

April 4, 2002

MEMORANDUM TO: Those on the Attached List

FROM: William D. Travers */RA by William F. Kane Acting For/*
Executive Director for Operations

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORM PILOT
PROGRAM CONCLUSION

We have completed the 18-month pilot program to determine the viability of the public meeting feedback forms to assess and enhance the effectiveness of NRC's public meeting process, and have decided the feedback form will remain in use as a tool to increase public confidence.

The feedback forms provide the public with an important vehicle to comment on our meetings and request any additional follow-up information. Our analysis and evaluation of these forms has demonstrated they help to improve our interactions with the public. In fact, some of the comments received have been incorporated into the revised policy on Enhancing Public Participation in NRC Meetings which will be sent to the Commission shortly for approval.

In response to suggestions received from meeting participants and NRC staff, we have streamlined and redesigned the form. A copy of the redesigned form is attached (Attachment 1).

We will continue to evaluate the feedback forms periodically in an effort to target areas for improving NRC staff communications and to track our progress in improving public meetings. Therefore, offices and regions should continue to review the forms carefully for actions the staff should incorporate. We are considering automated methods for tracking performance and analysis of the public meeting process. Should such a system be instituted, we will provide training and additional guidance. In the meantime, please continue to send your completed forms, along with any prepared analyses of the responses, staff comments and observations, to the Office of the Deputy Executive Director for Management Services.

As a reminder, the revised feedback form is available on Informs (NRC Form 659). If possible, forms should be attached to the handouts. Please ensure your staff uses the feedback form for **any** NRC meeting where members of the public (non-NRC individuals) are in attendance, excluding Commission meetings. The value and importance NRC places on communications with the public and on the feedback form responses should be emphasized at these meetings.

Attendees should be encouraged to complete the feedback form at the meeting or mail the form to the designated NRC contact afterward. Staff should review the forms when received, contact individuals who have indicated that they would like some follow-up, revise communication plans, if applicable, and track any resulting actions in the office operating plans.

Please review the feedback analysis (Attachment 2) and summary (Attachment 3) for consideration in your planning and conduct of future public meetings.

If you have any questions concerning use of the public meeting feedback form, please contact Mindy Landau, X8703 or Ramin Assa, X8709.

Attachments:

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

Please review the feedback analysis (Attachment 2) and summary (Attachment 3) for consideration in your planning and conduct of future public meetings.

If you have any questions concerning use of the public meeting feedback form, please contact Mindy Landau, X8703 or Ramin Assa, X8709.

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
 M. Landau
 R. Assa

ADAMS ACCESSION #ML020910220

OFFICE	OEDO	OEDO	DEDM	EDO		
NAME	RAssa	MLandau	PGNorry	WDTravers		
DATE	04/02/02	04/03/02	04/03/02	04/04/02		

OFFICIAL RECORD COPY

MEMORANDUM TO THOSE ON THE ATTACHED LIST DATED: April 4, 2002

SUBJECT: PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORM UPDATE

	<u>Mail Stop</u>	
Chairman Meserve	O-16	C1
Commissioner Dicus	O-16	C1
Commissioner McGaffigan	O-16	C1
Commissioner Merrifield	O-16	C1
George M. Hornberger, 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	E21
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, 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
Richard H. Wessman, Director, Incident Response Operations	T-4	D18
Hubert J. Miller, Regional Administrator, Region I	RGN-I	
Bruce S. Mallett, Acting 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 analyzed 345 public meeting feedback forms sent in by the Offices and Regions, representing 89 meetings held from September 2000 to February 2002. There were actually over 922 public meetings held during this period (excluding Commission meetings and partially closed meetings), however, many of those attending these meetings did not complete the forms, either because of lack of interest or because NRC staff did not introduce and distribute the form at public meetings.

The feedback forms represent input from a variety of stakeholder groups. Most respondents (78%) 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 groups. On some forms there were multiple entries for this and other questions. For example, local residents who worked for an interested organization were also concerned about the environment and checked all three answers in response to question number one.

The following statistics were gleaned from the responses:

69% of respondents were very familiar (28% somewhat familiar) with the meeting topic prior to attending the meeting and 55% have attended more than five NRC meetings.

27% of respondents found out about the meeting through an NRC mailing list, another meeting, licensee representatives, NRC staff, or *Federal Register* notice. 23% of respondents found out about the meeting through the internet. 97% of respondents indicated that sufficient notice was provided.

68% of respondents were able, and 8% were unable to find all the supporting information they wanted prior to the meeting. 93% indicated that the purpose of the meeting was clearly stated in the preliminary information.

81% of respondents indicated that attendees' questions were answered clearly, completely, and candidly, and 12% indicated that they were not.

The written material was useful in understanding the topic for 62% of respondents and somewhat useful for an additional 28% of respondents.

80% of respondents indicated that NRC's presentations and material were made in clear, understandable language.

83% indicated the meeting achieved its stated purpose. The meeting greatly helped 54% with their understanding of the topic and somewhat helped another 43% of respondents.

50% of respondents indicated that their concerns were directly addressed by NRC staff but another 13% who raised concerns were not satisfied.

89% of respondents indicated that adequate time was allotted for discussion with NRC staff on the topic of the meeting and 84% thought that the next steps in the process were clearly explained, including how to be involved.

Overall, 78% of respondents were very satisfied with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting. Another 20% were somewhat satisfied.

