

May 3, 2001

MEMORANDUM TO: THOSE ON THE ATTACHED LIST

FROM: William D. Travers */RA/*  
Executive Director for Operations

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORM UPDATE

As previously indicated in my September 5, 2000 memorandum to you, the public meeting feedback form is one of the major efforts involved in implementing the Strategic Plan performance goal on public confidence. We have completed five months of the 18-month pilot program to determine if the feedback form is a viable tool to assess the effectiveness of NRC's public meeting process. We intend to use the input from the public meeting feedback form to identify areas where the staff can improve its public interactions and, in doing so, increase public confidence.

Some of the feedback forms contain very candid and forceful comments on our meeting processes. Although positive comments were received, some participants noted that presenters did not maintain control over the meeting. Slides were criticized as being too hard to read or too complex. Other comments focused on staff attitude, mentioning arrogance among some presenters at meetings. Office Directors/Regional Administrators should periodically remind staff that sensitivity in this regard should be demonstrated. The NRC training on public meetings focuses on these and other issues, and will likely become mandatory for all staff who are involved in public meeting planning and presenting.

It should be noted here that the feedback forms are intended to help change and shape the way we at NRC do business with the public that we serve. Therefore, the forms should be carefully reviewed by Offices/Regions to identify actions the staff should consider to enable this change.

The feedback form should be used for any NRC meeting where members of the public (non-NRC individuals) are in attendance. The value and importance NRC places on communications with the public should be highlighted at these meetings, as well as the importance and value of the feedback form responses in our assessment of the public meeting process. Reference to the feedback form should be made at the beginning and end of meetings, and at other times as appropriate.

As a reminder, the public meeting feedback form (Attachment 1) is available on Informs (NRC Form 659). The NRC meeting contact completes the meeting date and title, and adds their name, mail stop and office designation to the form in advance of the meeting. Attendees should be encouraged to complete the feedback form at the time of the meeting or mail the form to the designated NRC contact afterward. Staff should collect and review the completed forms, contact individuals who have indicated that they would like some follow-up, revise communication plans, if applicable, and track any planned improvements or resulting actions in

the Office operating plans. In addition, Offices/Regions should forward copies of the public meeting feedback forms, along with any prepared analysis of the responses, staff comments and observations, and number and affiliation (if known) of meeting participants to the Office of the Deputy Executive Director for Management Services (DEDM).

The DEDM will continue to evaluate the collective NRC public meeting feedback forms on a periodic basis in an effort to identify any generic areas for improving NRC staff communications at public meetings. In this regard, please review the analysis of this input (Attachment 2) and the summary of the feedback form input (Attachment 3) for consideration in your planning and conduct of public meetings. Pay particular attention to the short-term actions in the analysis which can be implemented as appropriate to remedy some of the complaints.

As a result of the public participation workshop held on April 4, we will likely address these and other issues involved in our public participation processes, including revision and clarification of the form itself. We will be contacting staff from the offices to engage them in discussions of which suggestions to incorporate immediately, and which may be longer-term projects.

If you have any questions concerning use of the public meeting feedback form, please contact Mindy Landau, x8703.

Attachments:

1. Public Meeting Feedback Form
2. Analysis of Public Meeting Feedback Forms
3. Summary of Public Meeting Feedback Forms

the Office operating plans. In addition, Offices/Regions should forward copies of the public meeting feedback forms, along with any prepared analysis of the responses, staff comments and observations, and number and affiliation (if known) of meeting participants to the Office of the Deputy Executive Director for Management Services (DEDM).

The DEDM will continue to evaluate the collective NRC public meeting feedback forms on a periodic basis in an effort to identify any generic areas for improving NRC staff communications at public meetings. In this regard, please review the analysis of this input (Attachment 2) and the summary of the feedback form input (Attachment 3) for consideration in your planning and conduct of public meetings. Pay particular attention to the short-term actions in the analysis which can be implemented as appropriate to remedy some of the complaints.

As a result of the public participation workshop held on April 4, we will likely address these and other issues involved in our public participation processes, including revision and clarification of the form itself. We will be contacting staff from the offices to engage them in discussions of which suggestions to incorporate immediately, and which may be longer-term projects.

