEMBER FERDIG: And this one is not all of
8 the --

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: So how does it read now?

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Within the previous
11 processes. I'm just shortening that sentence right
12 up, John.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Fix the "was."

14 MEMBER BLOUGH: I'd say "degree of
15 subjectivity that was common within the" --

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes. Because who knows
17 what "subjective elements" are.

18 MR. MONNINGER: Reduce the degree of
19 subjective --

20 MEMBER FERDIG: Are we getting into
21 wordsmithing now?

22 (Laughter.)

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: This was not even just
24 wordwhacking, though. I mean, when -- the way that
25 statement was first written wasn't -- this isn't a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 style issue. That left the reader with a whole
2 different -- it landed totally different.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: I agree.

4 MEMBER BLOUGH: We evolved into
5 wordsmithing, but it's -- it's an important comment.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. A-1?

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: Hang on. Go back,
8 because I'm thinking I heard -- go back to the --
9 there's a little bit of a needle, again, in the last
10 line just like was in the first line. I mean, I think
11 this is sort of over --

12 MEMBER FLOYD: You could shorten that to
13 say, "Under the new assessment scheme, the response of
14 the agency is more timely than in the previous
15 program." I mean, that's --

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right. Just leave it at
17 that.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Take out all the
19 adjectives.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Sounds good. Ready for
21 A-1 now? The action matrix issue. Anything on A-1?

22 A-2, regulatory conference? Okay.

23 A-3?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER HILL: No color findings. Are we
2 in the procedure now? They are actually
3 proceduralized?

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. It's been
5 proceduralized. There's a flow chart that tells you
6 to do it.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: But there were some
8 inconsistencies even within the NRC self-assessment
9 report between regions and what was determined green
10 and what was determined no color using the same
11 guidance.

12 MEMBER KRICH: Just a clarification.
13 Loren, I thought that last sentence in the paragraph
14 before, Panel Recommendations, "External stakeholders
15 have noted that the staff has established a new,
16 undefined category of findings which is exacerbated by
17 the fact that they are colored blue on the NRC's web
18 page."

19 And I thought maybe the reader may
20 misunderstand and think that there's now another -- so
21 I thought of putting in a parenthetical expression,
22 i.e. to designate no color findings.

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Yes, that
24 clarifies it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: And John can, you know,
2 reword that just to get that concept, and something
3 like, you know, "In order to display on the web, the
4 no color findings are blue," which is another level of
5 confusion.

6 MEMBER KRICH: Right. So however you do
7 that --

8 MEMBER SHADIS: Actually, they're going to
9 gray, so what the hell? I mean, they are.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's okay.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Anything else
12 on --

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Do you have another
14 concern?

15 MEMBER SHADIS: Wait a minute. How was
16 that changed? You guys are really fast. What did you
17 do to that?

18 MR. MONNINGER: I didn't quite finish it,
19 but I left a placeholder.

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: He was just trying to
21 take down Rob's comment that, you know, even the blue
22 on the website adds another level of confusion, even
23 if the --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Why don't say, "which is
2 exacerbated by the fact that the no color findings are
3 color blue on the web page"?

4 MEMBER SHADIS: They're going gray.

5 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: But now they're -- at
6 this moment they're still blue. Yes, I checked last
7 week. Yes, you need to take out the whole
8 parenthetical.

9 MEMBER KRICH: I think the NRC needs to
10 contract one of those color consultants who will tell
11 you what color you should wear based on your --

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Anything else on A-3?
13 A-4?

14 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Loren, I think we might
15 want to add in here not only can one issue get you
16 multiple inspection findings, but also can get a PI in
17 there -- what you do when you have a PI and a couple
18 of findings. We've stumbled across that and how to
19 deal with that.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I thought the staff was
21 -- double-hitting is pretty clear on --

22 MEMBER FLOYD: If the PIs related to the
23 findings you wouldn't double count them. It's not --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REYNOLDS: We had a PI -- we had a
2 finding with two PIs, I think. I wasn't clear on that
3 one.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I just thought
5 there is guidance on double hits, but not multiple,
6 because I think yours could be still a subset of this.
7 It's multiple issues on the same --

8 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Yes, it is.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Anything else on A-4?
10 This is a new section. As we were putting
11 it together, John reminded me we made a conclusion on
12 the front about the self-assessment but didn't write
13 anything in the report.

14 So this is really to explain what we did
15 as far as what we looked at, and to try to explain
16 better why there's a caveat in our conclusion.
17 Essentially, we have no final conclusion, because it's
18 not done and we didn't really have sufficient
19 information to review but to provide some general
20 comments on at least the elements and the things that
21 we looked at. And this is to describe what we did and
22 what our conclusion is.

23 MEMBER LAURIE: Loren, before we get into
24 this, just let me note -- because I have to leave in
25 a couple of minutes -- and I just -- for the record,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I just want to note that I feel very privileged to
2 have been able to serve on this panel, and I
3 appreciate everybody's tolerance.

4 In looking through the transcripts and the
5 record, there is just not enough intelligent comments
6 attributed to me, so I'll be going through the record
7 and I'll be offering amendments, so that I can refer
8 those to my governor for proper accreditation.

9 But I really do appreciate the time you
10 all have spent with me on this. It's been a terrific
11 experience for me, and I thank you.

12 And I'll be leaving in just a couple of
13 minutes.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, thanks for your
15 help. And as I said before, you'll get another bite
16 of the apple. Once we get through all these changes,
17 we'll send this out again. And if you want to add
18 some more intelligent comments --

19 MEMBER LAURIE: Okay.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: -- put those in.

21 MEMBER LAURIE: Thanks.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Thank you.

23 Self-assessment?

24 MEMBER FLOYD: I think it looks fine.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And I do want to make
2 sure -- because I think this is one area we have
3 touched on all through the process, and I don't think
4 as a group we have -- you know, I put down what I
5 thought our consensus was, and I want to make sure
6 that you do agree with that, how I've characterized
7 that.

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: I didn't think you went
9 far enough when I read this. I actually think Allen
10 and the staff really made a credible, very
11 conscientious effort to really capture looking at the
12 process. I know they are still doing it ongoing, but,
13 I mean, I think -- I think that that -- I mean, at
14 least from one person on the panel, I was impressed
15 with the way they went after trying to really get some
16 metrics around something that's very difficult to do.

17 And I thought that was a very credible
18 effort that, you know, isn't just started. They're
19 well along the way. It's just they didn't get it
20 finished in time for us to look at.

21 I just wouldn't want to infer that, you
22 know, them not being done in time for us to look at
23 was any reflection of, you know, the type of effort
24 that was put forth to try to do what I thought was a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 pretty credible job at developing a self-assessment
2 process for this program.

3 MEMBER HILL: Well, I thought the second
4 paragraph ties in, you know, why we didn't -- weren't
5 able to draw the conclusion without any bad reflection
6 on them.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: I didn't say this was
8 written negatively. I would recommend that we put
9 forth -- you know, every other section we put forth a
10 section around -- just say that, you know, if we all
11 felt that it looked like there was a credible effort,
12 and, you know, well on track to build the self-
13 assessment program to effectively oversee the process,
14 then, I mean, I think we ought to put some language
15 like that in there to be consistent with what we did
16 with every other section.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And the last sentence is
18 where I try to make an underhanded positive statement
19 on the process. Without seeing their results, was the
20 fact that, you know, as they presented their issues
21 that came through, all of it -- and this is the other
22 thing I want to try to make sure it's clear here is --
23 at least in our paper is the self-assessment process;
24 it's not just the metrics.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 There's, you know, a much more broader
2 body of information, with the feedback forms, you
3 know, the workshops, and the other things that they're
4 doing to collect information. And I was trying to
5 say, in the end, they did -- I mean, the issues that
6 we have identified are on their plate, too. They're
7 the same things.

8 I mean, we may have a different spin on
9 the issue, or maybe a little different insight, but
10 those -- those issues were captured by their process,
11 and that's what I was trying to say.

12 MEMBER GARCHOW: But just it seemed to me
13 -- and this isn't that big of a deal for me, so this
14 isn't worth probably much more than 10 more seconds,
15 but it just seemed when I read this your style changed
16 in this. And you'd say something, and then hedge it,
17 say it, and then hedge it, so all the way through it's
18 notwithstanding, and so I just sort of got left --
19 well, what are they trying to tell me about the self-
20 assessment program the NRC is developing? And I was
21 sort of left with -- just stand back and look at --
22 well, it's not on track or something, but --

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I think we were
24 hesitant to go too far, because what we -- on what the
25 consensus is, because I'm not sure we knew exactly

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 what it was, other than we thought it had the right
2 elements, it's looked -- you know, I don't think we
3 had that many suggestions on other things they should
4 look at.

5 I think they -- when they presented what
6 they're looking at, we would -- I think we should show
7 some refinements on how they look at some of the data
8 and how they cut some of the data. But I think all of
9 the elements were there. I mean, that's what I tried
10 to capture in here, that they had all of the elements.

11 MEMBER HILL: I like this down here, you
12 talk about it's best described as noteworthy work in
13 progress. And I don't -- without seeing one, I'm not
14 sure you can say a whole lot more than that. I'm not
15 even sure I can say it's a credible effort at this
16 point in time. I think it will be, but I -- I don't
17 know if I can draw that conclusion yet.

18 MEMBER GARCHOW: I don't have that as a
19 major concern.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: But, I mean, do you have
21 any suggestions for any other words or --

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: I just tried to recognize
23 the effort that went on. I mean, I've been involved
24 in these things where you turn people on to these

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 large efforts and nobody ever uses it. And they put
2 a lot of time and effort into that.

3 MEMBER FLOYD: Just add a statement that
4 the panel acknowledges the effort expended by the
5 staff in trying to develop an assessment program.

6 MEMBER FERDIG: And the value that that
7 effort has to sustaining the quality of the program.

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right. And I think we
9 all agree that we need to continue that level of
10 effort and --

11 MEMBER FERDIG: That's right.

12 MEMBER BLOUGH: I might add something in
13 the very last sentence that just said that the -- just
14 add that the panel was encouraged by the fact that the
15 staff, for the most part, identified the same issues.
16 Just make that a little more --

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's what I was going
18 to do, just put a little more of the language in to
19 give a little different impression at the end.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Anything else on
21 self-assessment?

22 MR. MONNINGER: What was that for the last
23 sentence?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The last sentence, that
2 the panel was encouraged that -- instead of
3 notwithstanding.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: That would get the --
5 your self-acknowledged "underhanded" component out of
6 that. Just restating it.

7 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. It seems like a
8 fairly long statement. Seriously. Given the amount
9 of time that -- for input --

10 MEMBER TRAPP: We spent a big --

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Actually, two different
12 sessions.

13 MEMBER HILL: That first day just lasted
14 two days. It was --

15 (Laughter.)

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: We spent one morning and
17 one afternoon or two mornings on all of --

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: On the basic structure.

19 MEMBER BROCKMAN: You missed the
20 opportunity to see it in all of its glory.

21 (Laughter.)

22 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes. I only got half of
23 it, so that's why I was thinking half of it would be
24 nice.

25 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We went line by line
2 through each metric. Anything else on that? How
3 about a lunch break?

4 MEMBER HILL: What else do we have to do
5 after lunch?

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Cover letter and
7 executive summary, and then give -- if you have
8 editorial comments, unload those on us. What our plan
9 is is to get another version out Friday and to include
10 those editorial comments.

11 MEMBER HILL: Well, if we're talking about
12 the executive summary and the cover letter, would
13 anybody entertain just trying to work through on that
14 if we're not very far away or --

15 MEMBER BLOUGH: I think lunch.

16 (Laughter.)

17 MEMBER FLOYD: You could easily get bogged
18 down, I think.

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: You can easily get bogged
20 down.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Start at 1:00? We'll
22 start at 1:00.

23 (Whereupon, at 11:51 a.m., the
24 proceedings in the foregoing matter went
25 off the record for a lunch break.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9

1 A-F-T-E-R-N-O-O-N S-E-S-S-I-O-N

2 (1:16 p.m.)

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Ready to get started
4 here?

5 Are there -- I hesitate to ask the
6 question. Are there any issues that we need to go
7 back to that anyone re-thought, where they were, over
8 lunch time?

9 MR. KROCKMAN: Hearing none.

10 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Rod wants to go over it
11 again just to make sure we captured it.

12 MEMBER KRICH: Can you do that?

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay, you want to --

14 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I was just being
15 facetious.

16 MEMBER KRICH: He was teasing.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Oh, I'm too easy.

18 MR. KROCKMAN: I suggest let's go to the
19 Executive Summary.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I'd like to start with
21 the Executive Summary.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: Would this be sort of
23 worth doing line by line?

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Probably.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: It's the only way we'll
2 ever get through it.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: What I tried to do is
4 capture some of the recurring themes and as you've
5 looked at it, try to highlight -- and some of these
6 are my views and that's why I want to go through this
7 carefully and make sure everyone agrees, what appear
8 to be some of the recurring either themes or what i
9 saw as contributing causes to a lot of issues that
10 came up throughout the discussion, to make sure that's
11 highlighted, because there's a lot of detail within
12 the body of the report and as we send this report up
13 to Sam what is driving some of these issues.

14 MR. KROCKMAN: Loren, this is as opposed
15 to taking each one of the areas and giving a paragraph
16 or section of that and then you tried to grab the
17 common threads that run across areas?

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right.

19 MR. KROCKMAN: Cross-cutting issues, if
20 you will.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right.

22 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Disregarding that
23 statement, I like the concept of what he did.

24 (Laughter.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: So we want to go
2 paragraph by paragraph, just do it that way or do you
3 want to make a general comment first?

4 MEMBER BLOUGH: I did have an
5 organizational question.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay.

7 MEMBER BLOUGH: I like the idea of getting
8 common themes here, but I also am wondering if we
9 spend a lot of time on working the issues and working
10 down to what were our recommendations and the way it
11 sets now the recommendations start in around page 7 or
12 so and they're spread throughout the report. I was
13 just wondering if there might be virtue in either at
14 the end of the Executive Summary or on page 2 of the
15 report, Panel Conclusions and Recommendations, to just
16 list - -have a sentence or two of introduction and
17 then list the priority 1 recommendations and --

18 MEMBER GARCHOW: Bring those forward?

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: That would be fine. Bring
20 those forward and somehow introduce them that you
21 know, these are the recommendations.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: I'd just -- just put them
23 as bullets, just like they're written in the report
24 because the reader is going to get them all flushed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out later anyway and you could just have a bullet,
2 pull them right out.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Where do you think the
4 best place is?

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: I sort of like Randy's
6 idea on page 2, where it says Panel Conclusions and
7 Recognition.

8 MR. KROCKMAN: I'm going to take
9 exception. If you go by the premise that many of the
10 readers will read the cover letter, the letter of
11 transmittal and the Executive Summary, you want to
12 just pull your category 1 recommendations, or your
13 priority 1 recommendations, Executive Summary is the
14 place to do it.

15 MEMBER TRAPP: The Executive Summary
16 should summarize what's in the report would be my
17 understanding.

18 MR. KROCKMAN: And here were the key
19 recommendations, Priority 1 recommendations that were
20 brought forward which I think is an exceptionally key
21 part of the report, that the big ticket
22 recommendations were made.

23 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think you can make the
24 argument to put it in both places.

25 MR. KROCKMAN: You can make that argument.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER TRAPP: Cover letter or Executive
2 Summary?

3 MEMBER REYNOLDS: No. Executive Summary
4 and at the bottom of page 2.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: You could put a table on
6 the bottom of page 2 just for completeness.

