

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

U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
FIRST ENERGY NUCLEAR OPERATING COMPANY
PUBLIC MEETING

Meeting held on Tuesday, February 11, 2003, at
7:00 p.m. at Camp Perry, Clubhouse #600, Port
Clinton, Ohio, taken by me, Marlene S. Rogers-Lewis,
Stenotype Reporter and Notary Public in and for the
State of Ohio.

PANEL MEMBERS PRESENT:

- U.S. NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
- Jack Grobe, Chairman for Davis-Besse ~~facility~~ Oversight Panel
- Christine Lipa, Branch Chief, NRC's Region III
- Anthony Mendiola, Section Chief PDIII-2, NRR
- David Passehl, Project Engineer, Region III
- Jon Hopkins, Project Manager - Davis-Besse, NRR
- Douglas Simpkins,
Resident Inspector - Davis-Besse
- Jay Collins, Project Engineer - Davis-Besse

1 MS. LIPA: It's about 7:00.

2 We're about ready to begin.

3 MR. GROBE: I don't think your
4 mike is on.

5 MS. LIPA: Can you hear me? It's
6 about 7:00, let's go ahead and get ready to begin.
7 I'll try to see if I can get my mike working. Does
8 that sound better? Okay, good.

9 Well, welcome, and this is the monthly
10 meeting of the 0350 Panel. We had a business
11 meeting during the day, and the purpose of tonight's
12 meeting is to inform members of the public of what we
13 discussed during the business meeting, and then give
14 you an opportunity to ask us questions or provide
15 comments to us.

16 What I'd like to do is start off with some
17 introductions for some of the NRC folks that are
18 here. I'm Christine Lipa, and I'm a Branch Chief in
19 NRC's Region III office near Chicago, Illinois.

20 Jack Grobe is a Senior Manager in the Region
21 III office, as well, and he's also the Chairman of
22 the Oversight Panel. We also have some other NRC
23 folks here today.

24 We have Tony Mendiola, who is the Section
25 Chief at NRR.

1 We have Jon Hopkins. He's the Project
2 Engineer in NRR, which is in Rockville, Maryland.

3 We also have Doug Simpkins. He's the
4 Resident Inspector at the Davis-Besse facility.

5 We have Dave Passehl, and he's the Project
6 Engineer in the Region III office.

7 We have Jay Collins. He's a General
8 Engineer. He's from headquarters, but he's actually
9 on rotation at the Davis-Besse site.

10 We also have Ivy ~~Netsell~~ Netzel. She's the
11 Resident Inspector at Cook.

12 We have Viktoria Mitlyng. She's is the
13 Public Affairs Representative here.

14 We have Roland Lickus. He's our State
15 Affairs Representative, and we have Nancy Keller.
16 She's the Site Secretary at the Davis-Besse NRC
17 office, and we have a transcriber, Marlene is here
18 today. I think that's about it. Okay. Good.

19 Well, what I'd like to start off with is Tony
20 Mendiola will give you a summary of what we discussed
21 during the business portion of the meeting, and then
22 we'll go ahead and turn it over to public comments
23 and questions, so go ahead, Tony.

24 MR. MENDIOLA: Thank you, Christine.

25 The meeting today started about 2:00, and as per all

1 our other meetings basically began with a summary and
2 a -- a summary from both sides indicating current
3 projects and milestones met and current other
4 highlights that are ongoing, and this one was no
5 different. The NRC began with their Restart
6 Checklist, which is the checklist that we use to
7 determine that we are following our process.
8 Basically the process steps as we follow along when
9 the plant prepares for restart. We did indicate
10 primarily that we are currently in the inspection
11 mode. We have a number of inspections at various
12 degrees of initiation or completion, and we did
13 indicate some of the program findings today on some
14 of our inspections. After that brief opening
15 portion there, FirstEnergy began their presentation,
16 and I do believe that there is still copies of the
17 slides out in the lobby. If anybody wants to get a
18 copy of FirstEnergy slides, they're just basically
19 14, 15 pages of slides.

20 The FirstEnergy presentation, first of all,
21 began to discuss the Restart Readiness by discussing
22 various ongoing projects on site. The first project
23 they discussed was the fuel, the actual reactor fuel
24 that is going to be used for refueling the reactor
25 and some of the inspections and corrective actions

1 have been performed on the fuel. They discussed
2 improving the experience of their operational team to
3 handle that fuel, and, additionally, discussed the
4 training that was ongoing for their fuel handlers and
5 how they were changing some roles and
6 responsibilities with the fuel in order to put, if
7 you will, appropriate amount of experience as the
8 plant prepares to refuel.

9 They discussed other engineering issues at
10 the plant. They discussed the refurbishment of two
11 of the four reactor coolant pumps, their current
12 status of the redesign and construction of the
13 containment emergency sump. They discussed their
14 current status on the decay heat valve pit, which is
15 now basically called the decay heat valve tank, I
16 think is what they're calling it, and discussed
17 additionally their containment air coolers that were
18 actually in containment and their refurbishment and
19 replacement of those coolers. Then there was a
20 discussion of the completion and refurbishment of the
21 containment dome area basically to repaint the dome
22 and to put it up -- to put the appropriate type paint
23 inside the containment. Then they discussed the
24 process for readiness to restart, how they were going
25 through reviews and management oversight and certain

1 observations, how they were reacting to observations
2 as they prepare for restart that management
3 determined needed to be discussed prior to actual
4 refueling and to restart. One of the tests which is
5 necessary for restart is the Containment Integrated
6 Leak Rate Test, and it briefly gave us an explanation
7 of what was going to be involved with that test and
8 basically the schedule for that test, hoping to
9 finish the completion of that test in early March
10 2003.

11 The discussion then branched off to a topic
12 on System Health Assurance. Basically, System
13 Health Assurance involved the operational readiness
14 and readiness basically of certain systems for
15 operation. They had standard reviews already in the
16 plant, Operational Readiness Reviews, System Health
17 Readiness Reviews, Latent Issues Reviews. Additional
18 reviews have come to pass as part of the 0350 process
19 and basically the process that's been going on at
20 Davis-Besse for the past year or so. Of course,
21 they did -- these additional reviews involved
22 self-assessments, and, of course, the NRC
23 inspections. All these issues, all these plans and
24 reviews developed a list of issues, and, from that
25 point, they discussed the three paths for issue of

1 resolution. Path A is -- and they named them Path
2 A, B, and C. Path A was basically the Corrective
3 Action Program, the standard Corrective Action
4 Program that you find at most all utilities. They
5 focus instead on Path B, which is entitled the Safety
6 Function Validation Project, and they were coming to
7 closure, coming to conclusion with this project,
8 which in a sense evaluated the safety functions of 15
9 safety systems to determine that they provide a
10 significant contribution to core damage frequency,
11 and that they were getting, if you will, the right
12 response from the systems. This involved evaluating
13 the methodology, and then based on the calculations
14 that came out of these reviews, determining whether
15 there were any non-conformances and then
16 appropriately entering them into a program that would
17 follow up on these non-conformances. Of the 15
18 systems they evaluated, they felt several systems
19 were fully validated and additional systems needed --
20 I'm sorry, and additional system needed additional
21 analysis, and they were using a variety of ways of
22 following through on this additional analysis,
23 including, I believe, a use of a contractor to
24 determine what additional actions needed to be done,
25 what technical evaluations and other actions needed

1 to be done in order to fully validate these systems.
2 Like I mentioned, there were three paths for issue
3 resolution. Path A, if you will, is a one time
4 project, the Safety Function Validation Project,
5 which, as I say, was nearly complete.

