

1 front of the public to answer your questions. We
2 have, at which I know you have access to an extensive
3 web site providing all sorts of information. We've
4 made both video and teleconferencing available for
5 all of our meetings that aren't conducted here in
6 Ottawa County. The vast majority, probably well over
7 90% of our meetings are conducted right here, so that
8 the public can come, see what we're doing, listen to
9 what's going on, and then in the evenings we provide
10 an opportunity to answer questions. For those that
11 can't make it, we provide transcripts that are
12 available on the web site and also available publicly
13 so that anybody that's interested can get whatever
14 information you want. The basis for my comments to
15 the Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards were
16 both my personal experiences over the last eight
17 months or nine months as well as the results of
18 numerous inspections that have been conducted. I
19 think during the month of September and October we
20 had over 20 inspectors at the Davis-Besse plant doing
21 a variety of inspections of programs and systems of
22 activities that the licensee was performing and
23 independent inspections of the design of systems.
24 It's -- it's clear to us that there is a demonstrable
25 change in the culture of the organization.

1 Now, the company discussed today during our
2 meeting this afternoon and Bill summarized it earlier
3 that two areas that they're going to provide more
4 details on in our next monthly meeting, and I invite
5 you to come to the afternoon meeting next month,
6 the -- one of those areas is the leadership of the
7 operation organization at the site, and the
8 initiative that they have undertaken to put the
9 licensed operators back in control of the plant.
10 They've concluded that over the past years prior to
11 March, that the organization lost its focus on safety
12 and the operations organization, particularly, lost
13 its focus on safety, and they have undertaken a
14 number of activities to re -- to reinvigorate --
15 that's not the right word, to establish the right
16 foundation that should have existed through the '90s,
17 where the operations organization, the operators that
18 are licensed by the NRC to operate that plant are the
19 ones that are driving the safety culture at
20 Davis-Besse, and that's the way it should be.
21 The second thing that they agreed to provide
22 a broader focus on next month is the activities that
23 they have undertaken to evaluate and measure and
24 monitor the safety culture at the plant. For those
25 of us that are engineers, that seems somewhat odd

1 because we're used to measuring and monitoring
2 equipment that, but, in fact, you can. There are
3 ways to measure things like the culture of
4 organization, there are experts in that, and the
5 company has done surveys in the past of their staff
6 to get a sense of what's going on in the minds of the
7 people that work at plant. They plan on continuing
8 those surveys and augmenting that with a broader
9 overview of the safety culture, and they're going to
10 report next month on those issues, so those are two
11 things that -- I think I answered your question on
12 what the basis for my statement was. You may not be
13 satisfied with it, but that was the basis for my
14 statement.

15 MR. WHITCOMB: Are there any specific
16 findings that you have?

17 MR. GROBE: Absolutely.

18 MR. WHITCOMB: What are they?

19 MR. GROBE: We issued at least
20 four or five reports in the last three months where
21 we have a number of findings of our inspections.

22 MR. WHITCOMB: Well, what specific
23 changes have you seen at the site that support a
24 change in the safety culture?

25 MR. GROBE: I can give you

1 examples. I don't pretend that this will be a
2 comprehensive dissertation of -- on safety.

3 UNIDENTIFIED: Can we have five
4 minutes? I can give you the five rule.

5 MR. GROBE: Let me try to answer
6 the question, and then if some of the FirstEnergy
7 people want --

8 MR. WHITCOMB: Is this a meeting for
9 the NRC to answer the questions, or is this a meeting
10 for FirstEnergy --

11 MR. GROBE: Howard, in the past
12 you've complained that FirstEnergy wouldn't come to
13 these meetings.

14 (Applause).

15 MR. WHITCOMB: You're correct, Jack.

16 MR. GROBE: I'm sorry.

17 MR. WHITCOMB: You're correct, Jack,
18 but I've also complained in the past that FirstEnergy
19 and the NRC are sharing the same bed.

20 (Applause).

21 MR. GROBE: Please, let's show
22 some respect here. Let's keep these comments
23 professional, and I'd appreciate no reactions like
24 that from the people in the audience, please. I'm
25 trying to think of where I was a minute ago, Howard.

1 MR. WHITCOMB: Well, I asked for some
2 specifics and what had --

3 MR. GROBE: You asked for
4 specifics, okay. A number of things that the
5 licensee has initiated under what they call their --
6 now, I can't remember the name. It's something like
7 the management organizational effectiveness building
8 block. They've structured their restart activities
9 under a series of what they call Building Blocks.
10 There's one for systems and one for programs, and
11 there is one that deals with the people in the
12 organization, and there's been a variety of
13 activities that they have undertaken, which from my
14 perspective, are bearing fruit. Those activities
15 include first documenting the management culture and
16 expectation with respect to safety, and there have
17 been documents issued by Peter Berg, Chairman of the
18 Board; Bob Saunders, President of FirstEnergy, as
19 well as Lew Myers, the Chief Operating Officer and
20 second Vice President on his expectations for
21 people's behavior in a safety culture in a nuclear
22 power plant.

23 In addition to that, Lew has had meetings
24 with several hundred employees, small group meetings
25 where they talk about issues. They've had training

1 on safety conscience work environment. They've
2 brought in experts in the industry that have worked
3 at other nuclear plans including Millstone,
4 reestablishing a safety culture there, and they've
5 provided training to every supervisor in safety
6 culture and safety conscious work environment, so
7 these are just a couple of the examples of actions
8 the company has taken. We have not inspected all of
9 those activities, but we have begun through our
10 inspections to see the fruits of those activities,
11 and those are comprehensive self-assessments.

12 We've concluded and reported on at our last
13 monthly meeting, and I believe you were at that one,
14 that the process and the reviews that the company is
15 performing in the area of programs and systems have
16 been robust, that the evaluation of the equipment
17 inside containment was completed. We completed our
18 inspection in that area. The company has undertaken
19 a number of activities and is spending a great deal
20 of money to make improvements to the plant that are
21 not required by the NRC that go far beyond minimum
22 requirements. I think that's another indicator of a
23 different attitude towards safety, so those are a
24 number of indicators, but what I would like to ~~emphasize~~
25 emphasize is that we haven't made a decision. What I

1 said to the ACRS is I have seen demonstrable
2 indicators of improvement in the culture. I haven't
3 said the work is done.

4 We have -- we began our inspection in this
5 area, and that inspection is ongoing and will be
6 ongoing for the next couple of months where we
7 evaluate the adequacy of the corrective actions and
8 the effectiveness of their implementation and at the
9 completion of that inspection before this plant is
10 allowed to restart we will have confirmed
11 independently that the safety culture has changed, so
12 I think that answers your question.

13 MR. WHITCOMB: Would you agree or
14 disagree that the statement I quoted earlier, it was
15 there for the asking, comes from a safety conscious
16 environment or not?

17 MR. GROBE: No, that's not an
18 appropriate response. The NRC --

19 MR. WHITCOMB: That was from the
20 FirstEnergy --

21 MR. GROBE: Excuse me, Howard. I
22 was answering your question. The NRC has made it
23 clear, and I think Brian Sheron was the next one
24 quote in that article, as well as Sam Collins, who is
25 the Director from the office of Nuclear Reactor

1 Regulation, and his deputy for technical assessment
2 which is Brian Sheron. They both stated publicly
3 that had they seen that picture which we put up on
4 the screen earlier that the plant would have been
5 shut down. It was very clear that there was
6 corrosion going on in the head, so, clearly, that's
7 not acceptable. The NRC asked for information and
8 was not provided complete information. There's
9 about -- I'm estimating six or eight examples of that
10 documented and inspection report that I believe was
11 issued in August of examples of inaccurate
12 information both with internal records as well as
13 submittals to the NRC and the root cause of those
14 inaccuracies. Those are things that occurred in the
15 past as being evaluated by our Office of
16 Investigations, so what I'm talking about is
17 something going forward, and, no, I would agree that
18 that's not an appropriate response to that question.