If you have any questions concerning use of the public meeting feedback form, please contact Mindy Landau, x8703.

Attachments:

1. Public Meeting Feedback Form
2. Analysis of Public Meeting Feedback Forms
3. Summary of Public Meeting Feedback Forms

DISTRIBUTION:

EDO r/f  
 DEDM r/f  
 MLandau  
 PNorry  
 WTravers

ADAMS Package #ML011160192

\*SEE PERVIOUS CONCURRENCE

|        |          |           |          |  |  |  |  |
|--------|----------|-----------|----------|--|--|--|--|
| OFFICE | OEDO*    | DEDM*     | EDO      |  |  |  |  |
| NAME   | MLandau  | PNorry    | WTravers |  |  |  |  |
| DATE   | 04/27/01 | 04/ 27/01 | 05/03/01 |  |  |  |  |

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

MEMORANDUM TO THOSE ON THE ATTACHED LIST DATED: May 3, 2001

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORM UPDATE

|   | <u>Mail Stop</u> |
|---|------------------|
| Chairman Meserve  | O-16 C1          |
| Commissioner Dicus  | O-16 C1          |
| Commissioner Diaz   | O-16 C1          |
| Commissioner McGaffigan   | O-16 C1          |
| Commissioner Merrifield   | O-16 C1          |
| B. John Garrick, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste  | T-2 E26          |
| George E. Apostolakis, Chairman, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards   | T-2 E26          |
| John T. Larkins, Executive Director, Advisory Committee on Reactor Safeguards/Advisory Committee on Nuclear Waste | T-2 E26          |
| G. Paul Bollwerk, III, Chief Administrative Judge, Atomic Safety and Licensing Board Panel                        | T-3 F23          |
| Karen D. Cyr, General Counsel   | O-15 D21         |
| John F. Cordes, Jr., Director, Office of Commission Appellate Adjudication  | O-16 C1          |
| Jesse L. Funches, Chief Financial Officer   | O-17 F3          |
| Hubert T. Bell, Inspector General   | T-5 D28          |
| Janice Dunn Lee, Director, Office of International Programs   | O-4 E9           |
| Dennis K. Rathbun, Director, Office of Congressional Affairs  | O-16 C1          |
| William M. Beecher, Director, Office of Public Affairs  | O-2 A13          |
| Annette Vietti-Cook, Secretary of the Commission  | O-16 C1          |
| William D. Travers, Executive Director for Operations   | O-16 E15         |
| William F. Kane, Deputy Executive Director for Reactor Programs   | O-16 E15         |
| Carl J. Paperiello, Deputy Executive Director for Materials, Research and State Programs                          | O-16 E15         |
| Patricia G. Norry, Deputy Executive Director for Management Services  | O-16 E15         |
| Stuart Reiter, Acting Chief Information Officer   | O-16 C1          |
| John W. Craig, Assistant for Operations, OEDO   | O-16 E15         |
| Michael L. Springer, Director, Office of Administration   | T-7 D57          |
| Frank J. Congel, Director, Office of Enforcement  | O-14 E1          |
| Guy P. Caputo, Director, Office of Investigations   | O-3 F1           |
| Paul E. Bird, Director, Office of Human Resources   | T-3 A2           |
| Irene P. Little, Director, Office of Small Business and Civil Rights  | T-2 F18          |
| Martin J. Virgilio, Director, Office of Nuclear Material Safety and Safeguards                                    | T-8 A23          |
| Samuel J. Collins, Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation   | O-5 E7           |
| Ashok C. Thadani, Director, Office of Nuclear Regulatory Research   | T-10 F12         |
| Paul H. Lohaus, Director, Office of State and Tribal Programs   | O-3 C10          |
| Charles L. Miller, Acting Director, Incident Response Operations  | T-4 D18          |
| Hubert J. Miller, Regional Administrator, Region I  | RGN-I            |
| Luis A. Reyes, Regional Administrator, Region II  | RGN-II           |
| James E. Dyer, Regional Administrator, Region III   | RGN-III          |
| Ellis W. Merschoff, Regional Administrator, Region IV   | RGN-IV           |

## ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORMS

The OEDO has completed a preliminary analysis of the 73 public meeting feedback forms sent in by the Offices and Regions, representing 25 meetings held from September 14, 2000 to February 10, 2001. There were actually over 225 public meetings held during this period, however, many of these meetings were not attended by members of the public because of lack of interest, therefore no feedback was received.