6 The second path they were using was Path C,
7 which is basically a Collective Significance Review.
8 The purpose of this Path C was to identify those
9 issues which are -- if you will, are cross-cutting
10 issues. Issues, if you will, that are across
11 program areas -- could be found in several program
12 areas and some of these were identified such as
13 Seismic Qualification, Environmental Qualification,
14 Fire Protection. Those issues can be found across
15 several systems, and they took it upon themselves
16 using a corporate operating procedure -- actually,
17 they call it Nuclear Operating Business Procedure to
18 perform, if you will, a Collective Significance
19 Review, to provide a consistent process and format
20 for the evaluation of these cross-cutting issues and
21 determine the corrective actions for these
22 cross-cutting issues and then meet with the
23 Engineering Assessment Board to review the results
24 and then to close these issues out. Like I
25 mentioned, they had these three paths. They felt

1 fairly comfortable these three paths would resolve
2 the issues that were identified during the System
3 Health Reviews. They summarized the issues
4 basically indicating -- they summarized this portion
5 of their presentation basically indicating there was
6 good correlation among these three paths to complete
7 the issues. However, they did indicate there was
8 more analytical work that was needed, but they had
9 not identified any major modifications which needed
10 to be performed prior to restart, and they felt that
11 they needed to provide some more rigor in their
12 calculations. Then there was another presentation
13 to discuss the safety culture using the FirstEnergy
14 model. I'd really rather prefer to point this to
15 the folks that have the slides. If you still have a
16 copy of it in front of you, it's basically Slide 30
17 of their presentation, it's easier to see it than for
18 me to describe it, but it basically builds on three
19 levels of commitment, Individuals' Commitment,
20 Managers' Commitment and then Policy Level Commitment
21 and the success of those three commitments helps
22 build, if you will, the safety culture. Using that
23 model rather simplistically described there, they
24 went about and used it to determine their safety
25 culture for fuel load, one of their next major steps.

1 They went back and looked at each of the indicators
2 to support those commitments and colorized them as
3 necessary, you got the white, green, yellow or red.
4 Green being, of course, the best, and red being an
5 area that does not meet acceptable standards and
6 requires immediate management attention, and each of
7 the groups associated with fuel load were invited to
8 come in and have their areas assessed by a team of
9 managers to determine whether they were ready for
10 fuel load. When the ratings were all issued, these
11 ratings provided feedback to the individual
12 organizations on their readiness for restart, as well
13 as their current safety culture assessments, and then
14 they summarized the entire group, if you will, the
15 entire site-wide findings into a common safety
16 culture assessment and found themselves somewhat
17 ready for fuel load, although they had some areas
18 that needed some additional work. Basically, they
19 summarized this issue as very unique and state of the
20 art for assessing their safety culture assessment,
21 and, if you will, their readiness for fuel load, and
22 they felt it was very innovative, currently still
23 needing some refinement, but it was a tool that was
24 of some value to indicate rather objectively how
25 ready they are to do certain -- how ready their

1 safety culture is to do certain planning issues.

2 The next presentation was from the Nuclear
3 Quality Assessments. Basically Nuclear Quality
4 Assessments is an organization that needs to find out
5 things others have not found basically is how that
6 was explained, and they characterized their current
7 activities into three main groups, basically what
8 they've done in the recent past and not for -- the
9 list they have worked, that they were working, you
10 can see in the slides, basically discussed their
11 current and ongoing activities, and then their future
12 observations and assessments they're going to have in
13 the very near future, which included, of course, such
14 things as the Restart Test Plan, Fuel Movement
15 Activities and other activities associated with
16 restart.

17 At that point we found ourselves rather
18 limited on time. We moved quickly to the closing
19 remarks, Lew Myers made. Basically he summed it up
20 with the four main points; that fuel load would not
21 occur until everyone is ready. Containment testing
22 will occur after that, which is planned in March.
23 System review progress continues, and he was very
24 complimentary about the safety culture evaluation and
25 ~~not~~ model that was used for determining readiness for

1 load fuel. At that point we adjourned and took
2 questions. That's all I have.

3 MS. LIPA: Okay, thank you,
4 Tony. I also wanted to point out that there were
5 some other handouts in the foyer. One of those is a
6 February edition of the NRC Update, and this has
7 recent activities, ongoing activities, and then some
8 background information. We also have a public
9 meeting feedback form that is a one page with both
10 sides, and you can use this to fill out and provide
11 comments to us. A lot of you have done that in the
12 past, and we think it's helped us to improve our
13 meetings, and we also have some of the licensee's
14 slides were still there, and then some of the slides
15 we used during the business portion of today's
16 meeting were still there.

17 I also wanted to point out the transcript of
18 what we discussed during the business portion of
19 today's meeting will be on our web site in about
20 three to four weeks, so what we would like to do next
21 is go into public question and comment unless you
22 have anything else, Jack?

23 MR. GROBE: No.

24 MS. LIPA: We'd like to start
25 with -- thank you, Tony, local members of the public

1 first, and we want to really hold everybody to three
2 to five minutes. That's one of the feedbacks that
3 we have been getting is how important it is, so, with
4 that, I invite anybody -- local members of the public
5 to come on up and sign your name and speak your name
6 clearly for the transcriber.

7 MR. HELLE: Yes, my name is Mark
8 Helle, H-E-L-L-E. First of all, I am an employee of
9 FirstEnergy. I have been with the company for 18
10 years. During that time, I have been at Davis-Besse
11 since 1988. I'm a resident. I have been in the --
12 actually went to Oak Harbor High School, graduated
13 from Oak Harbor High School. With that said, I've
14 got many family, friends in the area, and every
15 time -- this is my third public meeting I have been
16 to, and every time I come up here, or every time I
17 come, I always want to say something because it's
18 always the same issues that are brought up, so I
19 thought I would jump up here and maybe say a couple
20 things before the others got their chance.

21 First of all, I mean, when they come up,
22 why -- if they could address why -- why would I work
23 out there if I didn't think it was safe?