19 MR. WHITCOMB: But since that comment
20 was made about a week ago, doesn't that draw any
21 concerns on the part of the NRC that that still is
22 lingering in FirstEnergy's ranks?

23 MR. GROBE: You'll have to ask --
24 you'll have to ask why the individual that made that
25 comment made it and what the context was. That's a

1 FirstEnergy person.

2 MR. WHITCOMB: Well, I'm asking you
3 as the NRC.

4 MR. GROBE: The objective evidence
5 that we see from our inspection programs and the
6 assessments that we review -- and we will continue
7 doing those assessments, and we'll continue to bring
8 you results of those publicly to you and these other
9 folks here in the room on a monthly basis, and we'll
10 continue to respond to your questions on a monthly
11 basis.

12 MR. WHITCOMB: Well, I'm hearing you
13 say that you're not concerned about the statement.

14 MR. GROBE: That's not what I
15 said, Howard.

16 MR. WHITCOMB: Okay.

17 MR. GROBE: What I said was I've seen
18 objective and demonstrable evidence of a change in
19 nature --

20 MR. WHITCOMB: But I'm talking about
21 a specific concept --

22 MR. GROBE: Howard, please let me
23 answer your question.

24 MR. WHITCOMB: You're not answering
25 my question, Jack, that's the problem. You're not

1 answering it.

2 MR. GROBE: No, you don't like
3 the answer that I'm giving you.

4 MR. WHITCOMB: No, you're not
5 answering it. I'm talking about a very specific
6 statement.

7 Okay, it is a concern to the NRC or not? Not
8 Jack Grobe personally, the NRC?

9 MR. GROBE: If I believed, the
10 NRC believed, if we believe that that was, in fact,
11 the culture of the organization, I would be
12 concerned. The statement made was very
13 inappropriate. It was concerning something that
14 happened in the past where the NRC asked for
15 information and was not provided complete
16 information. Please step back.

17 UNIDENTIFIED: Oh, I'm sorry. I
18 thought he was finished.

19 MR. GROBE: Yes, the statement
20 made was inappropriate, was not reflective of an
21 appropriate safety culture as reported in the
22 newspaper.

23 MR. WHITCOMB: Okay.

24 MR. GROBE: Do you have another
25 question, just one more, if you don't mind, because

1 we've probably exceeded our five minute limit?

2 MR. WHITCOMB: Well, I think you
3 exceeded the five minute limit. I don't know that I
4 have.

5 What about the restart checklist, why isn't
6 that part of the presentation?

7 MR. GROBE: I don't know -- that
8 was an oversight.

9 MS. LIPA: Yeah, I was thinking
10 about that after you said that, and, actually, that's
11 a good suggestion. What we did during the afternoon
12 meeting was we put up the bullets that are on the
13 restart checklist and in each of the inspection
14 reports that we issue, the cover letter describes
15 which restart checklist it's covering and what's
16 still open, so we didn't have any -- there is none
17 that are closed yet, but I think it's a good
18 suggestion. I think we'll do that in future
19 meetings.

20 MR. WHITCOMB: You've done it in the
21 past.

22 MS. LIPA: Well, to give like an
23 update as far as and here -- you know, this is what
24 we covered during the 2:00 meeting, we covered the
25 items on the restart checklist. We talked about some

1 of them and their status, but we didn't go into a lot
2 of detail, and I think that we should probably do
3 better on that one.

4 MR. WHITCOMB: Thank you.

5 MR. THOMAS: Can I slip in a
6 question from the audience?

7 Why hasn't the NRC released the tape of
8 reactor inspections, and I'm not real clear on what
9 this question is, and if you have -- if I don't
10 answer your question, please approach me after the
11 meeting, and I'll try again, but I believe what
12 you're asking is about the videos of the head
13 inspections. Those have been released in a number
14 of venues. There have been Freedom of Information
15 Act request, that -- they have been released as part
16 of that. They have been released as part of
17 congressional inquiries, so I'm not real clear on
18 what your question is, but please feel free to
19 approach me afterwards, and I'll try to clear it up.

20 MS. LIPA: One of the things I
21 would like to cover about that topic is, we received
22 a lot of documents. They don't all necessarily get
23 issued. There certainly can be some of them. Some
24 of them are documents that we get while we're on site
25 doing inspections. We don't necessarily publish all

1 those. Usually by reference in our report of what
2 item we used and what document it was that we used to
3 make our decision, but we don't necessarily issue all
4 of those reports, but when we get a Freedom of
5 Information Act request, we do look at the documents
6 that are being requested if we have them in our
7 possession. If they are not proprietary -- there
8 are certain rules on things we can't release, but I'm
9 sure that's what we would do with the tapes if they
10 were requested. Go ahead.

11 MR. GRIMM: My name is John Grimm.
12 I didn't really intend to come up here and speak, I'm
13 a bit nervous. First of all, I'm here to talk about
14 the safety culture at the plant. I came from the
15 Perry Power Plant three months ago, and I came here
16 because three of my friends who I've worked for in
17 the past said they needed some help, and they needed
18 some help changing the culture at the Davis-Besse
19 plant, and I can tell you the first step that this
20 place made was to take proven individuals who have
21 safety conscious culture built into their careers and
22 have proven that performance, take the help to
23 Davis-Besse. I have been here for three months and
24 I can tell you right now that I have seen changes,
25 but I've also been at days where we all have been

1 overwhelmed at the huge amount of work that lies
2 ahead of us, but we know it has to be done prior to
3 even us considering restart of the plant. I'm
4 participating in implementing change on both the
5 safety culture and some of the processes that might
6 be streamlined so we can free up people to
7 concentrate on safety. I'm also taking part in
8 changing people's basic decision-making that becomes
9 the basis for a safety culture. I've learned this
10 because I have been in the nuclear industry for
11 almost 25 years. I started on a consulting firm,
12 Three-Mile Island was a client of ours. I've got
13 samples and data from Three-Mile Island by the
14 accident it was happening and it moved me very
15 greatly, and I can also attest that Three-Mile Island
16 was a reactor that saw the most severe accident that
17 this country has ever seen, and I have analyzed the
18 samples that would have proven what radioactive
19 materials went out of there, and they weren't
20 significant. It's very unfortunate that this plant
21 is where it is, but I have seen intimately inside of
22 containment the improvements we're making. I'm
23 familiar with the designs we are making in the plant
24 today. They are robust. We're lining portions of
25 this plant with one inch thick stainless steel so

1 that we can protect valves that have to be available
2 during accidents. We're volunteering this. We're
3 looking for stuff that I have never ever seen in a
4 new plant before. We've uncovered things that we're
5 fixing, and I've crawled around new plants all my
6 life, and I haven't seen these things. We've had
7 hundreds of people crawling through containment for
8 months looking for where boric acid has caused any
9 damage to any component, and we have not shied away
10 from one particular component that might have had any
11 damage. I have seen this. We have 900 corrective
12 actions or condition reports that we will have to
13 address before we even think about starting this
14 plant up. I know the people personally. I have
15 children. I have lived near nuclear plants all my
16 life. We're technical people. We're not used to
17 talking like this in front of people, but I can tell
18 you we're very thorough. What I do know about some
19 of the people who are -- or some of the things I've
20 heard is that I sense that the statements come from
21 the fact that conclusions are drawn and data is being
22 gathered to support those conclusions, and what I
23 mean is I hear a lot of people that have concluded
24 that Davis-Besse should shut down. What I can tell
25 you is that we have not concluded that Davis-Besse

1 should start up. We're worried that it won't, but
2 we're working very hard to make it so.

