

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

PUBLIC MEETING

Between U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission 0350 Panel  
and FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company

Meeting held on Tuesday, May 6, 2003, at  
7:00 p.m. at Camp Perry, Clubhouse #600, Oak Harbor,  
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
- John (Jack Grobe), Chairman for 0350 Panel  
Davis-Besse facility
- David Passehl, Project Engineer, ~~Assistant to~~  
~~Branch Chief~~
- Brian Sheron, Associate Director for Project  
Licensing and Technical Analysis
- John Zwolinski, Director of Licensing and Project  
Management
- William Ruland, Vice Chairman, MC 0350 Panel
- Jon Hopkins, Project Manager - Davis-Besse
- Scott Thomas, Senior Resident Inspector

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

1           MR. PASSEHL:       Okay, we're ready to  
2           get started. Welcome everybody to tonight's  
3           meeting. Welcome to members of the public. I'm  
4           David Passehl, a project engineer and assistant to  
5           the branch chief, Christine Lipa, who is responsible  
6           for the NRC's inspection program at Davis-Besse.  
7           Christine cannot be here tonight due to other  
8           commitments.

9           We had a business meeting during the day and  
10          the purpose of tonight's meeting is to inform members  
11          of the public of what we discussed during the  
12          business meeting and then to give an opportunity for  
13          you to ask questions and provide comments to us.

14          Before we get started, I want to mention  
15          there are copies of the May edition of our monthly  
16          newsletter and copies of the slides from today's  
17          meeting in the foyer. The newsletter provides  
18          background information and also discusses current  
19          plans in NRC utilities. We also have a public  
20          meeting feedback form which we use to get feedback  
21          from people to let us know aspects of the meeting  
22          that we can improve on. Copies of those forms are  
23          also available in the foyer.

24          We're having the meeting transcribed today by  
25          Marlene Lewis to maintain a record of this meeting.

1 The transcription will be available on our web page,  
2 and usually we have those available in about three to  
3 four weeks.

4 What I'd like to do now is start off with  
5 some introduction of the NRC staff that are here  
6 tonight. Jack Grobe, standing over here --

7 MR. GROBE: (Indicating ).

8 MR. PASSEHL: -- is ~~the~~ a Senior  
9 Manager ~~of~~ in the Region III office in Lisle, Illinois.

10 He's the Chairman of the Davis-Besse Oversight Panel.

11 Dr. Brian Sheron to my left --

12 DR. SHERON: (Indicating).

13 MR. PASSEHL: -- is the Associate  
14 Director for Project Licensing and Technical Analysis  
15 in our headquarters office, and Brian provides  
16 overall project management related to licensing  
17 activities associated with power reactors, and he  
18 provides management directions of technical  
19 evaluations and assessment of technical issues.

20 To his left is John Zwolinski.

21 MR. ZWOLINSKI: (Indicating).

22 MR. PASSEHL: John is the Director  
23 of the Division of Licensing Project Management.  
24 His division implements the policy, program and  
25 activities including coordinating licensing and

1 technical reviews associated with the overall safety  
2 and environmental project management for individual  
3 power reactors located in the regions.

4 Bill Ruland is a Senior Manager.

5 MR. RULAND: (Indicating).

6 MR. PASSEHL: And he's the Vice

7 Chairman of the Oversight Panel. Bill's position is  
8 the Director, Project Director at Directorate III and in the  
9 Division of Licensing Project Management.

10 Jon Hopkins to my far left is the NRR Project  
11 Manager for Davis-Besse.

12 MR. HOPKINS: (Indicating).

13 Scott Thomas to my right is the Senior

14 Resident Inspector.

15 MR. THOMAS: (Indicating).

16 MR. PASSEHL: And I believe we have  
17 some other NRC staff here. Doug Simpkins, are you  
18 here?

19 MR. SIMPKINS: (Indicating).

20 MR. PASSEHL: Doug is the Resident  
21 Inspector at Davis-Besse, and also I believe  
22 somewhere here we have our Office Assistant, Nancy  
23 Keller.