24 Second of all, why would hundreds of people
25 work out there if they didn't think it was safe and

1 why would I allow my family to be in this area if I
2 didn't think it was safe? With that -- it goes back
3 to like being in the area. I know hundreds, if not
4 thousands, of people in this area. If it was not
5 safe, I would not work out there, and just one other
6 point was, I try to think of some other industry
7 where you're paid to find problems at your work area
8 so you can attempt to shut down that line or shut off
9 the reactor. What other industry does that? And
10 that's what we're paid to do out there, so, with that
11 said, thank you.

12 MS. LIPA: Thank you for your
13 comments.

14 MR. GROBE: Thank you.

15 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

16 MS. FARIS: My name is
17 Priscilla Faris, and I'm a lifelong resident of
18 Ottawa County and proud to say that I have worked at
19 Davis-Besse for 21 years. I am grateful for the
20 continued support of Davis-Besse by FirstEnergy, our
21 parent company, and I am thankful for the leadership,
22 guidance and perseverance of the FENOC senior
23 management team at Davis-Besse. I am also grateful
24 for the support and assistance we have received from
25 our peers at our sister plants, Beaver Valley and

1 Perry.

2 I would also like to voice my thanks to the
3 Ottawa County Commissioners, Steve Arndt, Carl
4 Koebel, and John Papcun, and to County Administrator,
5 Jere Witt, for their continued visible and verbal
6 support of Davis-Besse and for the swift and public
7 stance they took against Dennis Kucinich's demand to
8 pull our operating license. Their letter to Mr.
9 Kucinich questioning his motives and lack of
10 knowledge was right on the money. I have the utmost
11 confidence in the Davis-Besse management team and my
12 fellow workers, and I believe that we will safely and
13 successfully return this plant to service. Thank
14 you.

15 MR. GROBE: Thank you.

16 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

17 MR. MARTIN: My name is Steve
18 Martin. I, too, am an employee at FirstEnergy.
19 I've worked in the nuclear industry and commercial
20 end for about 22 years. I'm currently an
21 instructor, operations instructor, at the Davis-Besse
22 nuclear facility. I've been involved in this
23 industry, like I said, for 22 years. I started my
24 career in operations, got to Three-Mile Island about
25 a year after the accident happened, and so I have

1 been through a lot as far as seeing plants that have
2 problems get back in the line. We do find ourselves
3 in an unfortunate state of events right now at
4 Davis-Besse, but I've not seen a group of employees
5 in my 22 years that have really been so safety
6 oriented as the group of employees at Davis-Besse.
7 We've worked hard to ensure safety, and many of us
8 have asked questions about why we had a problem with
9 the hole in the head and how we got there, and I
10 think most of us our supporting our management's
11 efforts to ensure we going forward have a very good
12 safety culture. We've done a lot. Our management
13 has come up with a very, very unique and specific
14 program of what we are going to do to ensure that we
15 are ready to restart the plant.

16 My question for the 350 committee is, when
17 we've -- I've seen all things in my management steps
18 that we're going to take to ensure that we are safely
19 going to restart the plant, but I've not seen
20 anything from the committee saying that -- what
21 specific measurements they're going to measure to
22 ensure that we're there and at what specific time
23 they're going to allow us to restart, so I guess that
24 would be my question to the committee is, what
25 specific measurements are you going to take to ensure

1 that we're ready to restart?

2 MS. LIPA: Well, I would like
3 to start off by answering that we have our Restart
4 Checklist that you've seen, right, and has the
5 specific items that we want to make sure are
6 addressed before we would consider restart, and I
7 think what you're talking about, too, is a sub-set of
8 those is the safety culture efforts that the Utility
9 is taking.

10 MR. MARTIN: Right, right.

11 MS. LIPA: Right now we have a
12 plan to do three phase inspection of that area, and
13 we really are waiting to see the plan, see what it's
14 based on that FirstEnergy is putting together and
15 then send our inspectors in and our inspectors are
16 getting some expertise from consultants and then our
17 inspectors are going to assess it, so I don't have
18 any specific criteria that I can share with you
19 today.

20 MR. MARTIN: Well, I guess a
21 follow-up question would be is, then, are you going
22 to assess whether or not our safety culture program
23 is adequate to allow us to restart, or are you going
24 to come up with your own recommendations, or do you
25 have a specific plan?

1 MS. LIPA: What our plan is
2 really to tie it back to the root cause of the event,
3 what specific corrective actions have been taken and
4 what corrective actions are planned and how effective
5 are those corrective actions in being implemented, so
6 that's the focus we're going to use.

7 MR. MARTIN: So if the committee
8 feels that we have adequately addressed those areas
9 then, I assume it will be successfully allowed to
10 restart?

11 MS. LIPA: That will be what
12 we're doing for that section of it, and then the rest
13 of the restart checklist has to be reviewed also.

14 MR. MARTIN: Thank you.

15 MS. RIDLON: My name is Jessica
16 Ridlon, R-I-D-L-O-N. I live in Perrysburg, and my
17 dad, Tim Ridlon, has worked at Davis-Besse for 16
18 years now. Davis-Besse has served northwest Ohio
19 for many years now, and every day its employees come
20 in to tend to its energy. For years, we have taken
21 its beautiful energy -- or its beautiful plant --
22 this beautiful plant for granted and nothing is
23 perfect and we know that. We know that the plant is
24 not perfect, nor the people that work there, but one
25 mistake doesn't mean that the people are bad. We

1 need to learn to trust the workers and -- that give
2 us energy so we can see in the dark and that keep our
3 food cold. We trust our President to make the right
4 decision about war. He makes us -- if he makes the
5 wrong decision, it could be destructive, but we trust
6 him as a person. If we made a mistake -- if he made
7 a mistake, would we try to shut him down as well?
8 We need to trust, forgive, and give second chances to
9 those who are trying to keep us safe and healthy like
10 the workers at Davis-Besse. There are no guarantees
11 in this world, but there are commitments to try.
12 This is why I believe that Davis-Besse should be
13 allowed to continue to run with all support. Thank
14 you.