3 (Applause).

4 MS. LIPA: Thank you, John.

5 MR. POWERS: My name is Jim Powers,
6 Director of Engineering at FENOC. Like John, I came
7 over from the Perry Plant, FENOC's Perry plant
8 shortly after the degradation was found. I came on
9 board to help improve standards here. I came on
10 board to help turn the plant around, and, Jack, you
11 were asked what objective evidence are you seeing of
12 change in culture, and I just wanted to say, the past
13 two days I've spent reviewing and signing out,
14 approving reports that we've done in this case on our
15 system reviews and 36 reports, enough of them to
16 cover a large conference table with technical work
17 that's been done. Very critical technical work
18 pointing out problems, things that people want to
19 improve lead by our system engineers, getting into
20 very specific areas with a lot of technical detail.

21 Now, in the industry one of the most
22 important things that we hold dear is being
23 self-critical, having a questioning attitude. It's
24 one of the things that may have lead to the head
25 degradation, the lack of questioning attitude and

1 being effective in questioning each other in the past
2 and all I can tell you from what I seen in the past
3 two days going through the reports that we've
4 prepared out at the plant that that is turning around
5 substantially, you know, the quality of the reports,
6 the thoroughness of the reports and we can see it,
7 and you can see it back here on the wall.

8 What we've got posted are indicators. These
9 are the corrective actions that we've written as a
10 result of our reviews. Every time we find an issue
11 we think we need to investigate and follow-up on, we
12 document it. We write it down, and then we
13 investigate it, and we work on it, and all of those
14 documented problems are available for review, either
15 by the NRC, ~~INPO~~ INPO, any of our oversight
16 organizations, our quality assurance as well, so it's
17 all very open at the plant, and you can see the
18 number of issues that have been generated back there.
19 You can see also see the curves and performance
20 indicators turning and the work off of those problems
21 gaining momentum towards the restart of the plant, so
22 the staff out there is focused not only on finding
23 the issues, but on resolving them, and I think we've
24 got the objective evidence of that right up on the
25 wall.

1 MS. LIPA: Thank you, Jim.
2 What I'd like to -- oh, did you want to make
3 a comment?
4 MR. DEAN: No, no. I had a
5 question from the audience.
6 MS. LIPA: What I wanted to do
7 is take a break, though, because it's been over an
8 hour and a half already, and we need to give our
9 transcriber a break, and then you two can be first
10 right after the break, so let's take five minutes.
11 Okay?
12 THEREUPON, a brief recess took place.
13 MS. LIPA: Hello, let's get ready
14 to get going.
15 MR. DEAN: Okay, I wanted to
16 address one of the questions that was asked earlier
17 about the tapes of the reactor inspections, and Scott
18 had given an answer that had intimated that those
19 tapes were available for public release. In
20 reality, those tapes were things that we became aware
21 of and review as part of our Augmented Inspection
22 Team activities in the aftermath of discovering the
23 degradation in the vessel head, but those tapes are
24 what is called proprietary information. They have
25 been provided based on a request from Congressmen

1 Tauzin and Gillmor as part of their efforts to
2 investigate and understand the situation from their
3 perspective, and so they have the tapes, but they are
4 what we call proprietary which means they are not
5 releasable for public dissemination.

6 Another question came up with respect to,
7 basically, why didn't the NRC pick up the boric acid
8 build up as part of our inspections. That's a good
9 question. Certainly it's a big question we have been
10 asking ourselves. That was one of the keys of the
11 Lessons Learned Task Force that looked at the NRC's
12 practices and why didn't we pick up on this issue.
13 I will describe a couple things about our inspection
14 program. I think Jack mentioned earlier our
15 inspection program is basically a sampling process.
16 You know, these nuclear power plants are large, very
17 complex sites that have a multitude of equipment,
18 systems, components, structures, that we have
19 basically two resident inspectors on site, plus
20 periodic visits from region based inspectors to look
21 at very specific things. Our inspection program is
22 designed around trying to focus on those things with
23 our limited resources that are most significant,
24 those things that have the capability to have the
25 most significance, and I would say that, perhaps, one

1 of our failings in this issue relative to the reactor
2 vessel head was our belief that, you know, these
3 reactor vessels are very huge, thick steel, carbon
4 steel structures, that, you know, are basically
5 impregnable and our focus of some of our inspections
6 really are on places where there are connections,
7 things like welded pipes, and, of course, we had had
8 the information relative to the cracks, the first
9 lady, Lori, who had questioned -- asked questions
10 about the French nozzle cracking and why didn't we
11 take the same approach the French did, but we had in
12 place our requirements and expectations that licensee
13 would monitor those penetrations for potential
14 leakage, and that gets to a real basic premise of the
15 NRC's oversight of nuclear power plants is that the
16 ultimate responsibility for operating these plants
17 safely has to lie in the hands of the licensee, okay?
18 We can't be everywhere. We can't look at
19 everything. We have to pick our spots and try to
20 focus on those things, and, unfortunately, in this
21 case, the reactor vessel head was not necessarily an
22 area that we had integrated into our inspection plan.
23 It wasn't an area that we would necessarily include
24 in our samples of things we would look at.
25 Obviously, a lesson learned from there is, you know,

1 maybe that is an area that ought to be included in
2 our sample plan. It ought to be something that ought
3 to be looked at in a different way than we have in
4 the past, and, you know, that kind of points up to
5 one of, I think, for me one of the key learnings from
6 this is that if you look at the Lessons Learned Task
7 Force report, you know, their bottom line is that
8 this event was preventable. It was preventable both
9 from an industry and licensee perspective, but it
10 also was preventable from an NRC perspective. There
11 were things that were occurring at the plant that
12 maybe if we had connected all the dots properly, we
13 would have tumbled to them, and we would have asked
14 the right questions, and maybe would have spurred the
15 licensee to find the issue. Unfortunately, it took
16 a number of bulletins for us to issue that founding
17 of the licensee show to look at that more closely
18 where they actually found the degradation, and, of
19 course, it was too late at that point, but the big
20 learning is that, do we appropriately integrate
21 operating experience that we gain both from
22 international and domestic experience and do we as an
23 agency -- you know, this boric acid issue was an
24 issue, as Jack said, back in the '80s. We issued a
25 generic letter back in 1988. We went out an

1 inspected various licensees, including Davis-Besse to
2 look at their boric acid corrosion control programs,
3 and we assured ourselves that licensees had indeed
4 put in place appropriate programs to monitor their
5 boric acid corrosion control, and, basically, we
6 didn't really look too much at it after that, and so
7 that's probably the other failure besides operating
8 experience is that perhaps we have a need
9 periodically to go back and look at these safety
10 issues that we think we have resolved by putting in
11 place guidance and asking licensee to put in place
12 programs, maybe we need to be a little bit more
13 proactive in looking at those more periodically, so
14 those -- you know, those are -- that's kind of a
15 long-winded answer to a very good question, but it
16 does provide some learnings for us as the NRC, and
17 those are two of the major ones that I have taken on
18 in this whole evolution.