There were additional factors contributing to the low number of completed feedback forms: lack of response from meeting attendees, failure of NRC staff to introduce and distribute the form at public meetings, and no knowledge of, or confusion with, the September 5, 2000 guidance on when to use the form and how to introduce or encourage its use.

The feedback forms represent input from many of our stakeholder groups, including the general public. Most respondents (87%) indicated that they worked for an interested organization which includes: licensee, non-governmental organization, licensee contractor, law firm, newspaper, local or state government, and community or citizen group.

The following statistics were gleaned from the responses:

70% of respondents were very familiar (27% somewhat familiar) with the meeting topic prior to attending the meeting and 73% have attended more than five NRC meetings.

78% of respondents found out about the meeting through an NRC mailing list, another meeting, licensee representative, NRC staff, or *Federal Register* notice...20% of respondents found out about the meeting through the internet. 92% of respondents indicated that sufficient notice was provided.

59% of respondents were able, and 29% were unable to find all the supporting information they wanted prior to the meeting. 92% indicated that the purpose of the meeting was clearly stated in the preliminary information.

70% of respondents indicated that attendees' questions were answered clearly, completely, and candidly, and 26% indicated that they were not.

The written material was useful in understanding the topic for 55% of respondents and somewhat useful for an additional 36% of respondents.

81% of respondents indicated that NRC's presentations and material were made in clear, understandable language.

85% indicated the meeting achieved its stated purpose. The meeting greatly helped 41% with their understanding of the topic and somewhat helped another 55% of respondents.

51% of respondents indicated that their concerns were directly addressed by NRC staff but another 27% who raised concerns were not satisfied.

85% of respondents indicated that adequate time was allotted for discussion with NRC staff on the topic of the meeting and that the next steps in the process were clearly explained, including how to be involved.

Overall, 60% of respondents were very satisfied with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting. Another 36% were somewhat satisfied.

Additional, specific comments indicate that a number of short-term actions could be taken to improve the public meeting process. These include:

- \* Improve the sign-in and escort process to decrease attendee wait times
- \* Provide copies of referenced documents at the meeting
- \* Review slides, overheads, and other handout materials for errors, plain English, and readability if projected on a screen
- \* Be better prepared to answer questions and communicate relative risk
- \* Ensure appropriate speaker preparation through dry runs
- \* Pay more attention to meeting location and timing, especially for multi-day meetings requiring travel and security escort requirements

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORMS  
SEPTEMBER 14, 2000 to March 31, 2001

**Total forms returned = 73**

Note: More than one response to some of the questions

1. Why did you attend this meeting?
  - 9 - a. I am a local resident
  - 60 - b. I work for an interested organization
  - 14 - c. I am concerned about environmental issues
  - 8 - d. I am concerned about economic issues
  - 6 - Other
  
2. Were you familiar with the meeting topic prior to coming today?
  - 51 - a. Very
  - 20 - b. Somewhat
  - 2 - c. Not at all
  
3. How did you find out about this meeting?
  - 16 - a. NRC mailing list
  - 5 - b. Newspaper
  - 2 - c. Radio/TV
  - 15 - d. Internet
  - 41 - e. Other (another meeting, plant mgr., licensee, Fed. Register, NRC staff)
  
4. Have you attended an NRC meeting before?
  - 7 - a. Never
  - 7 - b. 1 or 2 times
  - 6 - c. 3 to 5 times
  - 53 - d. More than 5 times
  
5. Was sufficient notice given in advance of the meeting?
  - 67 - a. Yes
  - 6 - b. No
  
6. How well do you feel you understand the NRC's role with regard to the issues discussed today?
  - 62 - a. Very well
  - 9 - b. Somewhat
  - 2 - c. Not at all