15 MS. LIPA: Thank you, Jessica.

16 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

17 MR. WAGNER: My name is Terry
18 Wagner. I'm an electrical engineer at the
19 Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station. I have worked in
20 the nuclear industry all my life. From my six years
21 in the U.S. Navy Nuclear Power Program, to my 24
22 years at Davis-Besse, I have seen the many positive
23 effects nuclear power has had on the country. I
24 believe -- I live near Davis-Besse. My family and
25 friends live near Davis-Besse. We would not live

1 here if we thought that Davis-Besse were unsafe. I
2 attend these meetings quietly listening while half
3 the nuclear activists come from far-flung regions to
4 seize the opportunity to grandstand for their single
5 minded goal of eliminating nuclear power. To those
6 individuals, I say it won't happen in this lifetime.
7 There are too many rational people in the United
8 States who understand the important role nuclear
9 power plays in our country's energy future to let
10 that happen. There are too many people who support
11 our nuclear plants across the country that provide
12 more than 20% of the nation's electrical power to
13 allow the wishes of a few to negatively impact the
14 benefits to the many. To our elected officials who
15 count themselves in the camp of the anti-nuclear
16 activists, I say stop using the problems at
17 Davis-Besse to grab at the headlines. Focus your
18 energies on issues that will actually benefit the
19 people you were elected to serve. Concentrate on
20 helping us to win the war on terrorism. I have
21 heard the anti-nuclear activists compare Davis-Besse
22 to Three-Mile Island. The only comparison that
23 could honestly be drawn is that like Three-Mile
24 Island the lessons learned at Davis-Besse will be
25 used to improve programs and systems throughout the

1 nuclear industry. Let me put Three-Mile Island in
2 perspective. The accident there was the worst case
3 scenario for a nuclear power plant, a core meltdown.
4 Yet no one died and no one was injured as a result of
5 TMI. What other industry could experience its worst
6 calamity and not result in the loss of human life?
7 Not many. The reason is because nuclear power
8 plants are built on the concept of defense and depth,
9 redundant backup systems to ensure public safety is
10 maintained even in the event of a design basis
11 accident. Yes, Davis-Besse has had problems lately,
12 but remember these problems come on the heels of a
13 decade where Davis-Besse was ranked high in the
14 worldwide nuclear industry in terms of safety and
15 performance. We are working through these problems,
16 and we will correct them. More importantly, we will
17 learn from them. One of the things that the nuclear
18 industry does better than nearly every other industry
19 is to utilize lessons learned to raise the bar. To
20 the anti-nuclear community I say, go ahead and kick
21 us while we are down, but we will not be down much
22 longer. We will be back, and we will be better than
23 before. Thank you.

24 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

25 SHERIFF EMAHISER: My name is Craig

1 Emahiser, and, as you can tell, I'm the Ottawa County
2 Sheriff. As the Sheriff of this County, it's my
3 sworn duty, amongst others, to preserve the peace and
4 to protect the citizens of this County. During the
5 over 10 years that I have had the honor to serve as
6 the Sheriff and to work with the employees at
7 Davis-Besse to ensure the security of the facility,
8 I've gotten to know the employees of the power
9 station and consider many of them to be my friends,
10 and they have earned my respect. Many of these
11 employees make their homes here in our County.
12 Their families, their homes are here. Their
13 children attend our schools. I have gotten to know
14 these citizens as highly educated, trained
15 professionals, who I personally trust to know what is
16 happening at that power station. They certainly
17 know what the consequences are if there was a serious
18 problem at the nuclear power station and the results
19 if it was not run safely. I believe that the safe
20 operation of the plant is certainly in the best
21 interest of all the employees at Davis-Besse, their
22 families, their relatives and their friends. It
23 makes absolutely no sense to me to suggest in any
24 regard these professionals would put their families
25 and our community at risk certainly not just for the

1 sake of a paycheck. Some have suggested that we
2 should convert Davis-Besse to be a coal fire plant or
3 use some other fossil fuel. Coal would result in an
4 endless line of trains bringing in coal and hauling
5 out by-ash by-products. In my over 30 years of law
6 enforcement experience, I have responded to far too
7 many car/train accidents resulting in the needless
8 loss of many lives. Do you know how many nuclear
9 power accidents I responded to in that same period of
10 time? Zero. Not even the first minor injury.

11 Gas pipelines create their own set of
12 problems and dangers that would extend for miles past
13 the boundary of the plant and pass through our lands
14 and through our communities.

15 The radioactive material that's currently on
16 site would not magically disappear if the plant were
17 to close today and would still have to abide by all
18 the regulations associated with the nuclear power
19 plants that produce power.

20 Davis-Besse has produced power for over 25
21 years, but most important is the fact that --
22 excluding with the damage of the reactor head, the
23 power station has had an excellent operating and
24 safety record during that time. Davis-Besse's
25 generation of electricity is a vital part of our

1 economy and our communities and the entire region.
2 It generates approximately half of the electricity
3 that is needed for northwest Ohio. It also provides
4 more than 850 local jobs and has provided over 200
5 million dollars in taxes over the past 25 years.
6 Our community has greatly benefited by having
7 Davis-Besse Nuclear Power Station here in our County.

8 Ever since September 11, 2001, Ottawa County
9 Sheriff Deputies have stood shoulder to shoulder with
10 the men and women of the Davis-Besse Nuclear Power
11 Station to protect the station from the new dangers
12 that exist in the changed world that we live in
13 today, and we are proud to do so.

14 THEREUPON, Ms. Lipa exited the room.

15 SHERIFF EMAHISER: We are confident
16 that these professionals can run this plant safely,
17 and when they have done their jobs as they can do to
18 make sure the plant is safe, we have the highest
19 confidence in their ability and their commitment to
20 that high level of safety that nuclear power
21 requires. It is my strong belief that Davis-Besse
22 Nuclear Power Station should be allowed to restart
23 without unnecessary delay. Thank you.

24 MR. GROBE: Thank you, sir.

25 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

1 MR. HIRT: Dave Hirt, Danbury
2 Township Trustee, Ottawa County. We've certainly
3 heard from the employees tonight, and it's good that
4 they could be committed to be here and speak so well
5 for themselves, but Davis-Besse is a life blood of
6 Ottawa County, and, more than that, it is one of the
7 life blood industries of the State of Ohio. All of
8 its employees, all of them who work there are our
9 residents. They're our neighbors. They're our
10 friends. They're the familiar faces who have a great
11 number of years of seniority here. They are the
12 people who have so safely operated this plant in the
13 past and have the ability to run this plant again in
14 a very safe manner. They're good, frontline
15 employees with commitments securely rooted in Ottawa
16 County, commitment to safety as they have the
17 knowledge and the experience to securely and safely
18 run this plant. They have a commitment to the
19 community. Just look where they live, and they have
20 a commitment to the company. Look at their seniority
21 records. Management can change, but frontline,
22 dedicated employees have the commitment for safety.
23 Please don't let this restart become politically
24 motivated by congressmen posturing themselves for
25 their own political agendas, but concentrate upon the

1 reason, the logic, and the science of safety. We
2 hope that you're moving forward with the restart, but
3 do so with safety. Thank you very much.