19 MS. LIPA: Okay, thanks, Bill,
20 and then I told you guys you could go next, and after
21 that, I want to make sure we get the local members of
22 the public before we go to other members of the
23 public, but come on up.

24 MR. RHODES: So far, so good
25 because I am local.

1 MS. LIPA: Great!

2 MR. RHODES: I live in Oak Harbor,
3 Ohio. My name is Steve Rhodes. I'd like to --
4 mine's going to be comments basically, but I would
5 like to say that I have every belief that the people,
6 the professionals that will be responsible for
7 restarting this plant will use safety as their
8 driving issue. I can't believe it would be any
9 other way.

10 My statement is basically different on a
11 front, though. As a property owner and taxpayer and
12 a resident of Salem Township in Ottawa County, since
13 the 1970's, our community has taken a calculated risk
14 by allowing the Davis-Besse plant to operate in our
15 backyard.

16 As a degreed mechanical engineer, I assure
17 you that I am completely familiar with those risks.
18 In exchange, we have been the beneficiaries of a
19 significantly better economy. An economy that
20 benefits our local business, schools, Government
21 entities and our families. For over nine months I
22 have watched and waited patiently for people like
23 U.S. representative Marcy Kaptur, U.S. representative
24 Dennis Kucinich and others, some have made comments
25 tonight, to take a break from a tax on our nuclear

1 power plant and present us with a plan to replace the
2 economically devastating loss of funds that could
3 result in facing the closing of this plant.

4 As an elected member of the Benton Carroll
5 Salem Local Board of Education, I can tell you that
6 we are already struggling with the issues and early
7 effects of deregulation on our school funding. I
8 could not imagine the damage that would result to our
9 community should this plant be closed for good.

10 It's apparent to me that these people have no such
11 funding alternatives since they do not represent the
12 interest of the local people like me. I would
13 respectfully suggest that they -- until they have an
14 alternative plan that would address all of the issues
15 that maybe those statements should cease. It's safe
16 to say that anyone living in the community who is
17 comfortable with this hugely beneficial relationship
18 have the opportunity -- I'm sorry, was uncomfortable
19 with relationship that was uncomfortable with nuclear
20 power, have the opportunity to cash in properties at
21 elevated prices because of this plant and move to an
22 area that was more suited to their needs. The rest
23 of us chose to stay here and share that burden and
24 benefit. I'm tired of hearing from a small group of
25 individuals who receive the economic benefits but

1 can't seem to find the backbone to uphold their end
2 of the bargain. I would respectfully request that
3 the influx of people who have chosen our unfortunate
4 incident as a way to further their cause pack up and
5 go home. This is a local issue. It is our issue,
6 and we need to have the input from the local, the
7 local input. That's important to me. For those
8 people who are left, the concerned people who are
9 left that are taken out of this group -- and I am
10 fairly sure we are the majority, we need to come
11 together to remove the road blocks so that we can
12 solve this very dangerous problem and assure that it
13 never happens again. We need to get this plant up
14 and running. We've talked about it long enough.
15 We need to make sure the actions stay forward and not
16 lose sight of what the goals are to safely restart
17 this plant.

18 I urge the NRC, FirstEnergy, plant employees,
19 local officials, the media, and our entire, to stop
20 the unproductive finger-pointing and get on with the
21 business of restoring safe operation of this
22 facility. I would argue that we have the most
23 qualified workers in the world from the nuclear power
24 industry working right here in our community. It's
25 time to let these people do their jobs and train them

1 in whatever it takes to make this a ~~save~~ safe environment,
2 make sure that they have the tools to do the job.
3 Let's utilize this talent, make the necessary
4 corrections in procedure to overcome operational
5 shortcomings and move on. At one point in time this
6 plant was a star in the nuclear industry. I am
7 confident if everyone cooperates we will regain that
8 status once again. Thank you.

9 (Applause).

10 MS. LIPA: Thank you for your
11 comments.

12 MR. SHUTT: Good evening. I'm Dan
13 Shutt. I'm here as an independent contractor working
14 at Davis-Besse and to help get the plant restarted.
15 I had no intention of coming up here and speaking
16 tonight. I wanted to see what this is like, but
17 being that I'm a father with children ranging from 10
18 to 15, when I heard the teacher mention her opening
19 comment about Mr. Grobe, you know, assessment saying
20 that perhaps not everybody has the information they
21 need to be properly educated or whatever, it occurred
22 to me that the reason I got into this business back
23 in 1979 was because of Chernobyl. When I was coming
24 out of high school, I didn't know what I wanted to
25 do. I ended up getting a degree in nuclear

1 engineering specifically because of that, and since
2 that time I have had the opportunity to work at a
3 variety of different plants. I was fortunate enough
4 to be at the opening of two plants in Pennsylvania.
5 I've gone on the road as a contractor. I have been
6 to Cook, which was also going through the 0350
7 process, a shut down, rather extended shut down. I
8 got here a little bit before John Grimm from Perry.
9 I was working up there for a whole other issue.
10 I've seen good sides, and I've seen bad sides, and
11 the point that I wanted to make here was that the
12 most important people in the room in my mind are the
13 students that have come to see what's going on
14 because that's the kind of country we live. If you
15 want to look around you're going to see kind of three
16 distinct parts to this puzzle. On one side, you've
17 got utility, which has a financial interest, which
18 has a whole bunch of smart guys working towards a
19 goal to provide a safe, reliable source of energy for
20 everybody. Another side of this puzzle is the
21 regulators who have been called under scrutiny
22 themselves because of apparent problems within their
23 own oversight admitted and in the process of being
24 corrected, but the third piece of the puzzle, I think
25 sometimes gets a bad rap, and that is there's a lot

1 of people that come here to work real hard. I've
2 come from a distance to work at this plant. My
3 children are 600 miles away. There's a lot of
4 people that work for the utility working very hard on
5 this plant to try and get it restarted, doing their
6 best intention, very smart people. Same with the
7 regulators, they are putting a lot of hours in,
8 taking time from their families, taking time to do
9 public meetings in the evenings, but I don't want to
10 boo-hoo the people that have come from far out of
11 town to speak their mind on an issue, because that's
12 the nature of this country. It's exactly that that
13 allows this plant to not to be a Chernobyl, and
14 that's important to remember. We talk about the
15 technical aspects of the design of a Chernobyl,
16 that's -- that's -- maybe that's over my head, and I
17 have been in the industry a while, but the fact
18 remains that a Chernobyl could not be licensed in
19 this country because we have regulatory bodies like
20 this, but, more importantly, it could not be licensed
21 in this county because we have well-meaning -- if
22 some people say misinformed, disinformed,
23 misdirected, whatever, but still well-meaning and
24 hard-working advocates who are watching and we're
25 raising questions and asking questions. I have

1 worked in jobs long enough to know that there's times
2 when you're working and you see something so clearly,
3 as you did, about how is it that you can see those
4 rust stains and it wouldn't occur to you that there's
5 a problem, you know, how can a student body here --
6 one of the comments you made was it was so obvious to
7 you why would it escape the regulators, and I can
8 tell you that more than one time I sat at my desk and
9 wondered what's wrong with my boss and his boss and
10 the other boss, that they couldn't see something that
11 I could see so plainly, so my only comment tonight is
12 I'm glad you're here, and I'm glad you get the
13 opportunity to participate in this and learn
14 something because it's exactly that about this
15 society bringing youth into it, bringing public
16 advocates into it, bringing all sides of the
17 discussion together. In the end, reason always
18 falls on the side of the right decision, and I
19 believe, my own personal spot, that reason falls on
20 the side of restarting this plant doing it in a safe,
21 carefully guarded, carefully watch and carefully
22 rewatched method. Who's watching the watchers,
23 that's what I love about this country, there is
24 always somebody on it, somebody watching, so -- I
25 feel safe, I live within a mile of this plant. I

1 could walk there. That's it.