7. Were you able to find all the supporting information you wanted prior to the meeting?  
43 - a. Yes  
21 - b. I did not try to find any information (one person had information already)  
9 - c. No
8. Was the purpose of the meeting made clear in the preliminary information you received?  
67 - a. Yes  
4 - b. No  
2 - Did not receive preliminary info  
2 - NA
9. In your opinion, were people's questions answered clearly, completely and candidly?  
51 - a. Yes  
19 - b. No  
2 - No response  
2 - Somewhat
10. Was the written material useful in understanding the topic?  
40 - a. Very  
26 - b. Somewhat  
3 - c. Not at all  
2 - No written material  
1 - Licensee brought material  
1 - No response
11. Were NRC's presentations and material presented in clear, understandable language?  
59 - a. Yes  
11 - b. No  
3 - NA
12. In your opinion, did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?  
62 - a. Yes  
10 - b. No  
1 - Somewhat
13. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?  
30 - a. Greatly  
40 - b. Somewhat  
1 - c. Not at all  
1 - no answer  
1 - Already understood

14. How well did NRC staff respond to your concerns at this meeting?  
37 - a. My concerns were directly addressed  
1 - b. I was provided an alternate source of information to address my concerns  
14 - c. I did not raise my concerns at this meeting  
17 - d. I raised my concerns but am not satisfied with the response.  
5 - No response
15. Was adequate time allotted for discussion with NRC staff on the topic of today's meeting?  
62 -a. Yes  
7 - b. No  
4 - No response
16. How satisfied are you overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?  
44 -a. Very  
26 - b. Somewhat  
3 - c. Not at all
17. Were the next steps in this process clearly explained, including how you can continue to be involved?  
62 - a. Yes  
6 - b. No  
1 - Marked between yes and no (asked how to provide input)  
4 - No response

**Additional Comments on conduct of meetings or public meeting process (Comments on technical issues or recommendations on NRC decisions or next steps are not included)**

**\* ( ) = number of forms returned from each meeting**

**POLICY ON FACTORS CAUSING FATIGUE OF OPERATING PERSONNEL AT NUCLEAR REACTORS - 9/14/01 (1)\***

This survey form is a good idea.

Signing-in process could be aided by having a listing of public meetings at the lobby computers to permit people to rapidly enter contact name and telephone number to speed up the process; it would also help when meeting locations are changed at the last minute.

**DRAFT PLAN FOR USING RISK INFO IN NMSS - CASE STUDIES - 9/21/00 (1)**

No comments.

**GRAND GULF KAOWOOL ISSUE- 9/21/00 (5)**

NRC responded directly and clearly to my (licensee) concerns; meeting was productive.

**REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING RULEMAKING- 9/27/00 (3)**

Referenced documents should be handed out or participants informed where to obtain.

Meeting began before all participants waiting in the lobby were escorted to the meeting room - not good.

Waited in lobby 50 minutes to be escorted to meeting - meeting was then already in progress.

NEI was upstairs with NRC staff at least 40 minutes before stated meeting time - unfair.

Request for a written explanation on "unfair and unacceptable behavior on the part of the staff."

Meeting notice indicated it would be conducted per Commission policy and to members of the public for observation only - staff did not conduct meeting as stated, allowed everyone in the room to speak- the meeting notice contained false information or the NRC staff deviated from Commission policy.

### **RISK-INFORMING PART 50 (OPTION 3)(RES) - 10/02/00 (6)**

Many errors in slides.....large number of errors on flowchart vugraphs not helpful.

Slides that involved flowcharts or box diagrams were difficult to read.

Too much background on history....audience was interested on where things are going, not where they have been.

Needed to be a nuclear physicist to understand Appendix K....I am and was lost.

SECY 00-0198 should have been available for meeting.....it's in ADAMS but download and printing problems associated with a paper this size are daunting.....couldn't find in ADAMS....there are other ways to get document to public besides ADAMS (Web site; copies at meeting; e-mail doc or where to find to registrants).

Less than 2 week meeting notice was provided.

Lack of clear NRC management involvement.

### **HATCH RELICENSING - 10/05/00 (1)**

Newspaper publisher appreciates that meetings are open and offers to help publicize these meetings or other info.

### **ROP/CORTLANDT, NY- 10/11/00 (1)**

Staff did well with a hostile, vocal, non-representative audience.