7 MR. KROCKMAN: Page 2 could list all of
8 the recommendations.

9 MEMBER FERDIG: I was going to say then
10 could we have all of them, 1 and 2.

11 MR. KROCKMAN: And Executive Summary
12 probably just once.

13 MEMBER FERDIG: But just again, we're
14 framing it for the moment as we're thinking of the
15 person that doesn't go any further than the beginning
16 of this.

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: Did the priority
18 recommendations, without going back, they all fell
19 into like four or five general areas? It would seem
20 like just for the flow of the document in the
21 Executive Summary you'd say the priority
22 recommendations fell into the following areas,
23 improved communication, rather than getting into
24 bullets on the Executive Summary, you might be able to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 write some text and leave the flavor of what areas
2 they fell into or topics.

3 MEMBER REYNOLDS: You might be able to see
4 that once you list them all.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right.

6 MEMBER REYNOLDS: You just list all the
7 bullets, it might jump out at you.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: Before we start the line
9 by line process, were there any other things in our
10 conversation this morning that we decided we were
11 going to highlight in the Executive Summary?

12 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Going back to Robert's
13 point?

14 MEMBER FERDIG: Yes. I'm thinking of
15 Robert's point, in particular.

16 MEMBER REYNOLDS: That's something we just
17 mentioned briefly.

18 MEMBER GARCHOW: It was education and --

19 MEMBER FERDIG: The emphasis, the resource
20 emphasis on continuing that communication in education
21 --

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: In a sense, maybe we
23 would do that if we worded it and pulled out the
24 priority actions and grouped them. Then you could

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 bring that into a text of the priority
2 recommendations, following types of areas or issues.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: That would make sense.
4 And also, I noted the comment that you made where
5 there were positive elements of the programs that
6 would be included in the report itself. Is it worth
7 having a succinctly written brief paragraph that
8 summarizes what it is that we think that is good about
9 this program that has led us to overall conclude that
10 it's on the right track and I didn't see that exactly
11 and I don't know that it is an addition. I just ask
12 the question from an organizational standpoint.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: We sort of worked that
14 backwards earlier. If we don't find any show stoppers
15 by definition it's okay. So we went through this
16 process of getting all the issues and concluded by
17 virtue of analysis of the issues it wasn't a show
18 stopper, therefore, okay, continue on. But if we did
19 that I'm not sure that totally captures what we did
20 either, but that sort of how we got to the issues.
21 Your second paragraph in the Executive Summary, what
22 is that eight step that's a notable improvement.
23 According to the Panel, what's that basis?

24 That was sort of your question and then
25 let's --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: So instead that conclusion
2 is --

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: Tough, based on the
4 absence of a show stopper. I mean that's what it sort
5 of what it evolved to.

6 MEMBER FERDIG: Let's keep that in mind,
7 go through it line by line. I just want to raise the
8 question so it was in the backs of our minds.

9 MEMBER HILL: I'd like to go back to the
10 first comment you made about the education and the
11 funding and all that. If I'm not mistaken, wasn't
12 that brought up with issue S-1 which actually is a
13 priority 2 item so it wouldn't be included in
14 Executive Summary.

15 MEMBER FERDIG: Good point.

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: It was that overall
17 issue.

18 MEMBER HILL: He wanted it in a
19 recommendation and the recommendation, I thought, he
20 was trying to get at was in the panel recommendation
21 on S-1 which had to do with evaluating and
22 communicating conclusions. I thought that was the
23 one.

24 MR. CAMERON: I think it's on --

25 MEMBER GARCHOW: We revised that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KROCKMAN: If you look at -- has
2 everybody read the Executive Summary?

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It's in 0-2 now.

4 MR. KROCKMAN: Because I mean there's
5 already a lead in on the second paragraph of the
6 indicative section that talks about need for resources
7 to continue and communicate the process and what have
8 you.

9 MEMBER FERDIG: Maybe we need to read it
10 again.

11 MR. KROCKMAN: I think a little emphasis
12 there and you capture what you want.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Thanks, Ken.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Any other overall?

15 MEMBER TRAPP: Just one overall comment on
16 the Executive Summary. The intent is to summarize the
17 report, just an observation I had is there's nowhere
18 in the Executive Summary that the words that I could
19 find, Significance Determination Process are listed
20 anywhere and our report is a quarter or more regarding
21 the Significance Determination Process. So it wasn't
22 clear to me if our intent was to try to summarize
23 what's in the report or if it was unique thoughts that
24 was going in the Executive Summary. I can go either

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 way, but I'm not sure the Executive Summary really
2 summarizes what's in our report.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: They're predicting what
4 they're about to read.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: The comment, if we could
6 get into some text with the priority recommendations,
7 the panel during its work came up with several
8 priority recommendations. They fell into the
9 following areas and one of them, many of them were in
10 the SDP area so that would bring that forward.

11 MEMBER TRAPP: I think each one of those,
12 and again, it's come out before. I think those lead
13 in paragraphs have at least pieces of them or parts of
14 them or something need to be brought in the Executive
15 Summary so I think those are real important findings
16 and we don't --

17 MR. KROCKMAN: This is a key philosophical
18 question. Do we feel the -- what Loren has brought
19 here, I believe, takes issues, as I've said, you can
20 take smatterings. They're the key things throughout.
21 What other people are saying though is we really need
22 to address each one of the sections. That's the
23 format. You'll get into a sectional orientation and
24 that's not -- that's not necessarily bad. That's a
25 philosophical question we probably need to come to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 grips with as a panel as to how do we want this thing
2 to present the findings or do we want to try to do
3 both, have a first part of it here's the key issues.
4 Now individually, here's the different sections and
5 the key smatterings that you bring up that way which
6 could allow you to scratch both itches.

7 MEMBER FERDIG: So what objective does the
8 Executive Summary serve?

9 MR. KROCKMAN: That's right. What do we
10 want it to serve.

11 MEMBER FERDIG: If you were an executive,
12 what would you want in your summary?

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, what I was trying
14 to do here --

15 MR. KROCKMAN: Since he's the author the
16 question has been answered.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: This discussion I've had
18 before. We've been debating about this and actually
19 I looked back and looked at the PPEP report too. I
20 think essentially they just listed the priority
21 recommendations. That's about all they did.

22 MR. KROCKMAN: But there wasn't a lot of
23 analysis.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: To me, the message that
25 we want to get across based upon our six meetings that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we've had discussions that are not in the report, by
2 looking issue by issue by issue, you don't get it.
3 That's what I was trying to capture is there's some
4 higher tier, really philosophical issues that drive a
5 lot of the issues. And that's what I was really
6 trying to capture and there are more obviously. I
7 tried to pick what I think were the biggest drivers as
8 far as what's driving some of the comments. This
9 presumption about maintain safety and we've heard a
10 lot from David and Ray about that and that question
11 about should we be improving and this gets into
12 thresholds. It crosses a whole bunch of areas and
13 that's the point and I want to try to make sure that
14 got across. This eventually will make it up to the
15 Commission. It's going to Sam, but it will make it up
16 to the Commission that they understand that. Because
17 it's not in the report issue by issue. I mean if you
18 studied it long enough, you might be able to draw the
19 same conclusions, but we've heard so much I thought it
20 was really that we need to pass those messages along.

21 MEMBER GARCHOW: This is almost like a
22 report that's just overall insights or something that
23 you gather from the collection of stuff before you
24 burrow into the PIs and SDPs, but that's what I read
25 this as. It's very valuable. I guess I'm struggling

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 with having to read stuff for a living, right, this
2 really isn't an Executive Summary of the report. It's
3 a very valuable piece of the report, but it really
4 doesn't summarize the findings, the conclusions, the
5 good, the bad and the ugly. To me it's a section of
6 the report that I think Sam needs to hear. When you
7 put all of the different panel in the room, we got to
8 some higher level of insights by virtue of the
9 conversation and you captured them here. So I think
10 that's valuable. I'm struggling with this being an
11 Executive Summary.

12 MEMBER FERDIG: Maybe it could go under
13 the panel conclusions and recommendations section on
14 page 2 at overall insight, I mean highlighted as
15 something that gets read early and with a perspective
16 of relevance for everything that comes after.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: I think you could do
18 something there. The problem I had with the body of
19 the report, the section on panel conclusions and
20 recommendations really don't have any conclusions.
21 That's in another section, the next one down that says
22 overall reactor oversight process. I think what you
23 mean there was overall reactor oversight process
24 conclusions because that's what the subject matter is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 of that paragraph that's under there is what's the
2 overall conclusion.

3 Maybe you could have a section of the
4 report that says panel conclusions and recommendations
5 and then those next four paragraphs that are under
6 there is really the approach. Then you have the
7 overall conclusions and then maybe take those three
8 major areas that are in the Executive Summary right
9 now and call those panel insights.

10 MEMBER FERDIG: I like that and there
11 would be three subsections under --

12 MEMBER FLOYD: Under panel conclusions and
13 recommendations.

14 MEMBER FERDIG: Does that work for you or
15 does that feel like it's --

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Got that down, John?

17 MR. MONNINGER: No.

18 (Laughter.)

19 MR. KROCKMAN: You'll still then for what
20 we're talking about, the Executive Summary, since
21 you've put it in the report, we'll still move them
22 back up to the Executive Summary because then now
23 there's something that's appropriate from in the
24 report.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: But it might be in the
2 Executive Summary that other insights were provided,
3 that might be all you have in the Executive Summary.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right.

5 MR. CAMERON: You could actually do a one
6 paragraph Executive Summary probably. Two paragraphs.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right. I wonder why we
8 don't do that?

9 MEMBER FERDIG: Which doesn't let them
10 read just the Executive Summary.

11 MR. CAMERON: Right.

12 MEMBER KRICH: I think we ought to decide
13 what message we want to leave with the reader and
14 that's what needs to go into the Executive Summary.
15 Unfortunately, that's the way life works.

16 I thought this was excellent. I really
17 have to commend Loren and John for this. I thought it
18 was a great write up and it captured some key things
19 that were not caught any place else that needed to go
20 in the report. And I'm struggling now as to how do
21 you do this so that we get the messages we want to up
22 in the Executive Summary, but also keep these thoughts
23 there because these are good thoughts that don't show
24 up anyplace else.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Rod, do you have any
2 problems with what was suggested by taking what's in
3 the Executive Summary now and putting it back in the
4 main body of the report under overall panel
5 conclusions? Granted, that still leaves you with the
6 question of what does the panel want to say in the
7 Executive Summary, but do you have any problems with
8 that suggestion about taking it all, putting it back
9 later on?

10 MEMBER KRICH: No, I don't, just so long
11 as we then reiterate in summary fashion the concepts
12 in the Executive Summary.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Or do we need an
14 Executive Summary, once we do that. If we could make
15 those key points in the cover letter and then have the
16 report start with the overall conclusions and
17 recommendations with the insights embodied and then
18 pull the other key points up to the cover letter so
19 you'd have the cover letter and then you get into the
20 -- after the cover letter into the --

21 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think a cover letter
22 should be more --

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: More of a transmittal.

24 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Here it is.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KROCKMAN: What you're trying to do is
2 make the cover letter the Executive Summary.

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: I have a model. You guys
4 send me mail every month for the last 15 years of my
5 career. I mean I know how that looks. I mean it's
6 possible to do that effectively because you read the
7 cover letter and you get the message.

8 MEMBER TRAPP: You don't read our
9 Executive Summaries?

10 (Laughter.)

11 MEMBER GARCHOW: I read them. I pay
12 people to read the rest.

13 MR. KROCKMAN: I know this technique.

14 MEMBER FERDIG: The only thing I'm saying
15 which is retracting what I said before, I hear Rod's
16 point, that if it isn't in what gets read and if we're
17 seeing now that that is the Executive Summary, then it
18 could be a loss.

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: I actually -- I bet Sam
20 would read all -- it is not that laborious of a
21 report. It's not a 500-pound gorilla and we really
22 were perfunctory even in the issues summaries. This
23 report will get --

24 MEMBER KRICH: It will. I didn't mean to
25 imply that Sam won't read it, but I think it will --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 there's a larger audience that will look at it and I'd
2 like to make sure that we get our key points across to
3 that larger audience as well.

4 MEMBER TRAPP: It seems like there should
5 be a little debate what we should put in the Executive
6 Summary. I mean Executive Summary should summarize
7 what's in the report, so you're right, I don't see
8 where there's any real mystery.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: By definition, if we've
10 got consensus on the report concept, we've got a
11 consensus.

12 MR. KROCKMAN: Let me reiterate Chip's
13 point then, if we might. If we move the current
14 things in the Executive Summary back into panel
15 conclusions and recommendations, also in panel
16 conclusions and recommendations we bring forward a
17 listing of all the individual recommendations
18 underneath so they're in one place, then we can
19 recraft the Executive Summary to have the key points
20 out of those lead in paragraphs and we would format
21 that probably with a very succinct write up of what's
22 currently in the Executive Summary, the key three
23 30,000-foot issues and then within each one of the
24 areas, here's a paragraph on each one of those.
25 You're going to wind up with another page and a half

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Executive Summary and we've got all -- we've got
2 30,000-foot, we've got the 10,000-foot, here's the
3 priority 1 recommendations that we're making as
4 opposed to everything else and then see report details
5 for further information.

6 MR. CAMERON: It seems that Loren based on
7 what Rod's reaction was and the rest of your
8 reactions, it seems like Loren and John did a lot of
9 heavy lifting, creative writing to prepare what's now
10 under the Executive Summary. If you move that back
11 into the body of the report, is there anything wrong
12 with just simply saying to Loren and John, just write
13 a concise summary of what's in the report. It doesn't
14 have to be mysterious or rocket science or anything
15 like that.

16 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think that's what Ken
17 said in a longer version than you did.

18 MEMBER KRICH: What we've got here is
19 really a distillation of a lot of things that happened
20 during the meetings, a lot of discussion. It's more
21 than just a summary of the issues. It's really a
22 distillation.

23 MR. CAMERON: What's already in there.

24 MEMBER KRICH: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: That's what I think is
2 important, your idea about putting that into the main
3 body of the report is important, but that would be one
4 of the things that -- that would be one of the things
5 that would be summarized in the Executive Summary,
6 would be these overarching panel insights or whatever
7 you're going to call them.

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: I have another suggestion
9 that could actually move this along. Your
10 introduction and approach of objectives, that could be
11 an attachment. Then if you got right into your panel
12 conclusions and recommendations, that really is the
13 Executive Summary. And I think it's interesting to
14 some people, the introduction and the approach, but it
15 really isn't -- people aren't grabbing the report to
16 see that. They're grabbing the report to see the
17 panel conclusions and recommendations.

18 If we basically agree on that concept, I
19 propose we let Loren and John take it, but we probably
20 ought to go through this part right now and make --
21 everybody's been saying this is great stuff, but I'm
22 sure there's some people who have some comments and
23 what have you on it and make sure if they're going to
24 integrate it, let's make sure if they've got the
25 thoughts that should actually get integrated.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I did want to go back
2 and make sure we've got -- I've heard lots of thoughts
3 now as far as what we want to do.

4 I want to make sure John captures this.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: We're going to include
6 this someone else. It's no wasted effort making sure
7 what we can sense and then decide where we're going to
8 put it.

9 MR. KROCKMAN: That's the easy thing.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Then it's almost a style
11 issue that I don't particularly need to debate.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: So let's summarize what
13 we've got.

14 We want to put -- I heard a number of
15 different proposals, but something panel insights or
16 overarching panel insights in this by the report near
17 where the panel conclusions and recommendations are
18 and include these overarching dots that are included
19 in the Executive Summary.

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right. I think we did
21 get consensus on that.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And provide some kind of
23 summary of that back into this, but not in the level
24 of detail that's in there now.