2 MS. LIPA: Thanks for your

3 comments, Dan.

4 (Applause).

5 MS. LUEKE: Hi.

6 MS. LIPA: Hi.

7 MS. LUEKE: My name is Donna

8 Lueke, and I'm a local resident. I live in

9 Marblehead, and I have several questions. Most of

10 them are factual.

11 A while ago, the employees were surveyed, in
12 fact, they have been surveyed twice as far as I know
13 about their confidence in the management and because
14 there was a big concern about the corporate culture
15 not responding to the questions that the employees
16 had about the safety issues, and that they were
17 concerned that they couldn't take those issues to
18 their managers, and since those that work at the
19 plant are the ones that are in the first line of
20 danger, they're the ones most likely to lose jobs if
21 the plant closes down. I think we really need to
22 hear from them again, and do you know if there is a
23 plan to survey the employees again and find out what
24 their level of confidence is in the management now
25 because it looks like there have been a lot of

1 changes in management. There are a lot of good
2 things that we're hearing tonight, but I want to know
3 what the people that work there day-to-day, my
4 neighbors and friends, what they have to say, do they
5 trust what's happening because they have been burned
6 by what's happened in the past. How do they feel
7 about the new management? Do they feel they go to
8 them? Do they feel they can talk about safety
9 issues?

10 MS. LIPA: Well, that's a good
11 question, and I can tell you we did talk about this
12 at a couple of the previous public meetings during
13 the afternoon. We didn't really get into it really
14 too much today, but the utility does have plans to
15 assess their safety conscience work environment and
16 do more work in that area. The NRC also has plans
17 to do more inspections in the area of what the
18 utility is finding and what we find ourselves talking
19 to the folks in the field, so there is more work
20 planned for that. I can't give you a status
21 tonight, though.

22 MS. LUEKE: Wouldn't it be
23 helpful to use the same kind of survey that was used
24 before? I think it was an independent survey.

25 MS. LIPA: Well, possibly. I

1 mean, there's a lot to survey science, so I can't
2 tell for sure if you just keep taking the same survey
3 over and over again if that's the best indicator of
4 change in safety conscious work environment, but
5 that's one of the things on our plate to assess.

6 MR. THOMAS: Christine, the
7 licensee has said that they will resurvey their
8 employees, so the answer to your question is, yes,
9 they will resurvey. Whether it will be identical to
10 the type of survey they did previously, we don't know
11 that, but they have said they will resurvey their
12 employees.

13 MS. LUEKE: I guess the benefit
14 would be that you have a baseline to work from and a
15 place for comparison.

16 For the first time, the management at
17 FirstEnergy, in fact, I believe it was Mr. Berg has
18 talked about the possibility of Davis-Besse not
19 restarting, and I believe that's significant and that
20 was mentioned by another person tonight also that
21 that is a very real possibility.

22 If FirstEnergy decides to not restart
23 Davis-Besse, if they make that decision as a business
24 decision, what happens then?

25 What's the NRC's involvement? How long does

1 it take to shut down a facility?

2 MS. LIPA: Well, there's a whole
3 process if they do make that decision to
4 decommissioning and the whole bit. I'm not sure how
5 long it really takes, but there's a whole process
6 that's already been established. Other plants have
7 been through that process.

8 MS. LUEKE: How long has it taken
9 other plants?

10 MR. DEAN: Christine, let me help
11 you out here. We have an organization at NRC that
12 is focused expressly on the decommissioning of
13 nuclear power plants, and they can take any form. A
14 lot of it depends on what approach the licensee wants
15 to take. Does the licensee want to take an approach
16 were -- because with the plan, what we call a safe ~~stored~~
17 storage situation where basically they just, you know,
18 kind of button everything up and let it sit for a
19 while, or do they want to take a very proactive
20 approach and actually dismantle the plant, ship off
21 all the components and basically return the plant to
22 what we call a greenfield concept, which basically
23 means it's habitable, okay? And, so, a lot depends
24 on what approach they decide to take. I will say
25 taking the plants that have taken the aggressive

1 approach, for example, there's a small nuclear power
2 plant in Massachusetts called Yankee Rowe which took
3 the approach to dismantle the plant, you know, I
4 don't even think -- Jon, help me out here. I don't
5 know -- that started almost a decade ago at least
6 and --

7 MR. HOPKINS: And it's still
8 ongoing.

9 MR. DEAN: -- it's still
10 ongoing, yeah, but most of -- a lot of the major
11 components have been dismantled and shipped off.
12 They have not yet reached the point of a greenfield
13 concept.

14 MR. HOPKINS: I think Maine Yankee
15 is the best one. There's a plant in Maine called
16 Maine Yankee which shut down, is going into
17 decommissioning, and I think they have done the most,
18 have been the most successful for a big plant, and
19 they still have someone watching them, so it takes
20 years.

21 MR. DEAN: Maine Yankee has
22 gotten to the point where they taken a large area
23 where -- which incorporated the nuclear power plant
24 site and have now narrowed that to a much smaller
25 area which basically consists of the fuel storage

1 area, and so -- so there's a variety there, but if
2 the plant were to get to that point, what we would
3 have is a decommissioning group comes out and has
4 public meetings much like this to explain to the
5 public what is the process, what are the different
6 options, and so it's a very public -- they have a
7 very proactive public posture in terms of informing
8 people.

9 MS. LUEKE: Because one of the
10 commitments that was made when Davis-Besse was first
11 opened was that after a fixed period of time it would
12 be returned to -- what do you call it, greenfield?

13 MR. DEAN: Uh huh.

14 MS. LUEKE: Greenfield state, and
15 naturally since the plant here is surrounded by
16 national wildlife refuge, by areas that are being
17 expanded into eco-tourism, and so I just wanted to
18 comment on that, that was a commitment that was made.

19 How long is Davis-Besse's license now
20 currently?

21 MR. GROBE: The license is for 40
22 years. I don't remember when it started.

23 MR. THOMAS: I believe it's 2017.

24 MR. GROBE: 2017.

25 MR. THOMAS: I'm getting head

1 shakes from the licensees personnel, so 2017.

2 MS. LUEKE: Has FirstEnergy

3 applied for renewal at this point?

4 MR. THOMAS: No.

5 MS. LUEKE: I know that several

6 nuclear power plants have applied for renewal

7 licenses. Have all of those been granted?

8 MR. DEAN: All of the plants

9 that have applied for license renewal have thus far,

10 I think there's been four or five that have

11 successfully gone through the license renewal

12 process. There are a number of plants that in

13 process now where reviews are ongoing and assessment

14 is being done whether to grant them their license

15 renewal extension or not, so --

16 MS. LUEKE: You mentioned that the

17 plant that was completely returned to -- or the most

18 pristine that has been returned to at this point,

19 still had the fuel pool there --

20 MR. HOPKINS: Correct, fuel storage.

21 MS. LUEKE: -- fuel storage there.

22 Is that the used fuel?

23 MR. HOPKINS: Yes, that's the used

24 fuel.