4 MR. GROBE: Thank you, David.

5 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

6 MS. LUEKE: Donna Lueke,
7 L-U-E-K-E. I'm a citizen of Marblehead in Ottawa
8 County, and I'm proud to live in this area and know
9 lots of people at the plant, and I think that
10 community loyalty and company loyalty is a wonderful
11 thing. I also think it can be a liability, and
12 that's why we're counting on the NRC to see through
13 that, to see through economic concerns, loyalties,
14 concerns about jobs, and I just want to reinforce
15 that point of view, that in spite of all the good
16 intentions something did go wrong here and more and
17 more it's becoming evident how serious it went wrong,
18 and it did not happen -- and, correct me if I'm
19 wrong, but it did not happen in one month or one
20 week, it was an accumulation, and there must have
21 been signals to the employees that worked there.
22 There must have been signs that something was wrong,
23 and I'd just like to ask, Mr. Grobe, did you find
24 that to be true in your investigations so far?

25 MR. GROBE: Absolutely, Donna.

1 I appreciate all your comments. I also appreciate
2 the forbore and dedication that a number of employees
3 have expressed tonight, but, as you know, you have
4 been to many of our meetings, our only focus is
5 safety and the plant will not be restarted until
6 we're comfortable it can be restarted safely and will
7 be operated safely. There was a number of
8 indicators that the damage to the head was
9 progressing over a series of years. Those
10 indicators were not properly assessed and responded
11 to. FirstEnergy has articulated clearly, I think,
12 on a number of occasions, that the principal -- or
13 cause of what happened over a period of years was a
14 reduced focus on safety at the management level and
15 an increased emphasis on production, and that
16 contributed to operating the plant at a level of
17 minimum standards and contributed to missing
18 indicators of what was going on.

19 MS. LUEKE: When do you think
20 you'll be comfortable that the safety culture has
21 enough -- the new safety culture, which is very
22 impressive from everything I've seen, and the efforts
23 that they're putting into it seem to be really
24 genuine and thorough, when do you feel that there's
25 enough of a track record from that that you'll be

1 able to assess whether it's working?

2 MR. GROBE: Well, the first
3 thing that has to happen is FirstEnergy has presented
4 to us on January 30th in a public meeting in Chicago,
5 presented to us their plans for how they're going to
6 measure safety culture at Davis-Besse, and, as Tony
7 articulated earlier, it's got three levels of
8 assessment. The first level is the Policy Level or
9 the corporate level. The second level is the
10 Management level, and the third level is the
11 Individual Worker Level, and in each of those levels
12 there's a series of indicators that feed into
13 assessment of the adequacy of those levels. We have
14 not seen the details of how those assessments are
15 going to be completed. We've heard in public
16 meetings the articulation of that information, but
17 until we see it on paper and have a chance to really
18 look at it, it's difficult to express a judgment on
19 its adequacy. Safety culture is a difficult area to
20 measure. There are some quantitative or objective
21 indicators that can be used. Other indicators are
22 less quantitative and more subjective than
23 qualitative. The outcome of a good safety culture
24 is easy to see. It affects not only decision making
25 and operations and engineering and maintenance, but

1 the way in which workers accomplish their jobs, the
2 way in which managers make decisions. Our inspectors
3 are observing those types of activities every day, so
4 it's going to be a process of melting together our
5 inspection observations for a variety of activities
6 and our assessment of the method by which FirstEnergy
7 is choosing to measure safety culture and bringing
8 that all together. Did I answer your question,
9 Donna?

10 MS. LUEKE: Yes, I think I saw
11 March as one of the deadlines, I looked at those
12 slides, and they said that would be when they're
13 finished with their first level of assessment.

14 MR. GROBE: They presented today
15 an assessment. It was the first assessment they'd
16 done of this nature of the organizational culture.
17 They did that assessment in their evaluation of
18 readiness to load fuel back into the reactor, and
19 they, as Tony articulated earlier, they colorized
20 their assessment in the various areas. I don't know
21 what date you were specifically referring to, but
22 there are no deadlines from my perspective. We need
23 to receive their plans in detail on paper so that we
24 can evaluate them. We need to observe how they're
25 implementing those plans, and, as I said, it will all

1 come together as far as a collective judgment of all
2 the observations the NRC has.

3 MS. LUEKE: Okay. One thing I
4 would suggest would be that when a safety culture has
5 been achieved, one of the things that will be evident
6 is welcoming questions and challenges from those who
7 are asking the tough questions about what happened.

8 MR. GROBE: Uh huh.

9 MS. LUEKE: And not to diminish
10 the loyalty and the team work -- I think that's a
11 wonderful thing, but when each employee at
12 Davis-Besse who was there while this was happening
13 can take an honest look and say, what could I have
14 done differently, when did I see those signs, and
15 whether it's a role play or whatever, come to some
16 answers with that, and also be able to say and answer
17 anybody who asks questions from the outsider, who
18 brings challenges about the safety culture and
19 welcome those because they know that their safety
20 culture is so solid that it can answer any
21 challenges, so I would offer that as a guideline.

22 MR. GROBE: Okay. We're
23 probably over our five minutes.

24 MS. LUEKE: Pardon?

25 MR. GROBE: I said --

1 MS. LUEKE: All right. Thank
2 you.

3 MR. GROBE: Thank you, Donna.

4 MR. ARNDT: Steve Arndt,
5 President of the Board of Ottawa County
6 Commissioners. Good evening. Last month I talked
7 about my 23 years as an elected official, my primary
8 responsibility, I believe, is the health, safety and
9 welfare of the general public, and I sort of broke my
10 questions down into two particular areas; one on the
11 physical side of the plant, as well as on the soft
12 side or the safety culture type activities that both
13 the industry is putting in place as well as the
14 observations from the NRC's perspective. I
15 certainly recognize that from the mechanical side
16 this plant has probably gone under more review and
17 more analysis than at any other time in its
18 particular life which is really a very good thing as
19 far as being able to identify any future problems.
20 I have one particular question as far as on the soft
21 side of the NRC. I truly believe with the
22 management staff that we have at Davis-Besse, the
23 dedication and commitment from the employees at this
24 particular time we'll be able to get the mechanical
25 side, as well as the soft issues, addressed to the

1 point that we will be considering the restart of
2 Davis-Besse, but what happens beyond that? How do we
3 assure the citizens of Ottawa County the plant will
4 continue to operate in a safe environment? Has the
5 NRC come up with a way that they're going to evaluate
6 to make sure the safety culture programs that the
7 industry has spent a lot of time on incorporating
8 continue on once restart has been achieved?

9 MR. GROBE: That's an excellent
10 question, Steve, thank you. The process that we're
11 under, it's named in accordance with the procedure
12 that we have. It's called the Manual Chapter O350.
13 The O350 procedure has criteria by which -- by which
14 we're supposed to evaluate plant operations, and it
15 has termination criteria for the panel. The panel
16 will be in existence long after restart. We'll
17 still be here conducting public meetings, discussing
18 performance. If and when the plant gets to the
19 point of restart, we'll be talking about different
20 types of issues. We'll be talking about continuing
21 assessments that they're conducting, we'll be talking
22 about the continuing evaluation of the safety
23 culture. We'll be talking about operational safety
24 issues, performance of plant systems, things of that
25 nature in the process of operations, so the panel

1 will be here for a period of time after the restart,
2 continuing to evaluate the ongoing safety of the
3 plant.