25 MR. CAMERON: Does that settle the --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's one. And then
2 we're going to add the priority 1 recommendations
3 within the body of the Executive Summary. My concern
4 is it's going to be hard to go one way or the other.
5 If we try -- no, I'm sorry, I mean this recommendation
6 is talking about trying to consolidate and put common
7 themes on those. I'm not sure if we would lose
8 something in that translation, just do a one to one
9 correlation of the priority ones --

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: List them by bullets.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And just go through. I
12 think there probably will be some vestige there, but
13 it might be difficult.

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: Just looking at the scan
15 of the recommendations, there all one and two short
16 sentences.

17 MEMBER HILL: But are they going to mean
18 anything without seeing the issue? If all you see is
19 a recommendation, is there going to be anything to it
20 if you don't see the issue too?

21 MEMBER BLOUGH: I read them that way
22 because I was thinking that that would be brought
23 forward and at least to me, I'm biased now, but at
24 least to me, trying to look at them, if they stood

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 alone, you change just a word or two here and there
2 and I think they would.

3 MR. KROCKMAN: They would stand alone?

4 MEMBER BLOUGH: They would, yes. If you
5 just pull them up as a list they make sense.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay. Then the other
7 recommendation had to do with the first two sections
8 here in the body of the report, introduction and
9 approach and objectives.

10 MEMBER FLOYD: I guess my opinion on that,
11 if you pull up the majority conclusions and
12 recommendations in the Executive Summary, I don't see
13 any problem in the body of the report starting out
14 with an introduction approach an objectives and then
15 a statement of the conclusions and recommendations
16 again. I think that flows okay if you've got the gist
17 of it in the Executive Summary.

18 MEMBER GARCHOW: I can buy into that.

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And I was concerned
20 about trying to put some context on what we did in
21 there and I tried to be brief, but at least get some
22 of the concepts on how we did our business in the
23 front before they got to --

24 MEMBER HILL: Should that be background
25 and not part of the Executive Summary then?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: But then they wouldn't
2 have read it.

3 MEMBER HILL: Do they need to?

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: No, but I mean it's not
5 in the Executive Summary.

6 MR. CAMERON: You're not talking about
7 putting it --

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I was talking about
9 what's on page 1. I was talking about this
10 introduction.

11 MEMBER GARCHOW: Actually, you did sort of
12 truncate that into the first paragraph of what was the
13 Executive Summary when you came in there and that was
14 sort of one paragraph of we met six times and that
15 made that -- that paragraph may carry over, wherever
16 it ends up, the Executive Summary.

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay, any other format
18 approach issues?

19 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Also, I thought that we
20 could talk about under panel conclusions,
21 recommendations, all the priority ones and twos?

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes, all
23 recommendations. We'll pull them all up into that
24 section.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KROCKMAN: So I guess we're to the
2 point where do we agree these are three key issues?

3 MEMBER REYNOLDS: You're going back to the
4 three key issues of the Executive Summary?

5 MR. CAMERON: Except that's not -- this
6 would be -- what you're doing is you're going to take
7 a look at this substance of what will now be part of
8 the main report under panel conclusions and
9 recommendations, right?

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes, they're insights.

11 MR. KROCKMAN: These would be the
12 35,000-foot insights that are listed there.

13 MEMBER FLOYD: So we're ready to go into
14 the content of this? Page 1, is that where you want
15 to start? Or do you want to start I?

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Let's do I.

17 MEMBER KRICH: All agreed, say "I".

18 (Laughter.)

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: I have a comment. On the
20 hurdles, it's listed as hurdles before they can
21 achieve further progress toward meeting the Agency's
22 goals. And I think maybe hurdles accelerating the
23 progress or to realizing the full potential or
24 whatever, but the way it's written there it's like a
25 stop sign. It's a barrier. You can't go any further

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 without overcoming these hurdles. I just wouldn't put
2 it quite that strongly.

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: Maybe the effectiveness
4 will be limited.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Hinder further achievement?

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's a good one.
7 Hinder further achievement, potentially hinder.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: To me, hurdles isn't the
9 metaphor to use here, is that --

10 MEMBER BLOUGH: It says before they can
11 achieve further progress. Those are the actual words.
12 The words -- that implies where to plateau or to stop
13 or you can't get any further, at least that's the way
14 I read it.

15 MEMBER FERDIG: Which line is that in?

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It's the paragraph that
17 starts "the NRC and the nuclear industry."

18 MEMBER BLOUGH: They could hinder, they
19 could slow or they --

20 MR. KROCKMAN: How about the panel noted
21 three hurdles are present which hinder achieving
22 further progress toward meeting the Agency's goals?

23 MEMBER FERDIG: I wanted to -- just while
24 we're thinking that, I wanted to challenge the use of
25 the hurdle metaphor. And I will tell you why. If you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 go to the last sentence, these three hurdles are
2 underlying contributing causes, you know, like our
3 underlying -- again, this is just from a writing
4 metaphor perspective. I think they're mixing what
5 we're trying to say here. So are they underlying
6 factors that are impacting the relative effectiveness?

7 MEMBER SHADIS: Three impediments. Three
8 impediments to optimal progress.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: Potential. The hurdle is
10 a word that I think has a lot of different meanings.
11 What were you trying to communicate, that there's
12 three underlying issues?

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: These three, I mean
14 there are more, but I think these are the three more
15 significant issues that really relate to many of the
16 areas of concern, either -- and not just one specific
17 stakeholder. I think looking at all the discussions
18 that occurs, what's causing some of the rubs. These
19 are involved. These philosophical issues are involved
20 with those concerns.

21 MR. CAMERON: What if you said there were
22 three underlying issues that need to be addressed,
23 instead of characterizing them as hurdles and going to
24 Mary's point, bringing that underlying sort of up
25 front.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: And is there another word
2 than issues, simply because we use issues in another
3 context in this report. Underlying areas, underlying
4 themes.

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: Three specific areas and
6 you listed out the areas.

7 The staff addressed three specific areas.

8 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Let's talk about the
9 theme concept for a minute. That has some attraction
10 to it.

11 MEMBER FERDIG: To me, there are themes
12 that emerged that's relevant to all of these issues.

13 MEMBER BLOUGH: I like that, but then when
14 we get to each of the area we have to make sure we've
15 got a good strong theme sentence.

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The problem is you don't
17 address themes though. We're talking about resolving
18 or addressing or overcoming something and particularly
19 you don't overcome themes.

20 MR. KROCKMAN: I like Ray's word,
21 underlying impediments.

22 MEMBER TRAPP: Are they really
23 impediments? If you look at the first one it's really
24 regulating for excellence. That's sort of a
25 philosophical thing. Should we be regulating for

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 excellence or should we maintain safety as where it is
2 and I don't see where that's a hurdle. I don't see
3 where it's an impediment. It's just that stakeholders
4 that came to our panel had different opinions on how
5 the NRC should approach doing their job.

6 I don't know where we're going to go with
7 that one. The other ones are a little bit different.

8 MR. CAMERON: Are these opportunities? I
9 mean if you wanted to not take a negative approach,
10 you could call them -- I don't know what the right
11 words are, but opportunities that could be capitalized
12 on to -- etcetera, etcetera. Instead of stating them
13 in negatives.

14 MEMBER KRICH: Let me make an alternative.

15 MR. CAMERON: Mary is getting me into
16 thinking like this now.

17 MEMBER FERDIG: It's dangerous.

18 MEMBER KRICH: Let me make an alternative
19 proposal, since we brought the issue that we used
20 issues later on and not to confuse it, can we call
21 these overarching issues? It's a little pompous. I
22 don't like the word overarching, but --

23 MEMBER FERDIG: We're looking for a term.
24 Maybe it will come to us if we go on.

25 MEMBER SHADIS: Broad concerns.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER KRICH: Broad concerns.

2 MEMBER GARCHOW: Or the issues fell into
3 broad categories? And you're spelling out the broad
4 categories?

5 MR. KROCKMAN: What we're really talking
6 about because Chip, Jim, we're talking about these
7 three things are three philosophical tenets.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: Philosophical what?

9 MR. KROCKMAN: Tenets.

10 MEMBER SHADIS: Let's try to frame it in
11 plain talk. You took a good cut at it there.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: These were changes,
13 philosophical changes.

14 MEMBER FLOYD: Almost cultural issues.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Uh-huh.

16 MEMBER FLOYD: They are. The first one,
17 if you could summarize the first one, it is should the
18 Agency be maintaining safety or pushing the industry
19 for further improvement?

20 The second one is that there is a -- it's
21 not philosophical, there an actual rub between trying
22 to make a deterministic regulatory process be risk-
23 informed.

24 And then the third one is the presumption
25 of whether or not you can through an indicative

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process identify issues at an early enough stage to
2 not have adverse consequences.

3 MEMBER TRAPP: Or should the program be
4 indicative or --

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, should it be more
6 indicative?

7 MEMBER SHADIS: That's more discussion.

8 MEMBER TRAPP: And we heard from different
9 people who had different opinions. States thought we
10 should be predictive and they thought we should
11 regulate for excellence and there were other opinions
12 on the other side.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: There are some philosophy
14 differences that need to be resolved.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The bolded word I tried
16 to capture, what was changed in our approach and that
17 was the change. The Agency decided maintain safety is
18 its goal, but --

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: That created a cultural
20 issue where there's a clash between the philosophy
21 that we should be pushing industry for excellence as
22 opposed to maintaining safety and then industry pushes
23 for excellence, without our exhortations. We changed
24 maintain safety, but the issue is what's that done?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 It's created an additional challenge in the enhanced
2 public confidence area because of acceptance.

3 MEMBER GARCHOW: So why don't we just make
4 a statement that says this new oversight process had
5 three fundamental changes which have caused many of
6 the issues brought forth by this panel.

7 MEMBER FERDIG: Underlying factor.

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: These were, like you were
9 saying, Steve, these are major changes in approach and
10 that change of approach is what gave us the
11 opportunity for many of the issues we discussed.

12 MR. KROCKMAN: But it's even more. It's
13 the premise upon which the changes were based. These
14 are almost three of the presumptions of the new
15 program. These are really the entry level assumptions
16 that the new thing was built on and there was a
17 creative tension and now this creative tension is
18 evolving into -- it's flaring up into points of
19 disagreement between various stakeholders because each
20 one comes in with some different lens that they look
21 at the problem with and these things really challenge
22 the different perspectives in which different
23 stakeholders come about when you're in that arena.

24 MEMBER FERDIG: Well, if we can think of
25 it ourselves not as flaring up in a negative way, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these are the philosophical tensions upon which this
2 entire program has been based and that has become
3 apparent in our conversations as we've looked at these
4 issues.

5 And yet, you don't put this in the report,
6 but just for fun, to say it's the philosophical
7 tension on these fundamental questions that generates
8 the creativity that has led to the invention of this
9 whole framework. So it's embedded in what's going on
10 here and I think to just highlight it as such.

11 MEMBER FLOYD: What if you said many of
12 the issues -- I'm sorry, many of the issues identified
13 in the report stem from three philosophical changes in
14 the Agency's oversight process that deserve continued
15 management attention and then you could have a bullet
16 which summarized the three in the Executive Summary
17 and have the more expansive paragraphs in the body of
18 the report.

19 MEMBER REYNOLDS: But I'm not sure
20 maintaining safety is a change.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: But that's not the issue.
22 The issue is not whether or not --

23 MEMBER FERDIG: It's the tension between
24 maintaining or --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Okay, I agree with
2 everything you said, but I don't know if changes is
3 the right way to characterize it.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: I don't know what the
5 factual basis is. I think it is a philosophical
6 shift. If that was the change, did the previous
7 mission statement have a different language?

8 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, it did.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: What did it say?

10 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, the change occurred
11 in what 1998 NRC Annual Plan? You shifted from
12 improving industry performance to maintaining the
13 current high levels of safety, so there was a
14 philosophical shift.

15 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Before the ROP.

16 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, and it was embodied in
17 the ROP, but it occurred before the ROP program.

18 MR. CAMERON: How about philosophical
19 underpinnings.

20 MEMBER SHADIS: Bill's chairman referred
21 to it in his comments before this committee that
22 change, that shift.

23 Can I make a suggestion? You have the
24 sentence that says "although change management tools
25 used to communicate and carry out the change" which

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 has already been referred to "were generally
2 successful." I would then drop the remainder of that
3 sentence and -- were generally successful.
4 Stakeholders brought forward three broad areas of
5 continuing concern.

6 MEMBER FERDIG: See, but I don't see them
7 as continuing concern and I don't think that's what
8 this discussion is about.

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: They sort of, they are.
10 They exist.

11 MEMBER SHADIS: Let is soak in for just a
12 second.

13 MEMBER FERDIG: I'll let it soak in.

14 MEMBER SHADIS: Your familiarity mind gain
15 some --

16 MEMBER FLOYD: Lingering concern?

17 MEMBER SHADIS: How about three broad
18 areas of concern? I mean this is --

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: We brought these up --
20 they got into the conversation, but I'm not sure we
21 talked a lot about them as concern.

22 MEMBER SHADIS: Some stakeholders?

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: Some stakeholders.

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We're at a logjam.

25 MEMBER GARCHOW: Actually, we're close.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Let's talk about Chip's
2 underpinnings.

3 MR. KROCKMAN: I still want to go back to
4 Mary's words and Ray, I think you're right, get rid of
5 the bad calf, but we're generally successful. Three
6 areas of philosophical tension between a concerned
7 stakeholder -- between all of the concerned or among,
8 between whichever, I think it's between the concerned
9 stakeholders have become apparent.

10 It's not that you really brought them
11 forward, each one. Each one brought their own thing
12 and when you played it all together, three areas of
13 tension have become apparent from looking at this
14 thing.

15 MEMBER FERDIG: That's great.

16 MR. CAMERON: So the tension, okay, and
17 just make sure that everything in those three is a
18 tension. The tension in the first one about maintain
19 versus improve.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's how we originally
21 had this worded.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: It's the philosophy
23 that's the tension. The tension isn't the tension.

24 MR. KROCKMAN: It's the philosophical
25 tension.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right. Tension is the
2 result. But the philosophy that's causing the
3 tension. The tension is the outcome.

4 MR. CAMERON: But is there a
5 philosophical, if you characterize the philosophical
6 tension in the second area, you would characterize it
7 as what, deterministic?

8 And then philosophical tension in the
9 third one?

10 MR. KROCKMAN: Predictive versus --

11 MR. CAMERON: So it's all consistent.
12 It's uniform, if you want to use philosophical
13 tension.

14 MEMBER FERDIG: And it is a concern, but
15 for me concern implies a problem. And I would like to
16 have us think of it not as a problem, but as a
17 philosophical tension that keeps us on our toes.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: I'd go back to what Ken
19 said. I'm not sure it's a philosophical tension.
20 It's a tension that results from a change in Agency
21 approach and philosophy in how they're going to
22 oversee power reactors.

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: The change in approach
24 has created the tension.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: I said something very
2 similar last time I spent a lot of money without
3 talking to my wife first.

4 (Laughter.)

5 This is a philosophical --

6 MR. CAMERON: Can you elaborate in
7 specific details?

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: Let's go back to what
9 Steve said. It's a change in the approach that
10 created the tension. That is the issue and change in
11 approach was in these three areas.

12 MR. KROCKMAN: These three philosophies
13 have been applied and are moving forward and when you
14 get all the stakeholders involved, now a tension has
15 become apparent.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: Right, okay. And the
17 change has occurred.

18 MR. KROCKMAN: Her word on philosophical
19 tension --

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: They're foundations of
21 the program, how the program was structured.

22 MR. CAMERON: And these tensions, as we're
23 calling them now are not just reflected in the reactor
24 oversight process. The reactor oversight process
25 illustrates three underlying tensions that -- I mean

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 these apply across -- don't these apply across the
2 board to the Agency?

3 MEMBER FLOYD: Objection 2, Objection 3.
4 Yeah a lot of initiatives that are under way.

5 MR. CAMERON: I mean you always get the
6 maintain versus improve, the deterministic versus the
7 risk-informed. You know?