25 MS. LUEKE: And where does that

1 go now?

2 MR. GROBE: Currently, the
3 Department of Energy has a process underway to obtain
4 the licensing -- a license for the Yuca Mountain
5 long-term storage facility in Nevada, and that's in
6 the licensing process. That storage facility hasn't
7 been approved. Until some sort of long-term storage
8 or reprocessing is approved, fuel like at that plant
9 or also at the Big Rock plant, many plants across the
10 country have what is referred to as dry cask storage,
11 and they store used fuel on site.

12 MS. LUEKE: So it's on site
13 everywhere at this point?

14 MR. GROBE: Yes.

15 MS. LUEKE: So even if we're
16 returned to a greenfield situation there is nowhere
17 to go with this spent fuel at this point?

18 MR. GROBE: Right.

19 MS. LIPA: That's correct.

20 MS. LUEKE: Okay. I think
21 that -- oh, just two more factual questions.

22 MS. LIPA: Okay, quickly,
23 because we have --

24 MS. LUEKE: Yes. Why have so
25 many independent contractors been released in the

1 last few weeks? I'd heard that like 400 independent
2 contractors -

3 MS. LIPA: We talked about that
4 a little bit during the afternoon meeting and that
5 was a business decision on FirstEnergy's part. It
6 really had nothing to do with -- we had been given a
7 purview over.

8 MS. LUEKE: Okay, and there's a,
9 I guess for lack of a better term, a post-mortem
10 being conducted on the old head somewhere. I think
11 part of it is in Oak Ridge and part of it is
12 somewhere else. Do you have any reports back on
13 that yet?

14 MS. LIPA: There is continuing
15 work being done on parts that were sent to Lynchburg,
16 Virginia, and the licensee continues -- their
17 contractors doing work on that. Do you have anymore
18 on that, Jon, the status?

19 MR. DEAN: Well, let me -- one of
20 the things that the NRC has asked for, and the
21 licensee has agreed to do this is to cut out certain
22 parts of the old reactor vessel head and ship them to
23 laboratories that are under contract to the NRC to do
24 some further analysis and assessment that we think
25 might help us in understanding things like crack

1 initiation and propagation. There's a lot of
2 uncertainties about, you know, how do these cracks
3 begin, how do they grow, how do they go from an axial
4 orientation to a circumferential orientation, so
5 these are questions that we have, our Office of
6 Research -- NRC's Office of Research are pondering,
7 and so they have asked the licensee to cut out
8 various samples of key parts of the reactor vessel
9 head that we think might be able to provide us to
10 some materials that will allow us to do testing and
11 research and analysis that maybe in the span of a
12 year or two, might be able to have some better
13 answers and better understanding of what actually
14 occurs from a metallurgical and materials point of
15 view.

16 MS. LIPA: And those pieces have
17 not been cut out yet, but that's the plan right now.

18 MR. GROBE: The rest of that
19 answer is that the head is currently stored on site,
20 with the exception of a one 17-inch disk that was
21 sent down to Lynchburg for review. The licensee has
22 agreed to take these samples that Bill is talking
23 about and they will do that when they have time and
24 have them shipped and the radioactive waste to a
25 waste repository.

1 MS. LUEKE: Thank you. And just
2 one more comment. I'm a local resident with no
3 particular axe to grind or anything, but a deep
4 concern about what has happened and I do think in
5 spite of all the good people that are involved here,
6 good people that work at the plant, the good people
7 coming in as independent contractors and with the
8 NRC, we must learn lessons from the past and what
9 happened in the past was not acceptable to anyone,
10 not to the NRC, not to the local residents and we
11 really want to know why it happened, and we want some
12 sort of more comfortable feeling that it's not going
13 to happen again than what we have so far, and I just
14 don't think that all the questions have been answered
15 yet, and to -- to our comfort level, and that's the
16 same with a lot of people I talked to.

17 MS. LIPA: Okay. Well, thank
18 you for your comments, I understand.

19 MR. GROBE: We couldn't agree with
20 you more. The questions aren't answered to our
21 comfort, and that's why we're still here and until
22 they are answered to our comfort level, the NRC won't
23 permit restart of the plant, so we'll continue to be
24 here. We have our meetings scheduled for the next
25 three months, and we'll continue to schedule them as

1 we need them into the future. This panel will be
2 here if the plant is permitted to restart eventually.
3 This panel will be in existence after restart to
4 continue to monitor the performance of Davis-Besse
5 and to assure that the corrective actions are
6 lasting. Thank you.

7 MS. LIPA: Yeah, as Jack
8 mentioned we have the meetings going forward, have
9 been set up for January 14th, February 11th and March
10 11th, and we tentatively have this place scheduled,
11 and it's a fine facility, but we'll see how it works
12 and decide for sure where the next meeting will be
13 located. Hi.

14 MR. SCHNEIDER: Hi. I'm Todd
15 Schneider. It's my job to talk to the media about
16 FirstEnergy issues. I was the one who was quoted in
17 the paper that was brought up here recently, and I
18 agree those comments were inappropriate for today's
19 time frame. Things have changed at the plant. My
20 discussion with the Plain Dealer was involving the
21 situation in 2001, and at Davis-Besse that was a
22 long, long, long time ago. It's a new world there.
23 As we get closer to completing projects, safety
24 becomes more important every day. As this project
25 becomes completed, safety takes even a higher

1 priority. As another one does, safety is -- is a
2 high priority, no matter what we do. I -- I guess
3 the bottom line was, maybe my better response to the
4 newspaper should have been was, we should never have
5 allowed the plant to get to that condition so there
6 was ever such a photo. We made mistakes along the
7 way. We're trying to rectify those now. I work
8 with Lew Myers and Bob Schrauder and Jim Powers for a
9 long time, started way back at the Perry plant, and
10 I'm not a technical person. I'm the guy who has to
11 put it into plain English -- try to put it in plain
12 English. It's hard sometimes, but what I can say
13 about Lew and Bob and Jim, the rest of the senior
14 management team that's there, when I go to them with
15 a question, I trust them. They have given me the
16 straight stuff. We don't try to mislead anyone
17 here. I certainly don't. Sometimes my comments in
18 the paper may look like that, but I don't. The
19 management team doesn't, and the most important thing
20 I can say is that I trust that management team.
21 They're strong leaders and safety is first and
22 foremost with all of them and they can return the
23 plant to safe and reliable service. Thank you.
24 MS. LIPA: Thank you, Todd.
25 (Applause).

1 MR. THOMAS: We have a question
2 from the audience. The question reads, does holding
3 a public meeting in a military facility where those
4 who wish attend must produce identification to enter
5 encourage public attendance or discourage it? Let
6 me say this. It's our attempt to hold these meetings
7 in the nicest facility that's available to us. As
8 you know, we have been holding them at Oak Harbor
9 High School for the past eight or nine months.
10 There was some scheduling conflicts occurred there
11 where we could only have them on Wednesdays. It
12 came to our attention that there is other community
13 activities that occur on Wednesday evening, so to
14 foster participate or to encourage increased
15 participation, we decided to keep them on Tuesdays.
16 This is a trial, using this facility was a trial.
17 We encourage your input, suggestions, if you have
18 suggestions that are -- where we should have these
19 public meetings, please fill out a comment card and
20 we'll take that into consideration. I guess that's
21 all I can say on that issue, but, please, you know,
22 if you don't like this facility, please give us
23 comments, and so we can move it to somewhere that
24 better would suit your needs.
25 MS. LIPA: Thanks, Scott. Go

1 ahead.