Some of the NRC staff had difficulty answering some of the questions and some answers not always complete, clear or candid. Some answers were long winded and didn't address original question.

Be prepared to discuss general nuclear related concerns and be able to place risk/health significance in perspective with “everyday” occurrences.

The responsible thing to do is to correct audience question/comment on the spot, when wrong.

**JOINT OWNERS GROUP MOTOR OPERATED VALVE PERIODIC VERIF. - 10/11/00 (2)**

Staff did good job in creating environment for mutual agreement on the central issues.

NRC and public interface on this topic continues to be well run and professional.

**SEQUOYAH FUELS- 10/17/00 (4)**

Clarity of presentation on the regulatory process.....There appeared to be an underlying concern about the containment cell. While the NRC clearly stated that a final decision has not been made, I did not think it was clear (from the presentations) that the construction of the cell is within current regulations.

Questions were passed on.

An NRC rep had an air of thinking he was superior to others.

There was too much information from the Sequoyah Fuels president.

The impact on humans from the standpoint of the EIS could have been clearer.

Isn't there an avenue, a person or persons can report emotional distress other than that of public meetings? Sometimes that is a very private concern and people do not want to talk about them publicly.

Not all meetings have sufficient notice.

How do we know how to go about providing input on the next steps in the process.

Appreciated use of the Gore facility.

**ST. LUCIE 1- EDG AOT EXTENSION - 10/24/00 (2)**

**\*\*\*Who is target audience for this feedback.....if not member of “public,” not all questions/choices applicable.**

Pleasantly surprised by the NRC's openness to discuss issue...need more R&D and development of guidelines for realistic fire risk analysis.

**COOK - UNIT 1 RESTART MEETING - 10/30/00 (1)**

Of meetings in Regions I, II & III, Region III are the clearest in stated purpose, focus of questioning, and summary wrap-up.

NRC participants in RIII ask intrusive questions, ensure complete understanding and do not let the licensee get by on "fluff" answers.

Oversight does not seem consistent from Region to Region.

**REACTOR OVERSIGHT PROCESS INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION EVALUATION PANEL - 11/1/00 (2)**

NRC conference rooms are not user friendly for the public...I felt captured; leaving requires an escort to get back in.

Conference room was cramped.

**PUBLIC WORKSHOP TO DISCUSS CURRENT ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE DECOMMISSIONING OF NUCLEAR FACILITIES - 11/8/2000 (17)**

Disappointed with staff preparedness; questions answered vaguely; poor awareness of industry issues; understanding of broad issues lacking; Need to better explain complex regulations in simple non-technical terms; some responses in conflict with actions and responses from Regions - need more effective intra-agency coordination; need trained communicators; presentations geared to regulated community.

NRC staff lost control with the spent fuel topic at reactor sites...it should have been briefly discussed and tabled for another workshop.

Poor control over discussion; moderator allowed discussion to wander; unsatisfactory opportunities for audience questions; allowed same questions with slight modification to be asked over and over again; Disproportionate amount of time was devoted to specific concerns of consumer/public advocates.

Members representing the public poorly chosen; too unbalanced a participation (non-industry reps dominated).

Provide audience with list of people and affiliations around table; hard for audience to know who is speaking.

Couldn't find meeting on Web; could you keep an e-mail list of interested parties.

Suggest second day of a meeting not extend beyond noon - people leave.

Supporting info difficult to locate on Web site - won't try ADAMS anymore.

Form of meeting identifies questions that may already be known...no resolution....allows people to vent frustrations rather than work towards a solution.

Photographer unexpected and unannounced - annoying, distracting and intimidating.

Printing on hard copy of slides was too small to read.....lights should not have remained dimmed during discussions after presentations.

Public participants lost control.....NRC staff demonstrated patience, restraint and kept their cool.

Need "Frequently Asked Questions" info.

How does NRC measure "success" for the public meeting? Is it the number of people who attended? The number of people who fill out this questionnaire? The number of issues raised? The earnestness of the staff in recording issues and addressing them? Is it in generating a memo to the Commission that causes some discussion about additional rulemaking? Is it the number of additional meetings people are willing to attend to get an action plan for changing the status quo? How do you measure public confidence and whether it was increased or eroded by attending this meeting? What are your performance indicators? Is government more open or more effective now that this meeting has taken place?