8 It may be valuable to point out that this
9 program isn't any -- these are something that have
10 further consequences or broader, more broader effect.

11 MEMBER FLOYD: Is it three changes in the
12 regulatory philosophy that have created the tensions
13 amongst the stakeholders in these --

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: I would say that's it.

15 MEMBER FLOYD: Changes in regulatory
16 philosophy.

17 MR. KROCKMAN: Are we trying to slice it
18 too thin? I want to go back. Maybe I'm too proud of
19 my word, but three areas of philosophical tension have
20 become apparent. Whether I've got the egg or the
21 chicken first is sort of irrelevant. We've identified
22 three areas of philosophical tension.

23 MEMBER FLOYD: But is the tension
24 philosophical? The tension isn't philosophical, it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the change -- it's the philosophical changes that have
2 created the tension.

3 MR. KROCKMAN: The philosophical points
4 have created a tension. We're in agreement.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Yeah.

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: I guess I go back to
7 Steve Reynolds had a comment. I think the Agency
8 changed their words and then you roll this up and it's
9 just not words on the paper, if you implement those
10 words, this is what it looks like and that's what's
11 creating the tension. It was operationalizing those
12 words in a big way in this process.

13 You could say that's what this looks like,
14 whether you agree with it or disagree with it and then
15 you could really see what that meant.

16 MEMBER REYNOLDS: You could also probably
17 make the argument that this tension has existed for a
18 long time and it helped drive these issues to become
19 stated as clearly as they have been.

20 These issues have been around way before
21 1998 and there's been a tension between a lot of
22 parties. So firmed up or clarified, staked out the
23 position, maintain safety was conformed.

24 MEMBER GARCHOW: So it's a change in the
25 philosophy of the approach that created the tension.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: That's it.

2 MEMBER GARCHOW: And those three areas of
3 the change of the approach I thought you did a pretty
4 good job describing those.

5 MEMBER TRAPP: I like Steve's thought that
6 tension was always there and now the ROP is really
7 trying to address that, articulate that.

8 MEMBER KRICH: Well, it's brought to the
9 forefront. It's almost as if these issues have always
10 existed, but I think what happened is the change in
11 the oversight process has brought these to the
12 forefront now. I hate to keep going in circles here.

13 MEMBER TRAPP: Like the risk informed
14 piece before, if you say why are you beating on me for
15 hydrogen recombining, why am I getting a Level 3.

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: I never would do that.

17 (Laughter.)

18 MEMBER TRAPP: The tension was always
19 there, but now at least we can deal with it. So it's
20 positive, I think.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: It's brought to the
22 forefront. The Agency has made a decision where
23 they're going and that's been embodied in the process.

24 MEMBER SHADIS: Does it really matter that
25 these tensions existed before the ROP? I mean in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 affects the ROP. Original sin existed some time
2 before, probably affects some of this. So --

3 MR. KROCKMAN: The key thing is they've
4 become very apparent now, whether they've been here
5 underneath the surface for the last 25 years,
6 everything we've gone through in the last couple of
7 years have now bubbled them up and they're very
8 apparent this tension.

9 MEMBER SHADIS: Our perception is that the
10 ROP is a major program. It's a major part of NRC's
11 charge and responsibility and it's informed by some of
12 these assumptions. And I'm glad, by the way that it
13 was spelled out this time that here's the assumptions
14 we're working on. It was good to include that.

15 MR. MONNINGER: How about the way it is up
16 there now? Tension continues to remain as a result of
17 three changes in the regulatory philosophy.

18 MEMBER FERDIG: That works for me.

19 MEMBER SHADIS: How about "that informed
20 development of the reactor oversight process" as
21 opposed to the word fundamental?

22 MEMBER FLOYD: Inform what?

23 MEMBER SHADIS: Development of the reactor
24 oversight process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KROCKMAN: You can't inform
2 development. You can't tell it anything.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: You can't inform
4 development? Developers?

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: How about inherent?
6 These changes are inherent in the new process.
7 They're inherent in the new process.

8 MR. CAMERON: They're the basis --

9 MEMBER SHADIS: Is that good with
10 everybody?

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Let him finish and read
12 it again.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: Do you want to chair the
14 next panel?

15 MEMBER SHADIS: No, but --

16 MR. CAMERON: One question. This -- on
17 the first issue, maintain versus improve, can you
18 truly say that that is a change in regulatory
19 philosophy?

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: Yes, it is.

21 MEMBER FERDIG: There's a slight wordsmith
22 thing. You don't want to probably continue -- we can
23 fix that.

24 MEMBER SHADIS: I'd like to ask about some
25 part of that paragraph and that is down the bottom,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 last sentence. It says the presumption that current
2 industry performance is sufficient to assure public
3 health and safety and then the phases in there, versus
4 regulating for excellence.

5 The question of regulating for excellence
6 was only articulated, I think, by one person
7 presenting before the panel.

8 MEMBER KRICH: I counted two, Ray.

9 MEMBER SHADIS: For excellence?

10 MEMBER KRICH: Yes.

11 MEMBER SHADIS: We had a State
12 Representative.

13 MEMBER KRICH: It counted for Vermont and
14 New Jersey.

15 MEMBER SHADIS: Oh really?

16 MEMBER KRICH: You know what, Ray? I
17 don't know if you were there for the Vermont --

18 MEMBER SHADIS: No, that was the second
19 day of the Atlanta meeting.

20 MEMBER KRICH: Okay, that's probably why
21 you didn't --

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: There's a third too, the
23 panel number from Georgia. I can't remember his name,
24 the fellow who --

25 MEMBER SHADIS: Jim Setser.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: He was talking about the
2 programs of regulating for excellence in his field and
3 they were beyond just compliance. He had that one
4 whole dissertation the one day about that.

5 MEMBER SHADIS: I asked about that because
6 it's a phrase and a concept that's foreign to me. I
7 just don't think you have enough information to say
8 it's safe enough. It's a different thing.

9 MR. KROCKMAN: And that's the essence of
10 the first one.

11 MEMBER TRAPP: One issue, I see that we
12 have three, but I was wondering if there is actually
13 a fourth and I toss this one out. A lot of our
14 discussions were over public communication, web sites,
15 how we communicate information and I wonder if there's
16 a philosophical change in trying to involve the public
17 in our programs and I wonder if that would capture a
18 lot of our --

19 MEMBER FERDIG: Add a fourth bullet.

20 MEMBER TRAPP: Because a lot of our
21 findings were public related information.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: But I don't see that as
23 a conflict. I think it's a new area of emphasis. I
24 think there's been --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: My sense is everyone has
2 been positive that the NRC has attempted to work at
3 this and then there are criticisms of how it's gone.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's the kind of area
5 where we hear criticisms, we try to make some changes.

6 MR. CAMERON: A new emphasis on a
7 transparent process.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Actually, if you go down
9 to the end, I tried to capture some public
10 communication theme.

11 MEMBER FLOYD: That was good.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The last is where I was
13 trying to capture the thought about the process has
14 tried to outreach and is different than -- I tried to
15 characterize it different because I didn't see as
16 something that's causing a conflict. I think we hear
17 issues and concerns and we're trying to respond to
18 those, but I don't think we're saying well, we're not
19 going to do that. We're not saying that.

20 MEMBER KRICH: On the three issues you've
21 identified, on each side of the argument.

22 MEMBER FERDIG: Good point.

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: But if there's more we
24 can add on that. That's what I tried to capture.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: You may want to -- I think
2 you need to go back obviously and see if that
3 philosophical tension description is correct, but then
4 after your indicative, you need to see if there's a
5 transition to -- a transition needed to your comments
6 about the public communication area.

7 But how about if you can get past this
8 tension continues as a result of three changes and
9 regulatory philosophy that are inherent.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: The changes have impacted
11 the ability. The tensions have. Let's call it for
12 what it is.

13 MEMBER KRICH: Well, but I've got to ask
14 a question for my own help here. Loren, what I
15 thought you wrote here was that you identified from
16 going through all the issues, you've identified these
17 three main areas which what you were saying were these
18 things need to be addressed in order for the new
19 process to be able to move forward successfully.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I was having trouble
21 with that because some of them --

22 MEMBER KRICH: Is that what you were
23 trying to say or did I miss the --

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Some can argue -- if the
25 Commission decided that's what we're going to do, it's

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a communications change management issue, not
2 something that needs to -- and I guess you could say
3 as having to address it, but it's not trying to change
4 it, but it's more has to be done to get the message
5 across, that's where we're going to go.

6 MR. KROCKMAN: But maintain safety is a
7 good one. If we're going to say it is safe enough,
8 that's a Commission decision, maintain safety, then
9 you've got to -- your implementation methodologies are
10 going to have to truly incorporate that to make sure
11 the project can move forward.

12 MEMBER KRICH: I'm not making myself
13 clear. Let me try again. When I read through this,
14 what I took from what you wrote was after going
15 through all the things, all the input, we've
16 identified three big areas that if they're not
17 addressed, need to be addressed in order for the whole
18 program to be able to move forward successfully.
19 That's what you said about you have to overcome these
20 hurdles, these underlying issues, whatever you want to
21 call them, in order for the whole process to be able
22 to move forward.

23 If you don't do that, the converse is that
24 this could potentially damage the process on a going
25 forward basis.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: I thought we had some
2 consensus though that we thought that was maybe too
3 strong a statement.

4 MEMBER KRICH: That's what I'm trying to
5 get at.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I think impede.

7 MEMBER KRICH: The point being that these
8 were issues that have, that could have a significant
9 effect on the successful progress of the oversight
10 process.

11 MEMBER FERDIG: So they more than impacted
12 the staff --

13 MEMBER KRICH: I'm still trying to
14 understand.

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I'm not sure I'd be that
16 strong.

17 MR. KROCKMAN: There's one change to that.
18 These are things which preclude us from being able to
19 meet all of the goals. And some of the goals are
20 inherently in conflict with each other.

21 MR. CAMERON: Does everybody on the panel
22 agree with those statements?

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: Go through that again.

24 MR. KROCKMAN: It precludes us from
25 meeting all of the performance goals, achieving all --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you may want to put achieving the performance goals,
2 totally achieving the performance goals of the reactor
3 oversight process. Because we've got four or eight,
4 depending on how you want to count --

5 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Eight goals.

6 MR. KROCKMAN: And one of the things we've
7 identified and I'll use an example is many of the
8 public stakeholders, Ray's expressed it very well,
9 challenged the premise that safety has evolved to a
10 point where it's adequate to maintain it. And if the
11 program goes on it and I'm not going to be able to
12 satisfy enhancing public confidence of that
13 stakeholder group in this area because they just don't
14 buy into the premise.

15 MEMBER KRICH: Okay, but let's stay on the
16 general -- let me just stay on this for a second. So
17 the idea is that we've identified three main areas
18 that need to be addressed in order for us to meet the
19 overarching goals, right?

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: What does address mean?

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's the word that
22 gets me.

23 MR. CAMERON: Is it more than having level
24 two PRA sheets, I can address hits on the website, but

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 if you're someone that has to do something, these are
2 the framework of the whole program.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's what I was
4 getting to. I'm not sure address is the right word
5 because -- maybe it's just making sure they recognize
6 some of these issues and as Ken said the goal may
7 never be achieved because of that.

8 MR. CAMERON: Is it more simply that these
9 are always going to be a continuing source of
10 controversy in the implementation of the reactor
11 oversight program and you call those to their
12 attention because there's a big difference between
13 saying that these are going to be a continuing source
14 of controversy and there's still going to be criticism
15 and saying that these issues prevent you from
16 achieving the goals of the reactor oversight process.

17 MEMBER FERDIG: These are paradoxes,
18 examples of paradoxes that are inherent in complex
19 adaptive systems. They're never going to go away and
20 it's the tension of the existing paradox and learning
21 to live in that paradox that is --

22 MR. CAMERON: There are going to be
23 continuing areas of --

24 MEMBER FERDIG: That's the beauty of the
25 ROP.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Conflict that you may not be
2 able to do anything about them, but you should always
3 keep your eye on the ball to see what you can do.

4 MEMBER SHADIS: You may or may not be able
5 to do anything about them. May or may not. Probably
6 you will be, if the Commission focuses some attention
7 on these areas of tension. They very likely can
8 engage stakeholders in a dialogue on them. They may
9 come to some way of gauging other than what already
10 exists, whether these things, what level they are, in
11 fact, at, so I think the question is at the end of
12 this, you give the Commission this information, what
13 do you want them to do with it, you know? And I know
14 you're not into problem solving, but a lot of these
15 recommendations look like problem solving to me. So
16 you know, maybe there's a recommendation that says
17 this is an area on which if the Commission wishes to
18 achieve all their objectives they must focus
19 attention.

20 MR. KROCKMAN: I think Mary had a very
21 good point in the aspect in the change in the arena
22 we're in. These levels of tensions are going to be
23 part of it. Don't think you're going to be able to
24 come up with a solution that is going to put
25 everything to bed and make everybody happy. What you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 want to do is come up with solutions that will allow
2 the tension to maintain itself creative and not become
3 destructive.

4 MEMBER FERDIG: And Ray's idea about
5 engaging the stakeholders in conversation about that
6 is the what you can do.

7 MR. KROCKMAN: That's one of the options.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: Right. It just keeps it
9 -- keeps everybody on their toes.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: There's nothing in this
11 that's saying that this is a show stopper. It's just
12 an insight that we gained along the way in the
13 conversation.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And that's all I was
15 trying to go to to highlight to -- based on our
16 insight, I thought we could provide to Sam Collins and
17 the Commission so they acknowledge and understand it
18 that these tensions --

19 MEMBER TRAPP: Why don't we just say then
20 that these differences in philosophy resulted in
21 stakeholders having different perspectives on the
22 success of the ROP.

23 You're not going to resolve, if you don't
24 like risk-informed regulation, you're not going to be
25 there. And some of the State people said we don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 like this. We like the old South. So it's a
2 philosophical change that really -- it was the
3 stakeholders perception on the success of the program.

4 MEMBER BLOUGH: As you try to address is,
5 one, everyone grows, understanding grows. Things that
6 can be done to mitigate the tensions or to accommodate
7 more of the views or more the perspectives can be
8 done. So you can make progress. You can mitigate,
9 but probably not eliminate.

10 MR. KROCKMAN: Jim, what were your words?
11 This tension is impacted to achieve the goals and --

12 MEMBER TRAPP: I said "resulted in
13 stakeholder differences and perspective which on the
14 success of the ROP, having different perspectives on
15 the success of the ROP."

16 MR. KROCKMAN: We can fix the words, let's
17 get the thought up, on the success of the ROP. And
18 then we need to capture Randy's point here with the --
19 it needs to addressed for its on-going considerations.

20 MEMBER FLOYD: I've got a sentence
21 suggested for that, but get yours first.

22 MEMBER FERDIG: Well, I heard Randy use
23 "increases understanding" --

24 MEMBER GARCHOW: Steve took that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: It's hard. I've been
2 trying to write and I keep scratching out as another
3 comma gets --

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: Too many good ideas.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: My word processor isn't --

6 MR. CAMERON: Are we ready for Steve's --

7 MEMBER FLOYD: What about after that
8 sentence just have a sentence that says "continued
9 Commission attention will be needed to manage the
10 tension embodied in these three changes." And then
11 you identify, bulletize what the three changes are.

12 MEMBER GARCHOW: Manage the change in
13 philosophy.

14 MEMBER FLOYD: Or demand its attention
15 embodied or resulting from --

16 MEMBER SHADIS: "Manage" is so bad a word.

17 MEMBER FERDIG: "Manage" sounds like
18 you're trying to make it go away.

19 MEMBER HILL: How do you have Commission
20 attention on maintaining safety versus improving
21 safety though?

22 MEMBER FLOYD: No, it's not that. It's
23 Commission attention is needed to and maybe manage
24 isn't the right word, but manage the tension, not the
25 philosophical change, but the tension that results

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 from the change. To address the tension, is that a
2 better word?