24 Our Public Affairs person for the region is  
25 Viktoria Mitlyng --

1 MS. MITLYNG: (Indicating).

2 MR. PASSEHL: -- who just raised her  
3 hand. Also, we have Margie Kosales, who is a  
4 Technical Assistant to Dr. Sheron, who is here with  
5 us today; as is Ho Nieh.

6 MR. NIEH: (Indicating).

7 MR. PASSEHL: He is a Regional  
8 Coordinator in the Executive Director's office in our  
9 headquarters office.

10 I wanted to present a summary of what we  
11 discussed during the business portion of the meeting,  
12 and then we'll go ahead and turn it over to the  
13 public for comments and questions.

14 This morning's meeting -- or this afternoon  
15 meeting, Lew Myers started the meeting and mentioned  
16 some management actions that they had taken, some  
17 management changes they made to strengthen their  
18 executive and nuclear site teams. He specifically  
19 mentioned Fred von Ahn, who is their new Vice  
20 President of Oversight, and a man named Mark Bezilla,  
21 who's the Vice President and also Plant Manager at  
22 Davis-Besse, and they discussed some of their  
23 background, which was quite extensive.

24 Next, Mike Stevens discussed their Restart  
25 Test Plan. Mike is the Director of Maintenance.

1 They discussed their Primary System Readiness and  
2 their Secondary System Readiness. Regarding their  
3 Primary System Readiness, he mentioned that they are  
4 currently performing a detailed inspection of their  
5 primary coolant system of nitrogen over pressure of  
6 50 pounds and that at the near term, they intend  
7 to -- intend to perform a 250 pound walkdown of this  
8 system and also a full pressure walkdown of 2,155  
9 pounds.

10 Regarding Secondary System Readiness, he  
11 mentioned that they were placing secondary plant  
12 components in service as they are required and as  
13 plant conditions present themselves, and these main  
14 systems are main steam system. They're condensate  
15 system, feedwater system and ~~they're~~ the auxiliary  
16 feedwater system.

17 Mike Ross is the Plant Restart Director, and  
18 he discussed some Challenges to Their Restart Test  
19 Plan and Plant Restart. He mentioned that they have  
20 an issues management support center that they have  
21 established in their auxiliary -- or offsite  
22 building, their DBAB -- I forget what that acronym  
23 stands for, for the administration building. He  
24 also displayed some statistics and charts that show  
25 they have approximately 1,172 Mode 4 restraints, and

1 Mode 4 means that the primary system temperature is  
2 between 200 and 280 degrees Fahrenheit. He  
3 discussed some of the challenges to reaching that  
4 plateau or that milestone of Mode 4. Three key  
5 issues being their high pressure injection pump,  
6 hydrostatic bearing issue for which a licensee  
7 submittal is in progress. Their safety features  
8 actuation system relay replacement activities and  
9 their electrical transient analysis program.

10 FENOC's contractor, Framatone and MPR, an  
11 engineering company, discussed the replacement option  
12 for their high pressure injection pumps, and they  
13 discussed their modification option, and they went  
14 into some detail on what that entails.

15 Mark Bezilla, the Vice President and Plant  
16 Manager, as I mentioned, discussed restart Operations  
17 Readiness for restart, and specifically mentioned  
18 some accomplishments that operations had achieved.  
19 He mentioned that there are some industry feedback  
20 from the INPO organization. They had Operations  
21 Assessments by Management, Personnel From Other  
22 Plants, and also from their Company Nuclear Review  
23 Board, and there is some -- as you can see from the  
24 slides on their Pages 33 and 34 it lays out some of  
25 the feedback they got back from each of those groups.

1           Next, Fred von Ahn, the Vice President of  
2 FENOC Oversight, provided some discussions on their  
3 Quality Assessment Overview. He discussed some  
4 things that operations was doing regarding leadership  
5 and explained a little bit about their Corrective  
6 Action and Condition Reporting Process and how  
7 they're starting a trend, groups of condition reports  
8 and problems to try to discern a trend and identify  
9 problems and fix those.