4 The other part of the question I think you
5 asked is, what changes are -- is the agency making in
6 its routine inspection programs to ensure that these
7 kinds of issues don't happen again, and, as you're
8 aware there was a Lessons Learned Task Force that
9 identified some 50 recommendations and the Commission
10 approved a prioritization of those recommendations.
11 Our Executive Director in Washington has requested
12 six month performance reports on how we're improving,
13 and I'm confident that he will keep us to task of
14 reevaluating our programs and improving our programs,
15 so I think I have answered both sides of your
16 question.

17 MR. ARNDT: Yes, you did. I have
18 two other requests; one, I believe on behalf of
19 Ottawa County and its residents. I understand that
20 your Resident Inspectors are on site. They do
21 quarterly reports based on those inspections, share
22 those with the Utility. I'm not aware of ever
23 having the opportunity to have direct contact and
24 dialogue with the NRC's Resident Inspectors and the
25 basis of those reports. I understand that

1 potentially those could be considered not a public
2 hearing, and, of course, with elected officials,
3 public meetings, the like, but, certainly, once those
4 reports are finalized I think I would like to see a
5 commitment from the NRC to sit down with the local
6 elected officials to go over those findings and those
7 quarter reports and have that continued dialogue, not
8 only from the physical standpoint of the plant, but
9 as well as because of the soft issues that remain.

10 MR. GROBE: As you're aware, the
11 Commission just conducted a meeting in the Washington
12 area regarding Davis-Besse, and they invited three
13 groups of folks to speak to them about Davis-Besse.
14 The first was FirstEnergy, the second was the NRC
15 staff, and the third group was a panel of
16 stakeholders, and, Jere Witt, Ottawa County
17 Administrator, was one of the people that the
18 Commission invited to Washington to speak to them and
19 a similar recommendation was made by Jere at that
20 meeting.

21 MR. ARNDT: Our message is
22 consistent.

23 MR. GROBE: That's right. I like
24 it. Among other recommendations, Jere had maybe
25 half a dozen or so recommendations going forward.

1 We're evaluating all those recommendations. I've
2 had the opportunity to meet with you on several
3 occasions, and I plan on continuing my interface with
4 Ottawa County officials while the panel continues in
5 its performance function, and we're evaluating Jere's
6 recommendations as well going forward also.

7 MR. ARNDT: I think it will go a
8 long way for the residents of Ottawa County of
9 reestablishing trust from the NRC that we have a
10 direct dialogue, and we understand what is going on
11 at the facility. We have the ability to answer
12 questions or ask questions, and maybe get some
13 answers to some of the things that we're hearing, and
14 I think it would be a great opportunity for some good
15 dialogue.

16 MR. GROBE: I appreciate that.

17 MR. ARNDT: The other request
18 that I have is, I really believe that the
19 reorganization or restructuring of FENOC's --
20 especially with the creation of Bill Pearce's
21 position is very well -- something that maybe might
22 have helped us avert the situation had that position
23 been in place before, but I guess I have a request of
24 the Utility that the Commissioners and especially in
25 light of what happened now, we think we can do one

1 step further that would be valuable, that is the --
2 they created the Restart Oversight Panel. We
3 really, truly believe that panel should continue on.
4 I think it's a great opportunity for the peers of the
5 industry to take a look at independent eyes, I think
6 is one that benefits the entire industry, not just
7 FirstEnergy or FENOC, and I think having local
8 representation on that -- certainly we're not the
9 experts, that's why I believe to have the dialogue
10 between the NRC as well as a peer review would be
11 invaluable for elected officials of making sure that
12 we're all looking at it objectively as to what's
13 going on in our community, so I would lay that
14 challenge to -- I see a number of representatives
15 here from FirstEnergy and FENOC, if they would take
16 that back to corporate, that is certainly a request
17 that we would like to see that request being honored.

18 MR. GROBE: Thank you.

19 MR. ARNDT: Thank you.

20 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

21 MR. WHITCOMB: Good evening. What
22 is the status of the NRC's criminal investigation?

23 MR. GROBE: The NRC doesn't do
24 criminal investigations, but our Office of
25 Investigations is conducting an inquiry into the root

1 cause of violations that occurred at Davis-Besse and
2 that investigation is ongoing.

3 MR. WHITCOMB: Thank you.

4 MR. GROBE: That was Howard
5 Whitcomb.

6 MR. WHITCOMB: Thank you, sorry.

7 MR. GROBE: That's all right.

8 MS. THOMAS: My name is Lisa
9 Thomas, and I'm an employee at Davis-Besse. I am a
10 wife, and I'm a mother, and growing up as a child, my
11 father died when I was very young, and as a result,
12 for many years I only had one parent. As a parent
13 myself now, I would do anything to make certain that
14 my child doesn't have to go through that. As a
15 result, I wouldn't work at a facility that I didn't
16 feel was safe. I have an MBA. I have strong work
17 ethics. My parents came from Europe. We work very
18 hard. I know I can get another job. I don't have
19 to work there. I work at Davis-Besse because I
20 choose to work at Davis-Besse. I feel confident
21 that the employees focus on safety, and that is their
22 priority. I am confident that the management is
23 focused on safety and that's their priority, and I'm
24 confident that our President's focus is on safety,
25 and I'm confident with your support we will run again

1 as a safe plant. Thanks.

2 MR. GROBE: Thank you.

3 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

4 MR. GROBE: You folks are more

5 timid that you usually are.

6 (BRIEF PAUSE).

7 Is there anybody else that would like to come

8 forward and speak or ask a question?

9 MR. LOCHBAUM: Hi, my name is Dave

10 Lochbaum, I'm with the Union of Concerned Scientists

11 in Washington, D.C. I just have three observations.

12 First, I monitored the restarts of the Salem

13 plant, and the D.C. Cook plant, Millstone and several

14 other plants that went through the 0350, 0350 like

15 process, and, in doing so, each of those plants by

16 the end of the day had reported dozens of Licensee

17 Event Reports that were found during the discovery

18 phase of their restart. I did a search on

19 Davis-Besse, and there have been only five Licensee

20 Event Reports submitted to date that had to do with

21 discovery during the current outage, which is

22 actually less than the plant reported in the year

23 2000 when it was operating. I understand from the

24 presentation this afternoon there's a number of

25 issues that might ultimately become LER's, but it's

1 our observations that we would hope the NRC would
2 ensure the scrubbing that was done during the system
3 reviews in discovery was as thorough as the other
4 plants and that the operability of the more than
5 2,500 problems that had been found has been thorough
6 and all those that need to be reported have been
7 reported or will be reported.