3 MEMBER SHADIS: To be responsive to --

4 MEMBER FERDIG: That's great.

5 MEMBER HILL: Are you specifically talking
6 about the Commissioners the way you're using this?

7 MEMBER FLOYD: I said the Commission.

8 MEMBER TRAPP: I'd take Commission out and
9 just put down continued attention, because I think a
10 lot of people can help you with that.

11 MEMBER FLOYD: Okay, continued attention
12 will be needed to --

13 MEMBER FERDIG: Respond to.

14 MEMBER FLOYD: To be responsive to the
15 attention resulting from these changes? Yeah, from
16 these changes in philosophy.

17 MEMBER FERDIG: You guys are good.

18 MEMBER SHADIS: That's good. That's very
19 good, Steve.

20 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think recognizing this
21 is something that's powerful in writing it down. So
22 I really commend you starting this conversation
23 because it's behind the scenes in all the
24 conversations, but it's like the Mokita, the unspoken
25 truth, everybody knows about, but nobody will say and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we're taking the courage to say it. It's out there.
2 It's real and it's behind a lot of us.

3 MR. CAMERON: Anybody have any problems
4 with what's up there, any more wordsmithing or do you
5 want to just leave --

6 MR. KROCKMAN: We've got to wordsmith a
7 sentence before that, but I trust John to be able to
8 do that.

9 MR. CAMERON: But this captures how you
10 want to introduce these three areas, right?

11 MR. KROCKMAN: That's good thoughts.

12 MEMBER FLOYD: Now just a question. Do we
13 want to put a colon there and then have a sub-bullet
14 of what the three issues are or is our intent now to
15 have these three issues in this descriptive fashion in
16 the Executive Summary?

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: We're not in the
18 Executive Summary.

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We're going to move this
20 back.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: I thought we were in the
22 Executive Summary.

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: We're moving this back to
24 the panel conclusions and recommendations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: This is so good. This has
2 got to go into the Executive Summary.

3 MR. KROCKMAN: The tech editor will decide
4 if it's a period or a colon.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Gotcha.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I want to get back to
7 Steve's comment is that I thought we're working off
8 the Executive Summary, but this section really is now
9 going to be back in the body of the report under our
10 panel, whatever we call it, panel insights.

11 MR. CAMERON: Some part of it will be
12 summarized in the Executive Summary.

13 MEMBER FERDIG: This is provocative.

14 MEMBER FLOYD: See, I was under a
15 misconception. I thought this paragraph was going to
16 be in the Executive Summary with a bulletized version
17 of the three areas. The Executive Summary, with the
18 more expansion thought --

19 MR. CAMERON: It may well be. When they
20 go back and take a look at the report, it may be the
21 most efficient way for them to summarize it. I don't
22 think you need to worry about that now.

23 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Are we ready to get to
24 the three bullets?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER KRICH: One more editorial comment?
2 It's not substantive time and effort, it's
3 substantial. Time and effort are not substantive.
4 They're substantial.

5 Thank you.

6 MEMBER REYNOLDS: "A lot of" works better
7 for me. That's pretty clear.

8 MEMBER BLOUGH: Maintain safety.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Maintain safety.

10 MEMBER FLOYD: Maintain safety. I've got
11 a comment there. I think the first sentence needs a
12 little bit of work.

13 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I think Randy had the
14 floor.

15 MEMBER FLOYD: Did he have it?

16 MEMBER BLOUGH: I think people like the
17 word presumption, but I think we have to be precise
18 when we use it and the first use of it there, the
19 presumption that the industry performances have
20 improved, to me presumption is like you're presumed
21 innocent, which means if there's no data at all,
22 there's a presumption of what it is. To me, this is
23 more of a judgment. Right or wrong, it's a judgment
24 because it's a judgment based on a lot of data. So
25 the word presumption --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: I agree with that.

2 MEMBER BLOUGH: -- is maybe not used.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: How about a determination?

4 MEMBER FLOYD: I had the same comment,
5 Randy. That was along the same lines what I was going
6 to say. The presumption is not that industry
7 performance has improved. The presumption is that
8 industry performance has improved to the point where
9 further encouragement for improvement is deemed
10 unnecessary. That's what the presumption is. Not
11 that industry performance has improved. I think it's
12 a fact that industry performance has improved, at
13 least I think the Agency believes that industry
14 performance has improved.

15 The question is has it improved, or the
16 presumption is has it improved to the point where it
17 doesn't need to be pushed for further improvement. To
18 me, that's what the presumption is.

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: I'd still call that a
20 judgment.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Not a presumption.

22 MR. CAMERON: What does it say in the
23 strategic plan?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I think the words after
2 strategic plan are copied right out of the strategic
3 plan.

4 MEMBER BLOUGH: That was it.

5 MEMBER SHADIS: Ever ponder the difference
6 between assumption and presumption?

7 MR. KROCKMAN: We fixed it. Get rid of
8 both of them.

9 MR. CAMERON: Now here you're referring to
10 it as a presumption again, right?

11 MEMBER BLOUGH: I'd call that a judgment
12 or
13 --

14 MR. CAMERON: The judgment that current
15 nuclear industry performance. Can we change that to
16 judgment for now? This particular word, get away from
17 presumption again.

18 MEMBER FERDIG: Is there a better word
19 than judgment?

20 MEMBER SHADIS: Decision.

21 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Assumption.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Determination.

23 MEMBER SHADIS: An assumption based on
24 evidence.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: I think the Commission would
2 probably question saying it's an assumption or a
3 presumption, whether they're right or wrong, it's
4 another story.

5 MR. KROCKMAN: Someone brought up earlier
6 a difficulty with the verse "regulating for
7 excellence." I mean we could change that to
8 regulating for continual improvement.

9 MEMBER SHADIS: I don't care if it's in
10 there. I just didn't want it to be the only thing
11 held in opposition to where we are. It really isn't
12 that important. It's fine to leave it in as far as
13 I'm concerned.

14 MR. CAMERON: Anybody else have a problem
15 with regulating for excellence?

16 MEMBER HILL: What was the word used
17 before?

18 MR. CAMERON: I think this was what was in
19 there, regulating for excellence.

20 MEMBER HILL: That was in the previous
21 NRC's mission statement before 1998?

22 MR. CAMERON: No.

23 MEMBER HILL: I'm just saying go back to
24 what those words were.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 When you say regulating for excellence,
2 that kind of implies --

3 MR. KROCKMAN: That was my thought.
4 Regulating for continual improvement.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: I agree.

6 MEMBER FERDIG: I like that.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think Richard is right.
8 I think John, you just need to go back to the previous
9 version. We're comparing and contrasting so if you're
10 comparing and contrasting, you have -- it seems like
11 you have a burden of going back to be precise with
12 what you're --

13 MEMBER BLOUGH: The words "will limit"
14 they have a ring of futility to them.

15 MEMBER SHADIS: Change to could.

16 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Potential to limit.

17 MEMBER SHADIS: Could is what we used
18 before.

19 MEMBER FERDIG: So is that unwelcome
20 message accurate?

21 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's more purple
22 language too.

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I debated on what word
24 to use. I picked that one.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: And it's qualified to some
2 --

3 MR. CAMERON: Take a look at the whole
4 paragraph. Any further comments on maintain safety?
5 Let's go to risk-informed.

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Risk-informed.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: I think here you could work
8 Jim's comment a little bit on significance of
9 determination process. You could acknowledge just as
10 we've acknowledged that there's a premise in the first
11 one, you could acknowledge that there's a major change
12 in the new oversight process, the incorporation of a
13 significance determination process and this new
14 process has highlighted the conflict between being
15 risk-informed and compliance based and that could
16 bring that thought in and at least put SDP in the
17 Executive Summary.

18 MR. KROCKMAN: Something along the lines
19 of the oversight process in many ways is further ahead
20 of the regulatory processes and cites an example of
21 this as the integration of significance determined
22 process --

23 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER TRAPP: My real concern for
2 Executive Summary for SDP is that it's broken. There
3 still needs to be action --

4 MEMBER FLOYD: Other areas developed.

5 MEMBER REYNOLDS: How much work there is
6 to be done.

7 MEMBER TRAPP: Right. That's the concept
8 I'd like to catch in the Executive Summary.

9 MR. CAMERON: Can we get this concept up,
10 whether it's consistent with what Jim was aiming at or
11 not. It may have validity. Can we take a look at it
12 up here? An example of this is an integration of
13 significance determination process as part of --

14 MEMBER FLOYD: Jim, would your comment be
15 resolved now with the decision made to put in the
16 Executive Summary the priority one items, many of
17 which are on the SDP issues. I have to see what it
18 looks like when we put them in, but --

19 MR. CAMERON: Do you need to -- do you
20 start this out with -- you need to start this out with
21 something like the reactor oversight process rather
22 than leaping into risk-informed and compliance-based,
23 although that seems to be the tension that you're
24 talking about?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes, because we do have
2 a lead in really in maintain safety and we really
3 don't have one for -- we kind of assume people know
4 what we're talking about and maybe we need to --

5 MR. CAMERON: The reactor oversight -- the
6 basis for the reactor -- or the methodology is the
7 user risk-informed methodology? Something like that.
8 I don't know the right way to way it.

9 MR. KROCKMAN: That may be where to put it
10 in the SDP.

11 MR. CAMERON: And then follow that up with
12 the SDP language?

13 Does anybody have a first sentence --

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We could say the reactor
15 oversight process uses risk insights to what --

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Oversee.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: Focus Agency attention.

18 MEMBER GARCHOW: I like -- just move it
19 up. The tension is coming because of a second
20 statement.

21 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

22 MR. KROCKMAN: That is the cause of the
23 tension.

24 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, in reverse order.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: Do you want to say
2 something like there is a conflict between the risk-
3 informed and compliance-based orientation? Instead of
4 being
5 risk-informed --

6 MEMBER BLOUGH: I think the thought's
7 right.

8 MEMBER FERDIG: Okay, never mind.

9 MEMBER FLOYD: Should it be between
10 risk-informed versus compliance-based? It's not
11 between, the conflict doesn't result from being both.
12 It results from one against the other.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: It's implementing a risk-
14 informed oversight process versus a compliance-based
15 regulatory framework.

16 MEMBER FLOYD: That's really what it is,
17 yeah.

18 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, if you say a
19 conflict between --

20 MR. CAMERON: Is the juxtaposition
21 risk-informed versus compliance-based? Is that the
22 right juxtaposition.

23 MEMBER BLOUGH: It's what Dave said.

24 MEMBER GARCHOW: It's the implementing and
25 oversight process that is risk-informed into a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 regulatory, on an industry that is operating its
2 plants in a compliance-based regulatory framework.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, yes, that's always
4 been the phrase, deterministic framework as opposed to
5 compliance-based.

6 MEMBER FLOYD: If you have risk-informed
7 regulations, hopefully you comply with those too.

8 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, some of these words
9 are value-loaded too. If you say all the NRC is
10 interested is compliance, mindless compliance.

11 MR. KROCKMAN: I'm going to noodlenik the
12 words. You can't read between X versus Y. It's
13 between X and Y or you can put an X versus Y
14 relationship, but you're not between X and Y.

15 MEMBER FLOYD: Well, how about Dave's
16 words? His was something along -- there is a conflict
17 in implementing a risk-informed oversight process on
18 a deterministic regulatory framework?

19 MEMBER FERDIG: Bingo. Gosh, you're good,
20 Steve.

21 MEMBER GARCHOW: Implementing a risk-
22 informed regulatory process.

23 MEMBER FLOYD: Oversight process,
24 risk-informed oversight process.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: That's not the only
2 conflict that was identified by the stakeholders.

3 MEMBER FLOYD: No, it isn't.

4 MR. KROCKMAN: What were the --

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Oversight process over a
6 deterministic regulatory framework.

7 MR. CAMERON: What about Ray's point
8 though about the other, perhaps other inherent
9 problems brought up in the risk-informed area by other
10 stakeholders? How would you characterize those
11 things, Ray?

12 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, I think the general
13 consensus among those activists that I've spoken to is
14 that the whole discipline of risk-informing is still
15 forming, that some things need to be maintained in
16 deterministic space. That's not a deterministic
17 regulatory framework. That is to single out some
18 areas that are so critical that you assume you're
19 getting greater margins of safety by staying in
20 deterministic space.

21 MR. KROCKMAN: It would seem that one
22 thing that helps capture that a little bit, Ray, might
23 be in implementing an emerging or a developing -- it's
24 still coming along now, but Jim, I need to --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER TRAPP: I think it catches that
2 thought though.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: It's all hung on a
4 deterministic regulatory framework.

5 MEMBER TRAPP: Is that conflict between
6 the deterministic and the risk-informed and I think
7 what you're saying kind of --

8 MEMBER SHADIS: I appreciate the
9 difference, you know, using the term deterministic.
10 I don't know about -- and it is a conflict, admitted,
11 that it's hard to hang it on the remnants of a
12 deterministic regulatory framework. All I'm saying is
13 that there are conflicts outside of the fact that the
14 framework is constructed, left over from days of
15 deterministic
16 --

17 MEMBER FLOYD: I think Ray's got a good
18 point. Why don't we -- there's almost two thoughts
19 under this risk-informed area. There's the thought of
20 we're trying to apply it on a risk-informed oversight
21 process and a deterministic regulatory framework and
22 I think we've got some words that identify that. And
23 then we could say additionally, some stakeholders have
24 concerns about whether the risk-informed tools are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 developed enough to the point where they should be
2 having as much impact as they are having.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: Essentially.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: That was what Jim was
5 bringing up too. Now we're getting into all the
6 nuances of it. I think you should just leave it big
7 picture for the three bullets and get into the detail
8 when we get into --

9 MEMBER SHADIS: It's really detailed to
10 say that the viewpoint is generated by the --

11 MEMBER SHADIS: I should say a
12 deterministic world because all this good stuff --
13 that's the conflict. You'd rather stay there because
14 you don't agree with all the risk-informed tools,
15 etcetera, etcetera, fidelity and all that stuff with
16 the models. So it's really the philosophical conflict
17 is between should we do risk-informed or should we do
18 deterministic?

19 MEMBER TRAPP: I think we should keep one
20 foot on the dock until we make sure the boat isn't
21 going to sink.

22 MEMBER SHADIS: I think that's captured.

23 MR. KROCKMAN: I might throw in again, an
24 emerging.

25 MEMBER FERDIG: I like that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KROCKMAN: I want to be able to
2 discuss exactly what you're talking about and I don't
3 think it takes anything away from the point you're
4 making.

5 MEMBER FERDIG: And that's exactly what it
6 is. I agree with that.

7 MR. CAMERON: Let me ask, let me get it
8 clear, do you mean to -- David pointed out one sort of
9 problem that's created by using risk-informed
10 methodologies in a deterministic regulatory framework
11 and Ray is pointing out another problem that comes
12 from doing that. I think there are two different
13 concepts that you're talking about, both a result of
14 what we call a tension.

15 MR. KROCKMAN: But we're trying to keep
16 the description here very high level. We don't want
17 to get down into all the details at this point.

18 MR. CAMERON: Although you do it down
19 here. You get into all this stuff, but do you ever
20 talk about the problem that Ray brings up which is a
21 lot of people are skeptical about using a still
22 developing assessment tool to determine whether plants
23 are safe?

24 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, our perception is
25 that the basic information that you're plugging in to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 risk-informing these things may not be whole or sound
2 and so there's a lot there to get into, but I just --
3 and I forget where the issue surfaced, but there was
4 some place in the workshop or in these papers where it
5 became evident that it was impossible to risk-inform
6 certain things because of the way they lay in the
7 regulatory process, that framework. I understand
8 that. And you're right, there's something more here
9 that we're talking about.