2 MR. OPFER: My name is Darrell
3 Opfer, and I am a local resident. My driveways is
4 12342 West State Route 105, and I'm proud of the fact
5 that I live within seven miles of Davis-Besse.

6 To the questioner about being on a military
7 reservation or whatever, as a former County
8 Commissioner and State representative, I have
9 attended a number of meetings here and, frankly, the
10 security at Davis-Besse is much, much stricter than
11 it is to get into -- enter Camp Perry. One of my
12 employees reported practically being strip-searched
13 to get into a meeting at Davis-Besse, so, you know,
14 everything is relative, and also with my experience
15 in coming through the gate is no one takes your name,
16 phone number, or whatever down. They're simply
17 making sure that you have proper identification to
18 get on base.

19 I would like to make a comment as one of the
20 previous speakers reported that he was a former lot
21 of things. I'm a former lot of things, too. I was
22 a Government teacher at one time, so I appreciate
23 having students here, and I appreciate the comment
24 about democracy, and the fact that in that kind of
25 system, unlike Russia, where you had Chernobyl and

1 where a few people make decisions, we have decisions
2 being made by people such as this, with experts able
3 to testify, with questions being able to be given and
4 so on. Enough of being a Government teacher.

5 I was also a former County Commissioner for
6 10 years in Ottawa County and have been through the
7 plant on a number of occasions and was also very
8 involved in the building of the emergency management
9 agency in the basement of the courthouse with the
10 support of Davis-Besse.

11 I'm also as a County Commissioner, I was a
12 member of the member Utility Radiological Safety
13 Board, which gave me a new experience in dealing with
14 folks who either didn't understand nuclear power
15 plants or generally because they were from a long
16 distance away had not been exposed to them as folks
17 in Ottawa County have. I became a State
18 representative and one of my -- my roommate in the
19 State Legislature was very anti-nuclear, in fact, he
20 still is unfortunately, but the reason that folks
21 have questions is because of the lack of familiarity.
22 Folks generally around here, people who have lived
23 here a long time, have relatives, have friends, I
24 have students and the students have students who work
25 at Davis-Besse, so that we have knowledge of what's

1 going on, and we're comfortable with it. It is a
2 safety issue as is the chief plant in Toledo and a
3 number of other plants around Northwest Ohio. I'm
4 particularly proud of the employees who have
5 testified here this evening and that's exactly the
6 type of employees that I believe that we have
7 throughout the power plant, and it's what's going to
8 get the plant back on course. I'm looking forward
9 frankly to a renewing of the license and even perhaps
10 to building of an additional plant as originally been
11 planned because we have a number of needs in this
12 area.

13 I have been a State representative for nine
14 years. During that time, I served as my caucuses
15 spokesman on the deregulation issue, so I understand
16 from Government some about of those issues.
17 Frankly, one of the things that I would like to find
18 out more about from the NRC is whether you are
19 concerned or doing anything to look at the effect of
20 deregulation in some of the states on nuclear safety
21 and the nuclear industry.

22 Currently, I am Director at the Ottawa County
23 Improvement Corporation which is the economic agency
24 for the County. This afternoon I provided some of
25 my own testimony with regard to my beliefs about the

1 importance of Davis-Besse in Ottawa County. One of
2 the comments that I would like to reiterate is the
3 environmental contributions that Toledo and
4 Davis-Besse have provided to our County. Comments
5 have been made about our wildlife refuges, our
6 national park -- our national and State parks and
7 wildlife areas, but you need to know that a large
8 chunk of that or a large portion of our marsh areas
9 and so on is owned by Davis-Besse and managed by the
10 staff so that the eagles will nest there and our
11 travel and tourism can benefit from the environmental
12 things that Davis-Besse has provided.

13 One of the things that I received this
14 afternoon on my E-mail is a number of comments from
15 area political leaders and business leaders. I
16 provided a copy of that to the secretary. I'd like
17 to read two of them. One is from the Mayor of Port
18 Clinton, Tom Brown. He said -- told me that he was
19 not able to come tonight because of a City Council
20 meeting. He said as Mayor of the City of Port
21 Clinton, I would like to go on record in support of
22 the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Plant. Since its
23 inception it has been one of the largest employers,
24 biggest taxpayers and has brought service and retail
25 dollars into our communities. I have toured the

1 facilities as Mayor of the City and learned about
2 nuclear energy and its importance to providing a
3 strong power base for our citizens of Ottawa County.
4 The open houses that I have attended were outstanding
5 in explaining the operations and safeguards of this
6 type of energy.

7 In addition, the Ottawa County Emergency
8 Management Agency is the best in the State. The
9 warning system that was used during a recent tornado
10 was very instrumental in saving lives and the various
11 tests and drills throughout the year shows what a
12 proactive approach to disaster can result in
13 life-saving procedures. This would not have been
14 possible had it not been for the work of the Edison
15 management and staff with their significant
16 contributions towards the safety of people.

17 Toledo Edison has been a tremendous corporate
18 citizen. Civic involvement such as the Mural Park,
19 Christmas tree lighting, Walleye Drop, Downtown
20 Revitalization and many other contributions have made
21 it possible for our community to benefit from their
22 assistance.

23 In closing, I hope that the plant is soon up
24 and running. Our economy needs are depending on
25 Davis-Besse. Nuclear energy, in my opinion, is

1 safe, and I support the scientist who best know the
2 safeguards of this form of energy. We have
3 benefited from it since its inception. Signed Mayor
4 Thomas Brown, City of Port Clinton.

5 We have also received from business leaders
6 such as Larry Durivage, owner of Durivage Pattern and
7 Manufacturing in Williston. Dick Spicer, President
8 of the Port Clinton Chamber of Commerce, and another
9 that I would like to read is from Jeff Crosby who was
10 here this afternoon, but had to go to Columbus.

11 He said, I planned on being at the 2 p.m.
12 meeting. I must leave however by 3:15. I will
13 give you the following in case I don't have the
14 opportunity to testify.

15 My name is Jeff Crosby and I manage Erie
16 Industrial Park. I have been employed by USCO
17 Logistics at Erie Industrial Park since 1976. I
18 have spent 27 years working next to and alongside our
19 corporate neighbor to the west Davis-Besse.
20 Davis-Besse is an integral part of the economy of
21 Ottawa County. Not only for the jobs it supplies
22 and the school funding it provides, but for the
23 energy needed by a growing Ottawa County.

24 I have had the opportunity to work with the
25 Emergency Management Agency of Ottawa County. It is

1 my opinion that it ranks second to none in the state.
2 We recently had the unfortunate chance to see how the
3 agency performed under fire during the recent
4 tornados. Their performance was outstanding. If
5 it had not been for the warning sirens funded in
6 large part by Davis-Besse the loss of life in Port
7 Clinton could have been staggering. Davis-Besse has
8 been a good corporate neighbor. Ottawa County needs
9 Davis-Besse up and running.

10 Other comments from Craig Trick, Business
11 Development Manager of Telamon Construction; from
12 Charles Elum, President of Scrambl-Gram Incorporated
13 in Port Clinton and also one that was just handed to
14 me by Jim McKinney, who is property manager of Erie
15 Industrial Park.