Comments and Suggestions Received

The following is a summary of comments received during the last six months of the pilot program¹:

- ▶ “Could use handouts on safety features for public and employees, describing what programs are in place and handouts describing how radiation is monitored.” (7/19/01)
- ▶ Millstone Unit 2 and 3’s annual performance assessment meeting: “This [meeting] seems more like a report about reporting than sharing information. The public does not come despite the fact that some very interesting things are alluded to. The NRC staff were friendly. The meeting [was] concealed or obscured by its tedious repetitive allusion to the structure of the evaluations.” (7/17/01)
- ▶ “Ads for the meeting should run in all the local newspapers instead of just one. Equal size ad.” (7/19/01)
- ▶ “Quit promoting nuclear and begin overseeing”, (6/14/01)
- ▶ “Meeting was with the steering committee, but only one of the four members was present. No one could describe the process for applying the current PPSDP. Meeting summary at the end was very confusing with no clear message. Too many acronyms used.” (09/05/01)
- ▶ Licensee’s presentation on TMI Unit 1, steam generator severed plugged tube, root cause analysis: “At the beginning of the meeting the PM stated that it was a public meeting open for observation only by the public and the NRC staff would remain after the meeting to meet with the public. Yet during the meeting, [a member of] NEI, who was not on the agenda and who was sitting in the audience, was allowed to go to the podium - twice -to make remarks. Why don’t the meeting rules apply to NEI as they do to [others]?” (11/09/01). NRC follow-up: The project manager (PM) called the individual making the comment and explained that two questions were asked during the meeting and the best person to answer them was the NEI representative. Rather than leaving the questions un-answered, the PM allowed NEI to answer the questions.
- ▶ “The meeting was too slow to start. We have work and other scheduling constraints to meet. If you [the NRC] expect everyone to be brief, why was NRC staff so long-winded in the beginning? My conclusion is that the NRC should hold safety hearings on the

¹ For comments and suggestions received earlier during the pilot program, please see memoranda dated May 3, 2001 (Accession no. ML011160180) and September 18, 2001 (Accession no. ML012560421)

Turkey Point license. (7/17/01), Meeting to discuss the draft supplement environmental impact statement for Turkey Point Units 3 and 4.

There were positive comments as well. Many respondents appreciated the opportunity to meet with NRC staff in person and express their views or ask questions. Several respondents commented that they thought the NRC staff was highly professional and competent.

- ▶ “Presenting industry trend data in key areas was very positive in giving the public an understanding of safety indication.” (7/19/01)
- ▶ “Well organized, focused meeting. The coordinator was very good about getting the questions and feedbacks and not “solving the problem”; Use email or web page to keep attendees updated as to the status of guidance. Breakout session format is good. Don’t make the breakout group too large” (8/23/01)

The NRC staff followed-up after the meetings by responding to questions, comments or requests for documents whenever contact information was provided on the feedback forms. Additionally, stakeholders’ suggestions and criticisms that could readily improve NRC’s public meeting process were incorporated and emphasized in The Office of Human Resources training sessions. Finally, in response to stakeholder’s concerns, we have prepared a proposed policy on enhancing public participation in NRC meetings. After this policy is approved by the Commission we will issue guidance to the staff which will help to achieve effective and efficient public meetings.

Attachment 3

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORMS RECEIVED (Entire pilot program period) September 2000 - February 2002

Total forms returned = 345

Note: There was more than one response to some of the questions while some questions were left unanswered.

1. Why did you attend this meeting?
 - 79 - a. I am a local resident
 - 270 - b. I work for an interested organization
 - 58 - c. I am concerned about environmental issues
 - 31 - d. I am concerned about economic issues
 - 59 - e. Other

2. Were you familiar with the meeting topic prior to coming today?
 - 238 - a. Very
 - 98 - b. Somewhat
 - 9 - c. Not at all

3. How did you find out about this meeting?
 - 94 - a. NRC mailing list
 - 31 - b. Newspaper
 - 7 - c. Radio/TV
 - 81 - d. Internet
 - 173 - e. Other (NEI, plant mgr., PM, licensee, Fed. Register, NRC staff)

4. Have you attended an NRC meeting before?
 - 60 - a. Never
 - 53 - b. 1 or 2 times
 - 49 - c. 3 to 5 times
 - 185 - d. More than 5 times

5. Was sufficient notice given in advance of the meeting?
 - 334 - a. Yes
 - 27 - b. No

6. How well do you feel you understand the NRC's role with regard to the issues discussed today?
 - 284 - a. Very well
 - 53 - b. Somewhat
 - 4 - c. Not at all

7. Were you able to find all the supporting information you wanted prior to the meeting
236 - a. Yes
110 - b. I did not try to find any information
28 - c. No
8. Was the purpose of the meeting made clear in the preliminary information you received?
316 - a. Yes
29 - b. No
9. In your opinion, were people's questions answered clearly, completely and candidly?
278 - a. Yes
40 - b. No
10. Was the written material useful in understanding the topic?
213 - a. Very
97 - b. Somewhat
7 - c. Not at all
11. Were NRC's presentations and material presented in clear, understandable language?
275 - a. Yes
43 - b. No
12. In your opinion, did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?
288 - a. Yes
32 - b. No
13. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?
187 - a. Greatly
149 - b. Somewhat
8 - c. Not at all
14. How well did NRC staff respond to your concerns at this meeting?
171 - a. My concerns were directly addressed
23 - b. I was provided an alternate source of information to address my concerns
95 - c. I did not raise my concerns at this meeting
44 - d. I raised my concerns but am not satisfied with the response.
15. Was adequate time allotted for discussion with NRC staff on the topic of today's meeting?
308 - a. Yes
28 - b. No
16. How satisfied are you overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?
268 - a. Very
70 - b. Somewhat
11 - c. Not at all

17. Were the next steps in this process clearly explained, including how you can continue to be involved?

289 - a. Yes

33 - b. No