10 To me, if you say you're trying to hang
11 risk information on a regulatory, deterministic,
12 regulatory framework, to me that's getting pretty
13 specific in itself.

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: And I think all this
15 stuff about the inspector, that issue there's a whole
16 other burden. I mean it puts the inspector in a
17 difficult situation, disagree with the words, but it
18 also puts the utility in a difficult situation, if I'm
19 sitting here knowing that I've got this body of
20 regulation I'm complying with that has no safety
21 significance. On the one hand everything is boiling
22 down to risk, on the other hand, they've got a body of
23 regulation and I'm trying to comply with that has
24 little or no safety --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KROCKMAN: You could inspector and
2 licensee and change then the second sentence from
3 directs the inspector to directs them both.

4 MR. CAMERON: One suggestion. Maybe you
5 should put Ray's idea -- I don't think that we're done
6 whether Ray's point should be in there, but on this
7 one point can you see if all of this language is
8 consistent? What you're doing now, in other words,
9 just puts the inspector and licensee -- see if this
10 thing makes sense, just with the one concept and then
11 see if we need to add anything to address Ray's point.

12 MEMBER GARCHOW: Actually, the "they" is
13 true for both the inspector and the licensee, so
14 "they" still applies.

15 MEMBER BLOUGH: I just -- while we're
16 wordsmithing here, the process can't really direct the
17 licensee, but it can seek to focus both the inspector
18 and the licensee. It seeks to focus now.

19 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right, I agree with that,
20 Randy.

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Just say focuses on
22 risk-significant issues. You don't need to say who it
23 focuses it on or anything. It's universally true. It
24 focuses on risk-significant issues --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: On this particular one,
2 we're offering a solution wherein under safety, we
3 didn't. Just as a point if we're trying to be
4 consistent. The last sentence is a solution wherein
5 at least the discussion on safety, we just presented
6 a conflict.

7 MEMBER KRICH: That sentence should
8 probably be deleted.

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Of course, maybe it's
10 one that we know and we're not sure what it is on the
11 other. Or at least an approach--

12 MEMBER BLOUGH: Do we disagree with that
13 last sentence?

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Someone shouldn't
15 disagree because I took that right out of someone
16 else's comments.

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: Mine. I'm just pointing
18 out that that is an inconsistency, but it may be
19 perfectly acceptable.

20 MEMBER FLOYD: I wonder if we need that
21 additionally, they cannot condone a noncompliance. I
22 think you make the point in the previous sentence,
23 don't you, that the oversight process focuses on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 risk-significant issues, but the associated regulatory
2 requirements are often not risk-informed? I don't
3 think we need to state this.

4 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That sentence was in
5 there because of the previous one that we took out.
6 It was really focusing on the inspector. It was their
7 dilemma.

8 MR. KROCKMAN: It's still a licensee's
9 dilemma.

10 MEMBER FLOYD: It's no dilemma at all.
11 You have to comply.

12 MR. KROCKMAN: Neither can accept the
13 noncompliance, no matter what the safety significance.
14 The inspector is required to enforce a compliance and
15 the license he's got to deal with coming back into
16 compliance.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: Absolutely.

18 MR. CAMERON: Do you need to be explicit
19 in this sentence about what that means? Focuses on
20 risk-significant issues, but the associated regulatory
21 requirements are often not risk-informed, therefore --
22 is there something, another shoe that needs to drop?

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Maybe we need to rewrite
24 it. I think the thought and Steve just mentioned it,
25 we need to capture, whatever the regulatory oversight

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 process is doing, compliance is still required. I
2 think that thought we need to capture somewhere in
3 there.

4 MR. KROCKMAN: Federal law is a good
5 motivation.

6 MR. CAMERON: Steve, do you have
7 something?

8 MEMBER FLOYD: Often not risk-informed,
9 yet compliance is still required.

10 MR. CAMERON: That's good.

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes.

12 MR. KROCKMAN: Where is that?

13 MEMBER FLOYD: After "often not risk-
14 informed".

15 MR. CAMERON: Before "additionally" --

16 MEMBER FLOYD: Two lines, three lines
17 down.

18 MR. KROCKMAN: You can't have a button
19 button.

20 MEMBER FLOYD: Down, left now. Change the
21 period after informed to a comma and say yet
22 compliance is still required.

23 MR. CAMERON: Then what about that next
24 sentence that some people have problems with the next
25 sentence?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: You don't need it now. And
2 the rest of it reads good.

3 MR. CAMERON: Does anybody have any
4 further problems with this the way it is now?

5 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes, where you just had
6 your hand in that sentence, reactor oversight process
7 focuses, etcetera, am I right? That one? You've got
8 but and yet in the sentence. I would say right after
9 significant issues, put a period and then just a new
10 sentence that says associated regulatory requirements
11 and you've got it separated out and it still tracks.

12 MEMBER FERDIG: He's not listening to us.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: John, are you getting all
14 the help that you need over there?

15 MEMBER FERDIG: What's he doing, writing
16 the report himself?

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: So then you have to put
18 a period after risk-informed to go where you're going.
19 He just did it a different way.

20 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes, well, compliance is
21 still required with, of, for. And then you need a
22 that right after requirements. That are often not
23 risk-informed.

24 MEMBER GARCHOW: How does that look?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Steve, what about -- I want
2 to make sure that Ray's point is settled one way or
3 the other which Ray's point I take it is that people
4 are skeptical of the risk-based or risk-informed
5 approach because they're not sure that there's enough
6 data to be able to make determinations or however you
7 want to say that, Ray.

8 MEMBER SHADIS: Essentially placing too
9 much reliance on it. This risk-informed philosophical
10 difference or whatever issue, this is a licensee
11 regulator issue and very much so. Although there are
12 safety implications, I'm sure, and public confidence
13 implications to seeing a mismatch of deterministic and
14 risk-informed. However, from the other stakeholders
15 that you've heard from, all along the board and from
16 what's going out on the streets, people are skeptical
17 about over-reliance on risk information at this point
18 and are anxious that at least some areas be retained
19 in deterministic space.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's the other
21 conflict, the risk-informed versus risk-based conflict
22 that we talk about.

23 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes, well --

24 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Too much reliance.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: It gets to a trick of
2 language if you flip it over that way because all the
3 conversation you hear, even if it's solidly risk-
4 based, the argument is well, no, we're risk-informing
5 here. But I really do think that people are very
6 uncomfortable with bouncing all this into
7 risk-informed space, especially when some of the
8 information is difficult to get a hold of. Some of
9 the underlying information, NRC has to go to the
10 licensee for it, public doesn't get it until after
11 it's all well digested issues.

12 I'm just expressing that to you and if you
13 want to put it in there.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I think it's a good
15 place to capture that thought somehow.

16 MR. CAMERON: In this paragraph, Loren?

17 MEMBER FERDIG: Otherwise it doesn't get
18 a place for it to go.

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The communication part,
20 I think, we've captured, but this other skepticism of
21 the risk analysis itself is different.

22 MEMBER GARCHOW: I have a suggestion. We
23 have the conflict. One example is and we go through
24 that path. Right? An example of the conflict. The
25 other example, so if you have one example when you get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 through with that you have another example of this
2 conflict is some discomfort on some of the
3 stakeholders on implementing the risk-informed
4 oversight process without the tools developed. That's
5 what you're saying?

6 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes, and of course, if you
7 think -- if you all think it's -- from what you've
8 heard in all these meetings it's enough of an issue to
9 put in there. It's my perception that it is, but --

10 MEMBER FLOYD: You could put a sentence in
11 that -- see if this captures it, Ray. An additional
12 concern for some stakeholders is the acceptance of the
13 maturity of risk analyses for regulatory use. Does
14 that --

15 MR. CAMERON: There we go.

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: I'd put "stakeholders".
17 I think it's better than one person.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: Probably some folks from
19 the industry as well. It's the acceptance of the
20 maturity.

21 Of risk analyses for regulatory use.

22 MEMBER SHADIS: That's not it.

23 MEMBER FLOYD: Not it?

24 MEMBER SHADIS: No, because in lots of
25 places, you know, it's obvious that risk analysis does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the trick, but I think it's the over reliance or a
2 perceived over reliance.

3 MR. CAMERON: Perceived over reliance.

4 MEMBER SHADIS: Many stakeholders hold a
5 perception that the process is over reliant on --

6 MR. CAMERON: What do you want to say
7 perceived over reliance on risk analysis for
8 compliance purposes or something like that?

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: No, for --

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: How about for regulatory
11 decisions?

12 MEMBER FERDIG: Is the methodology? It is
13 over reliance on the risk analysis methodology?

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: For regulatory -- take
15 out three letter words and --

16 MEMBER FERDIG: This is much better.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: I think you have to move
18 that whole sentence up to before in the long term?

19 MR. KROCKMAN: We'll all have time to
20 denoodle this in the next round.

21 MEMBER FERDIG: This is kind of fun
22 though.

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: If we can winnow it down
24 now, it makes the next round --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: How does that look to
2 everybody now?

3 MEMBER FLOYD: I think over-reliance
4 should be hyphenated, right?

5 MEMBER FERDIG: Is this what you guys did
6 --

7 MEMBER FLOYD: I think as soon as the
8 English is straightened up --

9 MEMBER GARCHOW: The concept, I think we
10 can let John work on the English.

11 MEMBER SHADIS: Is that good with you,
12 John?

13 MR. MONNINGER: Yep.

14 MEMBER SHADIS: Are we done with
15 risk-informed?

16 MR. CAMERON: Yes.

17 MEMBER SHADIS: Could we just step back
18 just for a moment, please indulge me. On the
19 unwelcome message thing, there's got to be a kinder
20 way to say that.

21 MR. CAMERON: Where are you?

22 MR. CAMERON: On the last sentence,
23 "however, this is an unwelcome message to some
24 external stakeholders." It reminds me again of being
25 disciplined in school. It may be --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Inadvisable?

2 MEMBER GARCHOW: It's not accepted.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: However, this message is
4 not accepted by some external stakeholders or is not
5 given credence.

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: Is not given credence.
7 We don't believe it.

8 MR. CAMERON: Let's put Ray's words down
9 and then we can see if you agree with it.

10 MEMBER SHADIS: It's not given credence by
11 some external stakeholders.

12 MEMBER FERDIG: Skip the whole message
13 thing.

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: Good, that sounds better
15 than unwelcome message.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: I didn't like that either.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: Sold.

18 MR. CAMERON: Everybody, we heard a sold
19 over here.

20 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Let Ray read it again,
21 to make sure.

22 MR. CAMERON: Ray, is that?

23 MEMBER SHADIS: Fine.

24 MR. CAMERON: Okay. Anybody else on this
25 one?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER HILL: Well, wait a minute. You
2 can't have a however. Since the determination,
3 however. You're missing some part of a sentence or
4 something.

5 There's a "however" thrown in for some
6 reason.

7 MEMBER SHADIS: Oh yes.

8 MEMBER HILL: The determination is
9 sufficient is what?

10 MR. KROCKMAN: We'd better go see what was
11 there before because it makes sense to cut something
12 out.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Just get rid of however,
14 this and say "is a message that is not given credence
15 by external" -- that's just some wordsmithing.

16 MR. KROCKMAN: Just "is not given
17 credence."

18 MEMBER BLOUGH: Yes, the determination i
19 snot given credence. So just take out this message.

20 MEMBER FERDIG: I thought we already took
21 out "this message".

22 MR. CAMERON: How's that?

23 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Do you want to do
24 indicative before we take a break?

25 MEMBER GARCHOW: Go for it.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I have one comment
2 myself when I went back and re-read it. It's just one
3 paragraph, right?

4 MEMBER FLOYD: Indicative is just one
5 paragraph or are the two paragraphs different
6 thoughts, right?

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes, the next goes on to
8 another section.

9 MR. CAMERON: We need to think about
10 whether -- what the transition is here.

11 MEMBER FLOYD: A heading of something.

12 MR. CAMERON: Theoretically, we're off the
13 tensions.

14 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Double indent the first
15 three.

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Somehow, the way it is,
17 it loses the impact of the --

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Where it says there's a
19 related assumption, it's not really passed from green
20 to red. It's really, we've got to use the titles of
21 the action matrix column, that's what I really
22 intended to say. That wasn't really the right --

23 MEMBER GARCHOW: Just say directly through
24 the action matrix.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: From the licensee
2 response column. Yeah, I've got to pull those words
3 up and see what's in there. It's not really one green
4 to red. You have to use the right terminology.

5 MEMBER FLOYD: Response column,
6 unacceptable performance.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right.

8 MR. MONNINGER: What was that change?

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Just take out green to
10 red and say the licensee response column to the
11 unacceptable performance column.

12 MR. MONNINGER: Column?

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Or you can say -- I
14 guess you can say from -- what's a simpler way to say
15 it?

16 MEMBER FLOYD: From the licensee response
17 to the unacceptable performance columns of the action
18 matrix.

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yes. Unacceptable
20 performance.

21 MEMBER SHADIS: Okay. But there's no
22 tension identified until you get down to that last
23 sentence, "many concerns." Right? It simply is an
24 exposition of the difference between the previous
25 program and this one, one trying to be predictive, the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 other one being indicative and then at the very end it
2 says many concerns raised about cross-cutting issues
3 etcetera come from discomfort with this presumption.
4 Is that your tension?

5 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We don't have the word
6 "predictive" in here. We need to get it in here.

7 MR. KROCKMAN: The other one, remember, we
8 put in a current program on there, the statement to
9 lead in. And this one, if we put in a current
10 program, the new program statement as to what it is,
11 the tension will come right in there with the second
12 sentence. The previous says the program focused on
13 something different. So we just need a new lead in.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Move the second sentence
15 up.

16 MR. KROCKMAN: It's just reversing them
17 again.

18 MEMBER REYNOLDS: You need a "versus" in
19 there, too, versus what it was before. Create the
20 tension.

21 MEMBER KRICH: That's the next sentence.

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Does that capture it, I
23 think?

24 MR. CAMERON: "Indicative" means what in
25 this context?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: You wait for indications of
2 related to performance outcome as opposed to looking
3 at inputs into the process regarding conclusions from
4 problems with inputs.

5 MR. CAMERON: This is the type of thing
6 where if you gave it to a well-educated layman and
7 they read "indicative", they wouldn't really have a
8 clue. "Predictive" they might be able to understand
9 if "indicative" is something --

10 MR. KROCKMAN: Let me throw out an idea.
11 We've said these are tensions and maybe we want to on
12 the titles put maintain safety versus improve safety,
13 indicative versus predictive.

14 MEMBER GARCHOW: Risk-informed.

15 MR. KROCKMAN: Risk-informed,
16 deterministic. And now you've got your tension in
17 your title.

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I think we had it in
19 there the first time. John and I, I think we had
20 that. We took --

21 MEMBER GARCHOW: There we go.

22 MR. CAMERON: Indicative process, i.e.,
23 can you explain indicative, what an indicative
24 process? It's not a word that you normally hear
25 thrown around.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Which relies on actual
2 performance outcomes.

3 MEMBER SHADIS: It connotes present tense,
4 really.

5 MEMBER REYNOLDS: It's more of a present
6 tense than a future forecast. This is what it is.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: You wait for an outcome,
8 when it's indicative.