10           Lew Myers then -- their chief operating  
11 officer, discussed Safety Conscious Work Environment  
12 and the key message from there was that workers  
13 recognized responsibility to raise nuclear safety and  
14 quality issues, that workers feel free to raise  
15 nuclear safety and quality concerns without fear of  
16 retaliation. There are some pockets of negative  
17 perceptions in RP and Chemistry, Maintenance and  
18 Engineering, and that contractors have a more  
19 negative overall perception than FENOC employees.  
20 Lew mentioned that they were taking action to address  
21 that.

22           Next, Randy Fast is their Director of  
23 Organizational Development, discussed their  
24 containment and containment closeout activities. He  
25 mentioned there are several areas that they are ready



1 for the next milestone, which is Mode 4, including  
2 their Emergency Sump, Containment Coatings, their  
3 Integrity of the Fuel, Environmentally Qualified  
4 Equipment, Boric Acid Inspections, and he also  
5 mentioned there are some areas where they are not  
6 quite ready, but they are making progress, including  
7 sealing conduits in their Decay Heat Valve Tank and  
8 performing some balance testing in their Containment  
9 Air Coolers and others.

10 Finally, Lew Myers provided closing comments  
11 where we reiterated that they have made good progress  
12 to date. They continue to focus on Mode 4. He  
13 stressed that they intend to achieve and sustain,  
14 improve performance in each and every one of their  
15 building blocks that they developed toward restart.

16 And with that, I would like to turn it over  
17 to Jack for questions and comments from members of  
18 the public.

19 MR. GROBE: Great! Thanks, Dave.

20 Before we get started, I want to take a  
21 minute and recognize one of our NRC family that is  
22 leaving us. Stand up, Doug.

23 MR. SIMPKINS: (Indicating).

24 MR. GROBE: Doug Simpkins and his  
25 wife, Lisa, and their five children are going to be

1 leaving for Georgia. I don't know quite why he  
2 wants to go to Georgia, but he's leaving for Georgia.  
3 Doug has gotten closure, he's going to be Senior  
4 Resident Inspector at a plant called Plant Hatch,  
5 which is in Georgia, and he's been an extremely  
6 valuable member of the NRC team here at Davis-Besse  
7 for the past four years, brought not only a  
8 tremendous amount of knowledge and experience to the  
9 job, but also dedication to public health and safety  
10 that is second to none, and we're going to miss him  
11 from that standpoint, but, also, Doug is a  
12 significant contributor to the community. I don't  
13 have my notes in front of me, but the list is very  
14 long. He held leadership capacity here at Camp Perry  
15 for youth rifle programs, as well as starting a youth  
16 rifle program in Ottawa County -- or, excuse me, Oak  
17 Harbor, coach and assistant coach of several sports,  
18 leader at his church. He's been a valuable member  
19 of the community, too, so I just wanted to take a  
20 minute to recognize his contribution not only to  
21 safety at Davis-Besse and to the NRC, but also to the  
22 community and wish him luck.

23 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

24 MR. GROBE: At this time, we'd  
25 like to open the floor for public questions and

1 comments. First, I'd like to recognize any local  
2 officials or representatives, local officials that  
3 would like to make any statements or comments or ask  
4 any questions.

5 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE).

6 MR. GROBE: Well, they're both  
7 shaking their heads no. Okay, well, I open the  
8 floor up for any questions or comments.

9 MR. WHITCOMB: Good evening,  
10 gentlemen. My name is Howard Whitcomb. A special  
11 welcome to Mr. Zwolinski and Mr. Sheron to Ottawa  
12 County. A year ago -- almost to the day, I stood in  
13 the Junior High School in Oak Harbor and I made the  
14 following -- or raised the following concerns  
15 regarding Davis-Besse.