16 I appreciate your coming to the County on a
17 monthly basis, for your patients in answering
18 questions by people who obviously have not been
19 involved in the process before, and so we do
20 appreciate that. Thank you very much. We look
21 forward to the return, the safe operating return of
22 Davis-Besse, and to many more years of electric
23 generation. Thank you.

24 MS. LIPA: Thank you for your
25 comments.

1 (Applause).

2 MS. LIPA: Before we go to your
3 comments, Carl, let me -- I have got a card here.
4 Let me read the question.

5 Since Davis-Besse has been shut down, have
6 there been any brownouts or blackouts in the area or
7 anywhere in the region providing electricity to the
8 communities previously provided with power by
9 Davis-Besse, and the answer to that question, as far
10 as I understand, there have not been any brownouts or
11 blackouts in the area.

12 The second question is a series of questions.
13 Who will pay for the incompetence, neglect and
14 deception that led to the near miss at Davis-Besse,
15 will it be NRC employees, FENOC executives or area
16 utility rate payers? Who will pay for the vessel
17 head replacement? And on this question, it's my
18 understanding that the utility is responsible for
19 paying for these items, and that's all I have on
20 that.

21 MR. KOEBEL: Thank you. My name is
22 Carl Koebel. I'm President of the Ottawa County
23 Commissioners. I'm representing not only myself, but
24 Steve Arndt, a fellow commissioner, and John Papcun,
25 fellow commissioner.

1 Earlier tonight I heard the words, lack of
2 confidence, and I have to say that when these public
3 forums started, that comment was made on a regular
4 basis by the people taking the podium, and I believe
5 I even stated that because of the lack of direction
6 by the NRC and what I saw as a lack of pride and now
7 the new terminology, safety culture at Davis-Besse,
8 that I had lost some of the confidence in
9 Davis-Besse.

10 This afternoon's meeting, I said I think I
11 was hungry at that meeting, at this one I'm tired,
12 but -- this afternoon we saw a great example of what
13 safety culture is and how it's being developed and
14 how it's being nurtured in a plant. Tonight we're
15 seeing evidence of what safety culture is. I've
16 attended every meeting both morning and evening -- or
17 afternoon and night since this started, and this is
18 the first night that I've seen this number of
19 Davis-Besse employees here standing up with pride for
20 what they do. That speaks volumes in raising my
21 confidence level in this plant. I go to church with
22 these people. My kids go to school with their kids
23 or my grandkids do -- my kids are out of school now.
24 These are our community people. They are our
25 community leaders. They know the importance of what

1 they're doing and they lost that. They have it
2 back. They have it back even better than they had
3 it before, and I'm sure that once this plant reopens
4 it will once again be the star of nuclear power
5 industry and not only in the United States of
6 America, but throughout the world. Thank you.

7 (Applause).

8 MS. LIPA: Thank you, Carl.

9 Are there anymore comments or questions from
10 local members of the public or from others while
11 we're here? We only have a few more minutes, but go
12 ahead, come on up.

13 MR. MATHERLY: Good evening. My
14 name is Greg Matherly. I am an employee at
15 Davis-Besse in the Operations Department, but I'm not
16 here to speak because I'm an employee at Davis-Besse,
17 more importantly I'm a local resident of Benton
18 Township.

19 My comments are short, at least to a short
20 question for each of you on the 350 Oversight Panel.

21 Davis-Besse is my employer, but, quite
22 honestly, I feel I work for the people of Ottawa
23 County. I run the plant. It's my job to operate
24 the plant and whenever we get up and operating again,
25 it's my job to ensure that it's ran safely. I do

1 that for each of you, but, more importantly, I do it
2 for my family. I'm a family man first. I'm a
3 husband, and I'm a father. Many of these people
4 here are husbands and fathers or mothers and wives.
5 We wouldn't go to a plant and operate it with the
6 knowing fact that we could do something that would --
7 as some people have raised concerns that we would do
8 something that would bring harm to our families, so
9 as a father and a husband, my question to you guys,
10 as the 350 Oversight Panel, that is ensuring that
11 we're going to start up safe, I mean, I know that I
12 would never do anything, but the confidence needs to
13 be that, would you, Ms. Lipa, would you, Mr. Grobe,
14 if you lived next-door to the plant have the
15 confidence to say, okay, you can restart because I
16 know my family would be safe, and that's my question
17 to you guys.

18 MS. LIPA: Thank you. As we've
19 stated before our plan is to review all the --
20 through inspections and through assessment all of the
21 activities that lead to restart, and we will not make
22 a recommendation for restart unless the panel is
23 convinced that the plant can operate safely.

24 I would also, just on a personal note, let
25 you know that I used to be the Resident Inspector out

1 at Perry, and I didn't live within the 10 mile zone,
2 but I was probably about 12 miles away from the
3 plant, and I have small children, and I felt
4 comfortable living there and reporting to the
5 facility every day for my job, so that's on a
6 personal note.

7 I don't know if somebody else has anything to
8 say?

9 MR. THOMAS: I'll just add that --
10 although I live in Toledo so I guess that doesn't
11 make me a local resident, but the resident at this
12 site lives downtown Oak Harbor, and he has five
13 children, so we have a say in whether Davis-Besse
14 starts up again, so we are local, and so -- it won't
15 happen until we feel comfortable as well, so --

16 MR. GROBE: Okay. Very good.
17 Any additional questions?

18 (No response).

19 MR. GROBE: Lots of eager
20 listeners, no more questions?

21 (No response).

22 MR. GROBE: Okay, I would like to
23 make a couple closing remarks. This has been an
24 exceptional meeting. I can't tell you how much we
25 appreciate you folks coming out. We come here for

1 this reason to stand in front of you and try to
2 answer your questions and listen to your input and
3 whatever it might be, that's why we're here, and I
4 think it's a real tribute to this community that so
5 many folks are willing to come out and share your
6 views and listen to others views, and we respect you
7 for that and we appreciate you coming out.

8 As Christine indicated, we've got at least
9 three more month's worth of meetings scheduled, and
10 we'll be back. Please come, listen to what's going
11 on, if you can be here in the afternoon. If you
12 can't we'll continue to summarize what's discussed in
13 the afternoon. Please pay attention to the
14 information that's on the web site. There's just a
15 wealth of information available. If you can't get
16 access to what you need, you can always call Vika
17 Mitlyng. Her number is plastered everywhere or her
18 counterpart, Jan Strasma, in our Region III office,
19 and there is toll free numbers for that, or you can
20 E-mail her or you can always get ahold of Christine
21 or myself or Scott and Doug at the plant, so our
22 purpose here is to ensure that you have an
23 understanding of what we're doing and to ensure that
24 we have an understanding of what your concerns are,
25 and I think tonight's meeting has been a success.

1 Thank you very much.

2

3

4 THEREUPON, the meeting was adjourned.

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

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

CERTIFICATE

STATE OF OHIO)
) ss.
COUNTY OF HURON)

I, Marlene S. Rogers-Lewis, Stenotype Reporter and Notary Public within and for the State aforesaid, duly commissioned and qualified, do hereby certify that the foregoing, consisting of 114 pages, was taken by me in stenotype and was reduced to writing by me by means of Computer-Aided Transcription; that the foregoing is a true and complete transcript of the proceedings held in that room on the 10th day of December, 2002 before the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

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

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

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

My commission expires 4/29/04