Would like to see more Agreement State input.

**REG CONFERENCE WITH CALLAWAY PLANT - RIV -11/09/00 (2)**

Could the meeting have been done by teleconference....there wasn't enough time for discussion because of travel considerations for some people.

There were too many slides...the licensee presentation should have been focused on what the NRC needed to address.

**DRAFT EIS FOR ARKANSAS NUCLEAR ONE, UNIT 1- 11/14/00 (5)**

Meeting should have been shorter.

**RISK-INFORMED CHANGES TO LOCA-RELATED REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS - 11/16/00 (2)**

Capability appears to be with contractors and not in-house staff; staff members appear to rely too heavily on contractors' judgements and not their own.

**INDIAN POINT 2 RECENT INSPECTION RESULTS AND PLANT STATUS - RI - 11/16/00 (1)**

Commenter impressed by professionalism and candor of NRC staff.

**REGION SUGGESTS A LINK FOR THE FEEDBACK FORM ON WEB SO IT CAN BE SUBMITTED FROM WEB PAGE**

**MEET WITH NEI ON REACTOR DECOMMISSIONING RULEMAKING ISSUES - 11/27/00 (1)**

No comments.

**MGT. MEETING TO DISCUSS STATUS OF CONNECTICUT YANKEE ATOMIC POWER CO. AND YANKEE ELECTRIC CO. DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES -RI -11/30/00 (2)**

Good meeting - picked up points I had not been aware of.

**REGION INDICATES IT WILL CONTINUE PRACTICE OF TELEPHONE LINKS WITH LICENSEE, STATES AND LOCAL COMMUNITY ADVISORY GROUPS.**

**PUBLIC SCOPING MEETING ON ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES PERTAINING TO LICENSE RENEWAL OF TURKEY POINT, UNITS 3&4 - 12/6/00 (1)**

No comments.

**REGULATORY CONFERENCE - V.C. SUMMER - RII - 12/7/00 (1)**

No comments

**DRAFT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT RELATED TO HATCH NUCLEAR PLANT, UNITS 1 AND 2, LICENSE RENEWAL - 12/12/00 (1)**

No comments.

**V.C. SUMMER -REACTOR COOLANT SYSTEM HOT LEG WELD CRACK - RII - 12/20/00 (1)**

No comments

**V.C. SUMMER HOT LEG PIPE CRACK - PUBLIC MEETING - RII - 1/18/01 (1)**

No comments

**PUBLIC MEETING TO SOLICIT STAKEHOLDER INPUT ON THE USE OF RISK INFORMATION IN THE NUCLEAR MATERIALS REGULATORY PROCESS: CASE STUDIES ON GAS CHROMATOGRAPHS, STATIC ELIMINATORS AND FIXED GAUGES - 2/10/01 (9)**

NRC is between a rock and a hard place. Meetings like this one seem premature - like the presenters haven't yet put in enough time & effort to dig out info. But I also know that NRC is constantly criticized for holding meetings too late - often after NRC has already reached conclusions. Probably, in my case would opt to attend a bit further along in process.

Context for the meeting should be given in more detail. Background scope and any previous work should be discussed. A process should be in place to get the stakeholders to provide more direct input (during the meeting on the work that NRC is doing). To some extent, the stakeholders were giving their position on the general topics.

Speakers poorly prepared. Questions from public audience not well addressed, especially for speaker on Gas Chromatographs - who treated audience like a bunch of fools. This is unacceptable and denigrates NRC in public eyes. How this meeting fits into previous meetings - what is the overall good - would have been much appreciated.

Very disappointed in NRC staff presentations. Clearly, the many implications of proposed regulatory changes had not been thoroughly thought through. Supervisor served as a neutral, unbiased reviewer. One presenter needs instruction in presentation technique.....his attitude was somewhat off-handish and inconsiderate in dealing with members of the public. A second presenter needs to present information in a much less verbose manner.

The NRC was very deficient in addressing the cumulative dose inquiry raised in the meeting. Credibility suffered.

Meeting was useful to explore issues.