9 MEMBER REYNOLDS: It's what it is, not
10 what it will be or could be.

11 MEMBER GARCHOW: The past versus
12 predictive, past performance versus predictive
13 performance. That is the issue.

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The place to put it is
15 right at the end of this first sentence, where we say
16 "is an indicative process" we can explain in words --

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: Or lagging versus
18 predictive and anybody that extracts performance
19 indicators or reads across --

20 MEMBER HILL: Why isn't it going from
21 green to white on PIs? Why isn't it predictive? It's
22 not risk as is.

23 MR. KROCKMAN: Because it's after it has
24 occurred. And the thresholds are what established the
25 predictivity.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER REYNOLDS: It's indicative of what
2 happened, what's going to happen.

3 MR. KROCKMAN: That's the dilemma you get
4 into that I think is what's driving a lot --

5 MEMBER HILL: Isn't everything else, when
6 you say predictive, everything else we've done in the
7 past has been after it happened too. You have
8 violations after they occurred.

9 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Right, but we've tried
10 to be predictive.

11 MEMBER HILL: But it's really no
12 different. Still, you've got violations that occur
13 now, then you're thinking something will happen. The
14 green to white is the same thing.

15 MEMBER REYNOLDS: No, it's a philosophy
16 difference.

17 MEMBER GARCHOW: Never write Richard a
18 violation because you thought it was going to have a
19 violation next March. You're trying to change his
20 behavior now.

21 MEMBER TRAPP: You could have a SALP-3
22 with no violations.

23 MR. KROCKMAN: The difference that you
24 have is the old process took a lot of things and you
25 said okay, I'm seeing all these small things that are

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 happening real low in the significance ban and that
2 causes me a concern that the program has difficulties
3 with it and the manifestation of that was is you've
4 got a SALP-2 and that was predictive. You're not
5 there.

6 The new program leaves that licensee's
7 control band. It's totally under your control with
8 all these problems. You're as high as you can get.
9 That's the essence of the difference that you're into.

10 MEMBER HILL: Okay, I can see that.

11 MR. KROCKMAN: And it's what we're talking
12 about. It's at a very high philosophical level.

13 MEMBER HILL: I don't think any of our
14 computers are going to understand that.

15 MR. KROCKMAN: I understand.

16 MEMBER HILL: This isn't a simple process.

17 MEMBER FERDIG: But this is an example of
18 some of what might be included in this public
19 information conversation we've been talking about. I
20 mean it is pretty sophisticated concepts.

21 MEMBER GARCHOW: I'm fine with indicative
22 versus predictive. But we're getting more into this
23 than what we are trying to actually get out of the
24 message.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FERDIG: But we're getting smarter
2 in the process.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Are we ready for a break
4 now or is there anything --

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: Before the break, how
6 about painting the process to being done, so we've got
7 this section done. What's between us and being done.
8 If you're going to rewrite the Executive Summary or
9 take a shot at it --

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We want to see are there
11 any other messages or insights that you think we need
12 to communicate that we haven't got in the report.

13 MR. MONNINGER: Plus the cover letter, do
14 you want to cover that?

15 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The cover letter, we're
16 really trying to just keep it as a transmittal.

17 MEMBER FLOYD: I had a couple of other
18 organizational comments to make on the body of the
19 report.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We still have those two
21 pages now in the front that we need to talk about too.
22 That's the other two pieces. That's really what we
23 have left.

24 Are there any other issues that we need to
25 capture in the Executive Summary and then we'll hit

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 quickly these first two pages of sort of describing
2 the approach, the process.

3 MEMBER KRICH: I had one other, something
4 that came up and it's covered somewhat in the issues,
5 but I throw it out for discussion as to whether it
6 should go in the Executive Summary and that was the
7 issue that came up from presentations we had regarding
8 the inability of people to differentiate now between
9 plant and performance. We covered it somewhat in the
10 issue where --

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: In the overall
12 discussion on communication?

13 MEMBER KRICH: Exactly, but it was a theme
14 that we heard a lot from nonlicensees, non-NRC
15 stakeholders and it's kind of stuck with me.

16 Was it -- my question was was it enough
17 to rise to the level of the Executive Summary or is it
18 adequately handled in the issue discussion?

19 MEMBER HILL: Talking about the fact that
20 some people wanted numbers instead of colors?

21 MEMBER KRICH: Exactly. You want to be
22 able to differentiate between a plant in my
23 neighborhood versus the guy down the street.

24 MEMBER REYNOLDS: How safe are you
25 compared to somebody else.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: Where are we -- you
2 identified what we need to do. Are we done with this
3 though?

4 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes.

5 MR. CAMERON: Everybody's satisfied with
6 the language in here? Okay.

7 Is this up for -- are you going to go to
8 that?

9 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Rod has -- this first
10 thing, if there's any other issues he was proposing
11 one, at least to toss out to discuss, if everyone
12 heard that.

13 MR. CAMERON: No, I don't think that a lot
14 of us did hear -- what is it?

15 MEMBER KRICH: It was the issue that came
16 up a couple of times from other, from stakeholders
17 that the current process is difficult to differentiate
18 plant performance, one from another and my question
19 was we did cover it in one of the issues and my
20 question is was it significant enough and was it one
21 of the tensions that needed to rise to the level of
22 the Executive Summary or is it adequately covered in
23 issue.

24 The issue that covers it to my mind was
25 the one having to do with reorganizing the webpage and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 have it give more information in a different way so
2 that people can figure out better how their plant is
3 performing.

4 MEMBER FERDIG: Relative to other plants.

5 MEMBER SHADIS: I think that cure is
6 underway. I think there's an intention to do that.

7 MEMBER TRAPP: I didn't think we were
8 planning to do ranking the plants though.

9 MEMBER KRICH: No, I don't think we were
10 planning, but it was just an issue that came up a lot.

11 MEMBER TRAPP: People said that, that they
12 liked that.

13 MEMBER KRICH: That that was the trouble,
14 that was the difficulty they were having with the new
15 oversight process.

16 MEMBER FERDIG: So his question is do we
17 want to do something to make it more --

18 MEMBER GARCHOW: I didn't think it was
19 that big.

20 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And we captured some of
21 this thought in that overall communication issue.

22 MEMBER FLOYD: And it will be in the
23 recommendations summary also.

24 MR. KROCKMAN: One thing on this other
25 paragraph we've got up here though, I think this gets

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 up forward once again. Bob's issue, who's not with us
2 anybody, said hey, you've got to allocate resources to
3 be able to go out and do the things and communicate is
4 one of the issues in there, so I think it's essential
5 that that part still stay and goes -- reemphasizes his
6 point again.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: And more than his
8 specific area. It's across the board.

9 MR. KROCKMAN: Across the board.

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: What I was trying to say
11 here if things are going well in the program, there
12 are some issues to be done. Don't declare victory and
13 pull the resources that are supporting the
14 infrastructure to keep these changes going. That's
15 what I was trying to say. There still needs to be
16 resources applied, not only to implement the
17 recommendations that we've got in this report, but
18 still some on-going things that the staff is working
19 on. And really, it's only been a year and there's
20 still parts of the process, like the Phase 2
21 worksheets that haven't really been fully vested out
22 yet.

23 MR. CAMERON: Is this up for -- first,
24 this paragraph and then the next paragraph up for
25 discussion now?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: I actually have no issues
2 with either of them.

3 MR. CAMERON: Does anybody have any issues
4 with either of those paragraphs?

5 MR. KROCKMAN: The last sentences that
6 Dave Garchow Memorial, FACA panel sentence.

7 MEMBER FERDIG: Right.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: The last sentence.

9 MEMBER SHADIS: Work his name into it
10 somewhere.

11 MEMBER FLOYD: Is that a gratuitous
12 statement?

13 MEMBER BLOUGH: The only -- this is really
14 minor, but the second sentence, "level of stakeholder
15 involvement has been unprecedented for an NRC process
16 change." I guess if I were saying it, I would say
17 that we believe or in our opinion or something. It's
18 stated as an absolute, in an area where actually
19 opinions could vary. For example, someone might have
20 the opinion that if you had a hearing, that would be
21 more than everything we've done, you know, considering
22 all the panels, the public meetings and workshops,
23 everything. One hearing would be more than that.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. CAMERON: So you're suggesting that it
2 should just say the level of stakeholder involvement
3 has been substantial?

4 MEMBER BLOUGH: "We believe."

5 MR. CAMERON: As long as you guys believe
6 that.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think we're close to
8 being done.

9 MEMBER FLOYD: I would really strike the
10 last sentence myself. I think that's a little
11 gratuitous for the panel itself to pat itself on the
12 back.

13 MEMBER GARCHOW: If we didn't see it that
14 way, who would?

15 (Laughter.)

16 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I would agree with
17 Steve, we take it out.

18 MEMBER FLOYD: It doesn't belong.

19 MEMBER BLOUGH: It's not just
20 congratulating whoever pointed us. Maybe it's
21 gratuitous.

22 MR. MONNINGER: The thought there was
23 whether the panel should provide any type of insight
24 or recommendation for the need for --

25 MEMBER FLOYD: Future panels?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER GARCHOW: I think that could be
2 decided well within the skill of the draft.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Actually, that seed is
4 sort of planted in the long term effectiveness
5 discussion. There is a seed planted in there, that
6 the needs -- Ray and I were talking about it later.
7 It talks earlier about the need for some kind of
8 periodic external stakeholder involvement and we had
9 that discussion in that long term effectiveness
10 recommendation.

11 MEMBER GARCHOW: But how could be any
12 number.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Right, we didn't say
14 how.

15 MR. CAMERON: Steve, do you have a
16 suggestion to -- Loren, are you going to plow through
17 and --

18 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Well, I was going to ask
19 that question. We really only have two pages in the
20 front and part of it is really just boiler plate,
21 factual information before we've gone through
22 everything. Do you want to keep doing it or do you
23 want to break?

24 MEMBER REYNOLDS: I vote for a 10 minute
25 break.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: What's that?

2 MEMBER REYNOLDS: A short break.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: If we can limit it to
4 five minutes, not all disappear for 20 minutes?

5 MEMBER REYNOLDS: Sure, I was back here
6 before lunch early.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: I know you were.

8 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Five minutes.

9 (Off the record.)

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Let's continue. What we
11 have left is the first two pages, just the
12 introduction, the approach and objectives. Comments
13 on those?

14 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes. I don't have any
15 comments on introduction, but under approach and
16 objectives, if I go over to the first two paragraphs
17 that right now are under panel conclusions and
18 recommendations, to me, those ought to be pulled up as
19 part of approach and objectives, because it's really
20 describing the approach that we used. So I would just
21 move those two at the end of what you have. I think
22 it fits neatly right after your 1, 2, 3.

23 MEMBER BLOUGH: Under approach and
24 objectives, where we list who came before it, it seems
25 to umbrella everyone who personally appeared, except

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Judy Johnsonrud from Sierra Club. I understand some
2 other people sent us written material, but just the
3 way it turned out, we list groups of people and then
4 individuals, more or less. She's the only one that
5 actually spoke to us who we left out.

6 MR. KROCKMAN: Add in the Sierra Club.

7 MEMBER TRAPP: She's not on the February
8 26th?

9 MEMBER BLOUGH: I'm just saying in this
10 paragraph, if you compare this to the list of people
11 who spoke to us, were actually -- everyone but her.

12 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We talked about that and
13 we kept flipping back and forth. We included the
14 invited. She did present. We did list her in the
15 back under Attachment 4. I can go either way.

16 MEMBER FLOYD: If she spoke, I would have
17 no problem with putting her name here. That seems
18 appropriate.

19 MR. MONNINGER: I think part of it is
20 maybe what the intent is of it there. Would she
21 believe we are overstating her involvement? Or not?

22 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's what I was
23 concerned with. Did she represent Sierra Club? Since
24 we didn't explicitly invite her to do that, that's
25 what I was concerned about.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Then maybe the right word
2 in that section, that paragraph should be "the panel
3 solicited additional views" rather than "obtained
4 additional views," if those are the ones that we
5 specifically asked for.

6 MEMBER SHADIS: I want to look at the
7 transcript too. I think there's a -- I don't know
8 what it's called. Environmental Action something or
9 whatever of Pennsylvania.

10 MR. MONNINGER: ECNP.

11 MEMBER SHADIS: That's what you put in the
12 back under Attachment, ECNP.

13 MEMBER TRAPP: She might be a member of
14 the Sierra Club. Was she representing the Sierra
15 Club?

16 MEMBER SHADIS: That was my concern with
17 putting that in there, that's why I didn't.

18 MR. KROCKMAN: Solicited or obtained.

19 MEMBER SHADIS: That's why I brought up
20 the Pennsylvania organization.

21 MR. KROCKMAN: Solicited or obtained.
22 Otherwise you get into those we solicited that didn't
23 provide us anything.

24 MEMBER FLOYD: Good point.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER SHADIS: While you're referencing
2 that list, Attachment 4, there's nothing from November
3 and names. You guys said earlier that you had that
4 panel presenting to you at the first meeting.

5 MR. MONNINGER: Madison and those guys?

6 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: That's what the last
8 sentence is supposed to capture. We kept the staff
9 members, we didn't list them all separately, but we
10 tried to capture them all in that last bullet because
11 that came several times.

12 Actually, one of the occasions John and I
13 talked about that. He brought a dozen people to give
14 specific presentations. And for efficiency, I just
15 decided not to list them all and just capture them in
16 the thought. We can do that. I don't have any
17 problem either way, but we just decided just to
18 capture them all within that one sentence.

19 MR. MONNINGER: I actually missed Steve's
20 proposed change to our --

21 MEMBER FLOYD: Oh, take the first two
22 paragraphs that under panel conclusions and
23 recommendations and move them under 1, 2 and 3 under
24 approach. In other words, put it at the end of the
25 approach section because they're really describing the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 approach that was used. Those first two paragraphs
2 there, just move them right up above panel conclusions
3 and recommendations.

4 MEMBER FERDIG: Under the approach
5 section.

6 MEMBER FLOYD: Put them right after the 3.
7 Then under panel conclusions and recommendations.

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: Besides listing which we
9 already agreed.

10 MEMBER FLOYD: I would suggest you have a
11 subheading called panel conclusion and then you take
12 that paragraph that right now is under the heading
13 overall reactor oversight process and just put that
14 right under it and then you have another heading
15 called recommendations and I guess you need a little
16 preamble that just says priority 1 and 2
17 recommendations are summarized or highlighted below
18 and then just list them. What you said you were going
19 to do, yeah.

20 And then I would put in that other two
21 paragraphs that are left under what was the old panel
22 conclusions and recommendations, although the panel
23 focused its emphasis on discussing areas needing
24 improvement, they noted many positive attributes and
25 outcomes and those are in the comments associated with

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 each program element and then the following five
2 sections provide a consensus issue description and
3 recommendations of the IIEP.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: The only thing we missed
5 was where we're going to paste in those other --

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Say that one more time?

7 MEMBER FLOYD: Panel conclusion and then
8 you have another section. Its sub-bullet is panel
9 recommendations and then you just add -- you guys can
10 do the words, but priority one and priority two
11 recommendations are summarized below and then we just
12 listed them and then I take those second two
13 paragraphs that -- the last two paragraphs that are
14 under the current panel conclusions and
15 recommendations. The first one, I think is pretty
16 much fine and the last one, you just have to noodle a
17 little bit and the following five sections, I would
18 suggest they provide a consensus issue description and
19 recommendations of the IIEP with respect to each
20 reactor oversight element. And the rest of it is
21 fine.

22 MR. MONNINGER: Provide a consensus issue?

23 MEMBER FLOYD: Provide a consensus issue
24 description. That's really what we reach consensus --
25 we reach consensus on both the issue description and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the recommendations. That's really what we've reached
2 consensus on. Subject to Ray's dissenting report or
3 whatever.

4 MEMBER GARCHOW: If Ray's going to put
5 something in the report, then this is where you would
6 put a sentence and where consensus wasn't reached.