8 The second observation is, I read in today's
9 Plain Dealer of Bill Dean's comment to the effect
10 that it would take the resources of the Homeland
11 Security Department to fully inspect every inch of
12 the plant, and clearly our expectation isn't that the
13 NRC inspect every inch of the plant. We think
14 that's unrealistic, but I think it is our expectation
15 that the NRC inspectors would be able to find one or
16 two of the more than 2,500 problems that are listed
17 on that wall over there. Again, we're not expecting
18 every inch to be found, but some were in the past --
19 I mean, some of those problems should have been found
20 by the NRC, and we're concerned that that didn't
21 happen.

22 In the meeting last month at NRC
23 headquarters, Art Howell, the Chair of the NRC's
24 Lessons Learned Task Force, said that that Task Force
25 consumed over 7,000 hours in that effort, which is

1 about the same, if not more, than the total amount of
2 NRC inspection efforts spent at Davis-Besse in the
3 years 1999, 2000 and 2001 combined.

4 As, Jack, you said earlier, that the NRC has
5 embraced 49 of those recommendations that came out of
6 that effort. I guess our recommendation would be
7 that the 0350 Panel should remain in place until the
8 NRC resolves all 49 of those lessons learned because
9 that would help assure this community that future
10 lapses in the NRC are less likely to occur.

11 And, lastly, the NRC last week issued a
12 special inspection of organizational effectiveness or
13 operational effectiveness, and, as was presented this
14 afternoon, that effort identified some areas, some
15 possible root causes that the company had not
16 evaluated, engineering, and the input it had in
17 decision making and corporate support in terms of
18 casual and other issues. I guess what this suggests
19 to us, what this inspection suggests to us, is that
20 FirstEnergy isn't doing a very good job of root cause
21 because it required NRC effort to come in and help
22 and encourage them along. You know, if I was in
23 class -- if I had multiple choice questions and if I
24 said, D, and they said, no, you know, ultimately, I'm
25 going to get the right answer. It looks like

1 FirstEnergy is not getting to the first answer by
2 itself. The NRC is still having to help them in
3 root cause, so we're of concern that that inspection
4 didn't demonstrate to us that the root cause
5 evaluation by the company's thorough and exhaustive
6 efforts still relies on a crutch from the NRC to get
7 to that answer. It was good that the NRC is there,
8 but it would be better if the company got there first
9 by itself. Thank you.

10 MR. GROBE: Thank you. Couple
11 of comments, Dave.

12 MR. LOCHBAUM: I'll stay here.

13 MR. GROBE: Good. You and I
14 have been together on some of those other plant
15 restarts. There's a unique characteristic to the
16 effort that I have seen at Davis-Besse. One aspect
17 that was unique was a very rapid simulation of all of
18 the learnings from the other plants into their
19 activities here at the plant. They brought in a lot
20 of folks who had experience at Cook and Salem and
21 Millstone and Crystal River and other plants in doing
22 these kinds of efforts, so the activity while there
23 were some initial bumps and bruises, but the activity
24 got off to a fairly strong start.

25 As you observed from this afternoon's

1 meeting, there was a number of engineering issues
2 that are still under evaluation. My overall
3 assessment is that the engineering evaluations that
4 are done here were as rigorous as the ones done at
5 D.C. Cook. They were done with essentially the same
6 process and with many of the same people. I don't
7 believe that there was as many findings. If you
8 recall Cook, there were some 150 modifications that
9 were necessary with plant equipment. The majority
10 of the modifications that are going on at Davis-Besse
11 are modifications that they chose to make, not
12 because of design basis concerns or deficiencies, but
13 to upgrade the plant, so I don't believe the design
14 of the systems was as challenged as some of those
15 other ones. I don't have experience at Millstone or
16 Salem, but I do at Cook.

17 The other thing is this discovery effort
18 proceeded much more rapidly, and, as you're aware,
19 engineering issues take time to evaluate, so because
20 of the rapid progress that they made in discovery,
21 the engineering issues resolution of those as far as
22 looking at past operability, which would be what we
23 have reported in the ~~NER~~-LER has taken over that time, so
24 I think those observations might help explain your
25 sense of the difference between Davis-Besse and other

1 plants.

2 The schedule for implementation of Lessons
3 Learned Task Force is laid out and there's no
4 alignment or connection between Davis-Besse and
5 restart and the resolution of those issues. The
6 high priority issues that the Commission identified
7 for implementation are happening on a very rapid time
8 line, but there is no connection between Davis-Besse
9 and the program improvements that are going on as a
10 result of the Lessons Learned Task Force. I think I
11 responded to the major issues that you talked about.

12 MR. LOCHBAUM: Can I just ask
13 for one follow-up for clarification?

14 MR. GROBE: Sure.

15 MR. LOCHBAUM: I take it from
16 your response that the NRC is looking at the
17 operability or reportability process to ensure that
18 they're at the right point?

19 MR. GROBE: Absolutely,
20 absolutely.

21 MR. LOCHBAUM: Okay.

22 MR. GROBE: Thank you.

23 Thank you very much.

24 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

25 MR. OPFER: Jack, and

1 members of the panel, I -- my name is Darrell Opfer,
2 I'm currently Director of the Ottawa County
3 Improvement Corporation, former Commissioner and
4 State Representative, schoolteacher and long time
5 resident of Ottawa County, and, in fact, born here.

6 One of the things that I appreciate your
7 commenting on is the positive attitude of the
8 Davis-Besse folks and their ability and interest in
9 putting together the collective engineering and
10 learning from other plants.

11 As a County Commissioner and State
12 Representative, I've always found the folks at
13 Davis-Besse, whether its management or workers, to be
14 very helpful and answer questions and to help people
15 learn and understand what's going on at the plant.