16 Following the loss of auxiliary and main  
17 feedwater event on June 9th, 1985, Harold Denton,  
18 then the Director of NRR, issued some findings to Mr.  
19 Williams who was, at the time, the Vice President of  
20 Nuclear for Toledo Edison Company. The NRC had  
21 conducted an investigation into the root cause of why  
22 the June 9th event occurred and cited in brief form  
23 were the following.

24 The investigation concluded that the  
25 underlying causes of this event were:

1           1. The lack of attention to detail in the  
2           care of plant equipment.

3           2. A history of performing trouble-shooting  
4           maintenance and testing of equipment and of  
5           evaluating operating experience related to equipment  
6           in a superficial manner, and, as a result, the root  
7           causes of problems were not always found and  
8           corrected.

9           3. The engineering design and analysis  
10          efforts to address equipment problems was frequently  
11          either not utilized or was not effective, and,  
12          finally, the equipment problems were not aggressively  
13          addressed and resolved.

14          Clearly, upon finding the degraded reactor  
15          vessel head a year ago, I would argue that these same  
16          findings would apply, and I believe the root cause  
17          that was determined would include a lot of those same  
18          sorts of problems. Now, a year later, we've heard  
19          the efforts of FirstEnergy. My concern still is  
20          this:

21          Does the NRC plan to assess the adequacy of  
22          the cultural changes that have occurred at  
23          Davis-Besse, and how do they plan to do that  
24          assessment, if they're going to do that assessment,  
25          in a way that will assure to the public that the type

1 of equipment failures that keep cropping up at this  
2 facility will not occur in the future?

3 MR. GROBE: I appreciate your  
4 question there. You have some question, and there's  
5 been other plants that in my experience based on  
6 Region III that have had what I call cyclic  
7 performance, and a plant that experiences cyclic  
8 performance hasn't truly corrected the root cause.  
9 The company, FirstEnergy, has come a long way in the  
10 last year. One of the issues that was clearly  
11 articulated was that the root cause -- the  
12 significant root cause of what happened at  
13 Davis-Besse had to do with cultural issues, and we  
14 venture to say that those four items that you quoted  
15 from letters gone -- in days in the past also had a  
16 root cause of cultural issues.

17 Let me introduce Jay Persensky. Jay, stand  
18 up. I want to introduce Dr. Jay Persensky.

19 DR. PERSENSKY: (Indicating).

20 MR. GROBE: Jay is one of the team  
21 of seven experts that we have on site, have been on  
22 site in past weeks, are on site again this week.  
23 It's the team that we issued a press release  
24 regarding what the scope of their responsibilities  
25 are and little bios about each of the members of that

1 team. Their mission is to perform a number of  
2 evaluations. They're to look at the external safety  
3 culture assessment, to evaluate the methodology that  
4 was used, the parameters that were looked at, the  
5 techniques that were used to reduce the data to  
6 conclusions and the approach for making  
7 recommendations to develop confidence in that process  
8 and provide feedback in areas that we feel are  
9 appropriate.

10 In addition, they're to assess the internal  
11 tools that FirstEnergy is using to measure culture  
12 and provide the same analyses of those internal  
13 tools.

14 In addition, they're to look at the long-term  
15 plans FirstEnergy is developing, and we haven't seen  
16 those plans yet. Going forward, safety culture is  
17 not something that is completely fixed in a short  
18 period of time. It's something that takes years and  
19 the challenge for the Oversight Panel is to evaluate  
20 the results of the work that Jay and the other team  
21 members are doing, results of all the various  
22 inspections that we're conducting, to evaluate at  
23 what point in time the panel feels comfortable making  
24 a recommendation to Jim ~~Dire~~ Dyer that the plant can be  
25 safely restarted and operated. That certainly

1 doesn't mean that all of the cultural issues are  
2 going to be resolved. As I mentioned, it takes  
3 quite a period of time to bring those issues to  
4 complete resolution, but that's the challenge that  
5 this panel faces.