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Now is probably a good
8 time to talk about that. If there are other views,
9 minority opinions, whatever you want to call them,
10 there are several ways we can handle. The PPEP had a
11 number of issues and they were discrete issues that
12 were related to a specific issue of recommendation, so
13 they embodied those in the report, but if you get
14 other broad areas that may not necessarily match up
15 one to one, I think the best way is just to
16 incorporate that as an attachment to the report. I
17 think the approach --

18 MR. CAMERON: Are these going to be --
19 obviously, it's nice to have coherent report from the
20 panel and people could submit additional information
21 for the record if they wanted to, if the panel wanted
22 them to do that or they could be some type of
23 dissenting view and I just was curious about if you
24 had any idea what to expect along those lines from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 panel members. I know that Ray has talked about
2 submitting --

3 MEMBER SHADIS: Something.

4 MR. CAMERON: Something. But we're not
5 sure if it's an additional view or would be called a
6 dissenting or whatever.

7 MEMBER FLOYD: The way we handled that on
8 the IIEP is -- I'm sorry, the PPEP. The way that was
9 done on the previous panel was the agreement that the
10 panel members reached was that we tried to have each
11 summary be a consensus and that the agreement sort of
12 was that no panel member as part of the panel report
13 would offer a different view unless they did not agree
14 with the consensus position that was -- then we
15 thought it was okay to include in the report that this
16 was a majority consensus, but there was a minority
17 opinion and then you could put the minority opinion in
18 there, but we tried to limit that to instances where
19 the minority member could not agree with the wording
20 that was capturing the issue description and
21 recommendation. All of us, obviously, are free to put
22 in a differing view or opinion as a member of the
23 public on this entire process as part of the comment
24 period or any time we want to for that matter. But we
25 felt that that shouldn't be representative of part of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 the panel report unless it disagreed with one of the
2 consensus positions.

3 MEMBER FERDIG: Where are we on that list
4 of consensus keeping notes?

5 MEMBER GARCHOW: I thought we got it.

6 MR. CAMERON: I didn't see anything yet.
7 I was just putting this on the table because to the
8 extent that someone might have a -- and I'm not just
9 talking about Ray. Other people might have dissenting
10 views, but to the extent that the panel had an
11 opportunity to discuss those dissenting views, maybe
12 it would turn out not to be a dissenting view, again
13 going back to your ground rules about we will try to
14 achieve consensus on all issues.

15 MEMBER FLOYD: I might add, that was the
16 other condition we had in the PPEP, was that if
17 somebody had a minority opinion that they wanted to be
18 included in the report, that the other people of the
19 panel had an opportunity to review those words, prior
20 to them being part of the report, since it is a panel
21 report.

22 MR. CAMERON: So it might be a possibility
23 that the other people on the panel when they saw what
24 was suggested as a minority report might say well, we
25 might be able to live with this.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Or we may want to make
2 adjustments to our issue description and
3 recommendations based upon the minority opinion that
4 we're seeing.

5 MR. CAMERON: Right, that's what I meant.

6 MEMBER GARCHOW: So where are we?

7 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Any other comments?

8 MEMBER SHADIS: Well, we're in crunch time
9 because there's no time left. You want to get a
10 report out by Friday and that makes it very crunchy as
11 far as the opportunity for anyone to review any
12 comments. I can tell you that there are -- I have no
13 show-stopping problems with consenting to any of the
14 issues as they've been laid out, except in general for
15 their limitations and there's two things that occur.
16 One is dealing with the process in which -- and I have
17 to have time to review it, but it appears that in
18 selecting the panel that it was selected in a way that
19 would lend itself to a point of view with respect to
20 the ROP, that the inclination that I could sense
21 before anything really got rolling with my involvement
22 was that generally speaking everyone felt that the ROP
23 was in a good place and only needed some tinkering.
24 That would be kind of the inclination that I sense of
25 the panel. And where you have 14 people, we had? 16.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Out of that you have two State representatives which
2 I would say, I would just presume they're neutral with
3 respect to that, except we heard -- and Bob expressed
4 his concern that the NRC get on with promoting nuclear
5 energy so there's a kind of bias there. And then you
6 have --

7 MEMBER FERDIG: Well, wait a minute. I
8 wouldn't say he was suggesting --

9 MEMBER SHADIS: Yes, he was.

10 MEMBER FERDIG: Promoting. I didn't hear
11 that.

12 MEMBER SHADIS: His initial thing was to
13 educate people as to how safe nuclear energy is. It
14 wasn't about educating people with respect to the
15 success of the ROP.

16 MR. CAMERON: I'm not sure that he said
17 educating people about nuclear energy, but he did say
18 he was supportive, he personally was supportive of
19 nuclear power. I did hear that.

20 MEMBER SHADIS: In any case, even that
21 much aside, generally, in the make up of the
22 committee, I think consensus is flawed unless there is
23 a broader balance than exists here, a less weighted
24 balance than exists in this committee. And I think
25 the committee did a great job, did fine. But when it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 comes to selecting a committee, knowing that you're
2 going to be asked for consensus, I think it's
3 incumbent on those people that want to have a true
4 consensual opinion come out of that committee, that
5 they balance it better than this committee was
6 balanced. So that's one comment that I have and
7 that's my observation. Nothing against anybody on the
8 committee, did a great job and have been very
9 accepting and I saw a lot of my input reflected in
10 what went on, maybe even out of proportion to my
11 representation of one and it was just great. But that
12 observation is there, okay? Any other one, I've
13 already spoken about. It's my sense on the historical
14 origins of the ROP that before anyone said ROP we were
15 looking at was essentially a predictive process,
16 trying to prevent a recurrence of surprises when it
17 came to plans which were good SALP performers, but
18 then turned out to have major problems.

19 From what we can see in order to have
20 that, you really have to have all that design basis
21 stuff there. You've got to have your engineering
22 inspections and all the rest of it working really well
23 and you also have to have all the probabilistic risk
24 assessment, the individual plant work done, nailed

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 down, in place or you can't build on it with any real
2 authority.

3 That's the working issue. The other one
4 is an issue with process. Those two things. And the
5 problem with plugging it into the general public
6 comment area is that the public has no confidence in
7 the general public comment area. They go in, they get
8 lost. We never hear of them again, you know? I don't
9 know how to handle those concerns with respect to this
10 panel and/or what the panel -- it was suggested
11 earlier in casual conversation that a single sheet or
12 something like it could be appended to the report.
13 If the panel wanted to do that and put a disclaimer on
14 it --

15 MR. CAMERON: It's almost not -- really a
16 dissenting view from the panel's conclusions. It's
17 comments on -- in other words, there's not much that
18 anybody on the panel could do in a discussion on those
19 issues to change anything about that at this point.
20 So it's -- by saying it's not a dissenting view, I'm
21 not trying to minimize the importance of what you're
22 saying, but it's almost like additional, an additional
23 view. I don't know, you can characterize it whatever
24 way you want to characterize it, obviously.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. KROCKMAN: I think one thing, I
2 understand how we did the PPEP, I was there too. And
3 I've been giving this some thought as to how we were
4 going to handle this. I know one of the things we
5 came up on the PPEP, we had individual items that sort
6 of evolved, no I just can't live with that language,
7 okay. And we had what, a half a dozen of them
8 scattered hither-thither through the report on
9 different issues.

10 MEMBER FLOYD: Two or three.

11 MR. KROCKMAN: Whatever, a small number in
12 that regard. And then I say well, if that evolved
13 itself in this panel it would seem to be an
14 appropriate way to do it. Here's the minority opinion
15 on this issue.

16 Ray, I hear the comment that you're
17 bringing up here to be a little more global, at a
18 higher level type of thing, especially the process
19 when the design basis, the history and what have you
20 is to me definitely speaks of a higher level concern
21 that one of the key members with a stakeholder
22 representation in the panel brings forward. It
23 probably, as Chip said, I don't see it relating to any
24 one of the specific issues, but I support fully that
25 here's an additional perspective that's provided by

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 one of the stakeholder members and it's provided as an
2 attachment to the report, a white paper or something.
3 That seems reasonable. I think from Steve's
4 viewpoint, however, all the panel members ought to be
5 able to have a chance to take a peek at and get a real
6 quick look too. And if somebody said hey, this is a
7 great point, we need to get back together on a
8 telephone conference or something like that, we can
9 make that happen. Time is short.

10 MEMBER FLOYD: If I totally disagree with
11 a point and feel a need to have my own opinion --

12 MR. KROCKMAN: There may be a point
13 counterpoint that get put there, that would have to be
14 allowed for, but I think that the appendix thing is a
15 right way to go on this.

16 MEMBER GARCHOW: Can I offer another
17 suggestion in an appendix because I think it's -- I
18 don't think that does it justice. If we all had an
19 equal number and minority stakeholder view, I wouldn't
20 expect somebody to find it in the appendix. We had a
21 section created called other insights and if Ray could
22 get that into a paragraph you could start it the way
23 you mention, you know, one of the stakeholders on the
24 committee provided the following insight and you have
25 a paragraph. We listed our consensus insight. These

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 are the three major areas we talked about this
2 morning. It seems like that would be a place where we
3 could put a single additional insight from a
4 stakeholder.

5 MR. KROCKMAN: So he's got to get two
6 areas, one to address -- ask Ray to author two inputs
7 to the body of the report per se?

8 MEMBER GARCHOW: In that part where we
9 talked about the additional --

10 MEMBER FLOYD: Yes, we were going to have
11 after we talked about panel conclusions and
12 recommendations, we were talking about having another
13 section that just called panel insights, you could
14 have a minority insight.

15 MEMBER GARCHOW: That's what I proposed so
16 it's not buried in the back.

17 MR. KROCKMAN: I think it's most
18 appropriate to give that whatever methodology included
19 with the report as opposed to lost in a separate
20 letter that comes in out of synch.

21 MR. CAMERON: Would this constrain you in
22 any way, Ray, these suggestions?

23 MEMBER SHADIS: No, it's a -- that would
24 be fine. It's a matter for me, I'm just looking at
25 the practicality of this in terms of time, getting it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out. I would presume by Friday morning, would be the
2 thing to have it e-mailed around Friday morning.

3 MR. MONNINGER: What you could do is if we
4 were giving this to everyone COB Friday, you could
5 just e-mail it to us and we would put it in and then
6 shoot it to everyone as part of the package Friday
7 afternoon.

8 MR. CAMERON: Or when do you want input
9 back from everybody on the report?

10 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We were going to send
11 out Friday everything we've incorporated from the
12 meeting. Any other editorial comments people give us
13 before tomorrow and then send it out?

14 MR. CAMERON: When do you want it back?
15 A week turnaround on comments?

16 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: A week. I wanted to put
17 together the final.

18 MR. KROCKMAN: If you put a place holder
19 there and Ray, we could give him the weekend and he
20 could get it out on Monday and John could say here's
21 Ray's input that's going to get placed that we held
22 the place holder for, I think all of us could respond
23 to that. The report is not damaged and it gives you
24 an additional two free days to write the -- your
25 inputs which I hope would be helpful.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MEMBER FLOYD: Would Monday be good for
2 you?

3 MEMBER SHADIS: Whatever I've got to say
4 I can say by Friday because of my own schedule anyway.

5 I'm on a plane Friday afternoon and who
6 knows where the hell it's going to land.

7 MEMBER GARCHOW: Right.

8 MEMBER BLOUGH: When would I see like the
9 thing I'm supposed to concur on, you think? It's a
10 week from Friday, May 4th?

11 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: This Friday.

12 MEMBER BLOUGH: This Friday.

13 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: With the exception of
14 this piece.

15 MEMBER FLOYD: It sounds like we could
16 have that Friday also because --

17 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Yeah, okay, we'll have
18 that Friday.

19 MEMBER FLOYD: So Friday we'll get a
20 complete draft, final draft package that you're
21 looking for comments on by a week from Friday.

22 MR. MONNINGER: That week from Friday, I
23 thought that week from this Friday is the issuance
24 date of the final. I'm trying to be straight forward
25 so if it has to be like a Tuesday or Wednesday, unless

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you said comments a week and then bump the issuance to
2 the following Wednesday or something to that effect.

3 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: We'll need the comment,
4 I would say by COB on Thursday.

5 MEMBER FERDIG: COB?

6 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Close of business.

7 MEMBER SHADIS: On those comments of mine,
8 I want you to understand that at least on the
9 substantive issue on design basis and so on, that's
10 not coming out of the blue. That was raised very
11 early on by me. I think Mr. Lockbaum had something to
12 say about it. I think Mr. Sherman from Vermont may
13 have something to say with respect to it. So -- and
14 we didn't go there with our discussion and that
15 happens, but I would want it see reflected because
16 that's one of our deep concerns.

17 MEMBER BLOUGH: If I could just take a
18 couple of minutes to comment. I heard too what Dr.
19 Laurie said this morning, so there was a certain
20 context. But I also recall when we were first coming
21 together and working on our charter, he engaged us,
22 the whole panel, in a discussion that was fairly
23 detailed about how wide open are the possibilities of
24 what we would come up with.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Is it possible that we would recommend
2 abandoning the ROP and there was some discussion, look
3 at our charter then, and I think the charter told us
4 to provide recommendations on reforming and revising
5 and what did those words mean and how wide open was
6 the term reforming and it was Dr. Laurie who was
7 pushing on that to understand how wide open the
8 possibilities were.

9 That was at the outset when we were
10 deciding what we're about and what we're going to do,
11 so I take that more as kind of a view of how open his
12 mind was coming into this.

13 That's all I wanted to say.

14 MR. MONNINGER: With respect to a schedule
15 so it goes out this Friday, COB, with Ray's input.
16 Comments from panel members back the following
17 Thursday which is May 3rd, COB and when is the final
18 report issued?

19 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: However long it takes
20 you and me to incorporate this, depending on the depth
21 and breadth of the comments.

22 MEMBER SHADIS: What kind of comments are
23 you going to be looking for? We're not going to go
24 around changing much.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: No, it's really intended
2 to be -- have we -- confirmation of the sections that
3 you've given us to rewrite. Have we captured that
4 appropriately and in our rewrite, did we
5 mischaracterize something?

6 MR. KROCKMAN: If there's an obvious
7 grammatical error, I mean an author is his own worse
8 proof reader, that's always been --

9 MR. MONNINGER: I would also like to offer
10 to Ray with respect to any comments you would have on
11 panel membership, I think you may want to start with
12 Commission direction for the panel which they directed
13 a panel with a similar make up for the PPEP. So you
14 may want to use that as a starting point and also
15 there's requirements for FACA panels as to knowledge
16 and experience for appointments, so you may want to
17 consider both of us.

18 MEMBER SHADIS: Okay, thank you. There's
19 no intention here of laying out any culpability or --
20 there's none of that. It's just my observation that
21 if you want to have a real go around and come to
22 consensus, you know, either you have a totally
23 homogenous group or try to get a broader spread. It's
24 a principle kind of thing, it doesn't have to do with
25 what their intention may have been.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: Okay, any other issues?
2 Anything -- we tried to look for any missed messages
3 or any other things we need to put in there that are
4 not captured. The only other -- I think to take back
5 from me too in this discussion is -- this is from
6 earlier this morning is to explain why we have the
7 PPEP issues in here and highlight in the front end.
8 I'll put that in.

9 MR. KROCKMAN: I would make the motion.

10 MEMBER GARCHOW: Before we do that I would
11 like to thank Loren for his leadership and John
12 keeping this thing afloat.

13 (Applause.)

14 CHAIRMAN PLISCO: I was going to thank
15 you. I know we took a lot of your time. I think it
16 was a valuable process. I know to me personally it
17 was valuable and I hope the product we're going to
18 provide is going to be valuable input into the process
19 and I appreciate all your efforts and good comments.
20 We'll try to get something out to you on Friday.

21 Thank you.

22 (Whereupon, at 3:56 p.m., the meeting was
23 concluded.)

24

25

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2