16 I do want to leave a copy of a Letter to the Editor
17 that I sent to our local papers, and just excerpting
18 a couple of points from that. While hundreds of
19 Davis-Besse power plant folks have been spending a
20 great deal of time and hours working on the plant,
21 and now that things are becoming -- are beginning to
22 come together very obviously, it's clear that outside
23 interest such as Congressman Kucinich, programs like
24 the Bill Moyers Program and reportedly 60 Minutes and
25 now the Cleveland Plain Dealer seek to use the plant

1 shutdown to advance their own agendas to influence
2 process under a decision about which they know so
3 little. It is interesting that the television
4 "news" commentators and the political "leaders"
5 opposed to restart have done so little investigation
6 into the causes of the current shutdown and what is
7 being done to operate the plant safely in the future.
8 Unfortunately, these opportunists are using the
9 current problems to advance their agendas, whether it
10 is to oppose nuclear power philosophically, build
11 their own membership or organization's membership by
12 appealing to public fears, increasing their listener
13 or reader base or even running for President. They
14 have little real concern for our area residents,
15 workers or our community and services. Why should
16 uninformed individuals who have not taken the time to
17 research the issues determine the fate of the largest
18 employer, taxpayer and environmental advocate in
19 Ottawa County and those of us who work, produce goods
20 and services and enjoy living in a wonderful area?
21 I encourage the NRC to continue to
22 constructively review the hard work and the plans of
23 hundreds of employees here at the plant to assure a
24 safe restart and plant operation and not be diverted
25 by the misguided political attacks and the agenda of

MARLENE S. ROGERS-LEWIS & ASSOC. REPORTERS
(419) 929-0505
(888) 799-3900

1 Presidential candidates and others.

2 I've also included for you a comment by John
3 Schaffner, who is the editor of the local Beacon, in
4 a story that he is -- will be publishing in the next
5 issue of the Beacon. He takes a very critical view
6 of the Cleveland Plain Dealer and the so-called
7 journalism that they have exhibited of late, and one
8 of the things -- the last paragraph of his yet to be
9 printed story suggests that since the Columbia
10 disaster, so many family, friends of the victims have
11 stated along with NASA officials that the space
12 program must go on; that NASA must determine the
13 problem of the shuttle program and move forward.
14 Local officials here in Ottawa County are adamant
15 that the NRC should work closely with FirstEnergy to
16 accomplish the same objectives and leave the topic of
17 safety at Davis-Besse out of the hands of
18 self-serving politicians and keep it within the realm
19 of the technical experts who actually have knowledge
20 of nuclear power, and I would also like to encourage
21 as a former County Commissioner that you consider the
22 suggestions of Commissioner Arndt with regard to
23 continuing a relationship after the restart of the
24 plant. Our County Commissioners have a long history
25 of meeting with the local plant officials to discuss

MARLENE S. ROGERS-LEWIS & ASSOC. REPORTERS
(419) 929-0505
(888) 799-3900

1 what issues are on everyone's agenda and to try to
2 maintain the safety of all plants for the health and
3 safety of citizens of Ottawa County, so I certainly
4 encourage you to consider Mr. Arndt's
5 recommendations. Thank you.

6 MR. GROBE: Okay, thank you very
7 much, sir.

8 MR. COLLINS: Sir, could you sign
9 in?

10 THE REPORTER: Could you sign in?

11 MR. GROBE: Any other questions
12 or comments?

13 (BRIEF PAUSE).

14 MR. WARREN: Good evening, my
15 name is Richard Warren. I'm a financial advisor in
16 the area, so I don't work at Davis-Besse, but I have
17 a lot of clients that work there. I've got
18 residence in the County, I have offices in the
19 County, and I commend you for all the work you're
20 doing. I think safety is very important, but I see
21 850 families that thrive and live in the area, and
22 I've also seen areas where industry has left, and the
23 devastation on all the individuals, so it's very
24 important for me, my clients, and all the people in
25 the area, all the other industry, not only

1 Davis-Besse, but everything that this program see
2 that everything is safe, but see that this industry
3 continues in the area so the whole area can thrive.
4 Thank you.

5 MR. GROBE: Thank you, sir.

6 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

7 MR. ELUM: Good evening. Just
8 a few words about me and why I'm here.

9 MR. GROBE: Could you introduce
10 yourself?

11 MR. ELUM: Yes, I'm Charles
12 Elum. I go by Chic, Chic Elum, E-L-U-M.

13 MR. GROBE: Thank you.

14 MR. ELUM: I'm the President
15 and CEO of Scrabble Brand, Incorporated, a 35 year
16 old family business that creates word puzzles and
17 features and books for major publications and
18 newspapers across the country. We also operate Park
19 Press, a commercial printing and mailing company.
20 Both are located in Port Clinton. My wife and I
21 built our home in Ottawa County about 20 years ago,
22 planning at that time to some day retire here.
23 Well, we got some kids in the business, so we didn't
24 retire, and we decided to move the company up here to
25 Ottawa County. We did that five years ago, and

1 we've never regretted it. We live on Catawba
2 Island, as do our two daughters and their families.
3 We have five grandchildren, all of us living within
4 the sight of the Davis-Besse tower, and, by the way,
5 I fish around there a lot, too.

6 As a retired police chief of more than 25
7 years in law enforcement, I am also very sensitive to
8 public safety issues and have followed the
9 Davis-Besse matter very closely.

10 Although mistakes were made, I believe it's
11 important to recognize the fact that Davis-Besse has
12 operated safely for more than 25 years without any
13 radiological related injury to employees or the
14 public, and with no adverse impact on the local
15 environment. Even with the damaged reactor head,
16 the plant operated normally. It's been reported
17 that FirstEnergy has spent hundreds of millions of
18 dollars on safety equipment, training and procedures
19 that have made the chance of a deadly accident
20 practically nil. Most of the 850 people who work at
21 Davis-Besse live in this area, have families and
22 relatives here, and it would seem logical that the
23 safety of the plant is in their own self-interest.
24 It just doesn't make any sense to imply that they
25 would put themselves or their families at risk in any

1 case. Davis-Besse, I think, is a good neighbor,
2 always has been. They have certainly done wonders
3 for Ottawa County school systems. They have helped
4 install the safety alert, siren alerts throughout the
5 County, which probably can be credited with saving
6 some lives in the tornado that hit Port Clinton not
7 long ago. It's been said here before this evening,
8 it's a good neighbor, and it's paid more than two
9 million bucks in taxes over the last 25 years. It
10 creates another 20 to 30 million dollars in business
11 state-wide annually.

12 I, too, believe the regulators are to be
13 commended for their efforts and thoroughness, and I
14 encourage them to constructively review the hard work
15 and plans of the company and hundreds of its
16 employees and to remain aware of the agendas of some
17 detractors. Davis-Besse has a long and well-known
18 record of safety and service to the community.
19 After the expenditure of hundreds of millions of
20 dollars to assure the repaired reactor is safe to
21 operate, I and many others are hoping that following
22 a successful test of its reactor in March,
23 Davis-Besse will run again. Thank you.

24 MR. GROBE: Thank you very much,
25 sir.

1 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

2 (BRIEF PAUSE).

3 MR. GROBE: Any other questions

4 or comments?

5 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE).

6 MR. GROBE: Okay, well, thank

7 you very much for coming this evening. We'll be

8 back -- Christine, do you have the date of our next

9 meeting?

10 MS. LIPA: March 11th.

11 MR. GROBE: March 11th is our

12 next series of public meetings. Thank you.

13

14

15 THEREUPON, the hearing was adjourned.

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 51 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 11th day of February, 2003 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 , 2003.

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

My commission expires 4/29/04