

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 0350 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