6 We plan on having two public meetings over  
7 the next period of time. One will be conducted in  
8 Chicago, but there will be access to that meeting  
9 telephonically for those who wish to participate from  
10 a distance. The focus of that meeting is going to  
11 be to receive FirstEnergy's results of their internal  
12 and external assessments and to receive their  
13 long-term plans and measurement techniques on how  
14 they plan on going forward.

15 The other meeting is once our inspection team  
16 completes their work, we will have a public exit  
17 meeting to present the results of that inspection to  
18 FirstEnergy, so it's -- it's a process that not only  
19 encompasses the results of the inspection team that's  
20 particularly looking at the safety culture area, but  
21 also the integration of all of the other observations  
22 that numerous inspectors have made over the last 12  
23 months. The panel will pull all of that together  
24 and make a judgment as to when they think the plan  
25 the ready to restart.

1 MR. WHITCOMB: Follow-up, I assume  
2 the exit -- the NRC exit comes after the other public  
3 meeting with FirstEnergy, or is there any order to  
4 those? No planned order yet or --

5 MR. GROBE: Don't know yet. Both  
6 of them are probably several weeks at least off, so  
7 we haven't put that much thought into scheduling  
8 those.

9 MR. WHITCOMB: Okay. Second, does  
10 the NRC have a yardstick or a benchmark upon which to  
11 compare Davis-Besse to some other cultural --  
12 culturally accepted organization that is out there?

13 MR. GROBE: Well, that's an  
14 interesting question. There are many different  
15 professionals in the United States that do these  
16 kinds of assessments and assess safety culture.  
17 Each one of them has a different approach, a  
18 different set of parameters. The NRC has no  
19 requirements in the area of safety culture, but we do  
20 have requirements that plants address the root cause  
21 of significant problems, such as those problems won't  
22 recur, and, to that end, FirstEnergy is required by  
23 NRC regulations to address the safety culture issues  
24 at the plant. There are no defined regulations or  
25 regulatory guidance addressing safety culture, but



1       there are a number of people who are expert in this  
2       field, and we have brought together a team of seven  
3       of them with very diverse backgrounds that are  
4       performing this assessment and collegiately  
5       developing their insights as to the adequacy of tools  
6       that FirstEnergy is using.

7           MR. WHITCOMB:       So this group is  
8       essentially setting precedent?

9           MR. GROBE:        No, I wouldn't say so,  
10       and, Jay, for example, has been working in this field  
11       for 25 years --

12          MR. WHITCOMB:       Well --

13          MR. GROBE:        -- and there are  
14       International conferences on the subject every  
15       year --

16          MR. WHITCOMB:       -- are there any  
17       other --

18          MR. GROBE:        -- so this is not a  
19       precedent setting activity.

20          MR. WHITCOMB:       Are there any other  
21       plants, though, that have the same trouble, cultural  
22       activities, that Davis-Besse has had to the same  
23       magnitude where you're bringing in a special team to  
24       assess --

25          MR. GROBE:        We don't compare one

1 plant to another plant. Davis-Besse clearly had  
2 significant -- significant performance deficiencies  
3 in their organization which allowed the safety focus  
4 at the plant to atrophy over a number of years and  
5 allowed the problems that occurred exist. Other  
6 questions?

7 MR. WHITCOMB: Only, I still don't  
8 feel comfortable that the public is going to have  
9 some objective way of accepting the fact that they  
10 have met at least a minimum requirement. You  
11 haven't set forth anything yet.

12 MR. GROBE: Well, again, what I  
13 suggest you do is attend the meetings and after you  
14 hear the results of our inspection and the results of  
15 FirstEnergy's presentations, if you still have  
16 questions, ask them at that time, Howard.

17 MR. WHITCOMB: Thanks, Jack.

18 MR. GROBE: Okay, thank you.  
19 Other questions?

20 (NO AUDIBLE RESPONSE).

21 MR. GROBE: Let me make a couple  
22 of comments then while we're waiting for somebody  
23 else to think of a question.

24 Over the last month, the NRC has closed out  
25 seven of the Restart Checklist items. We have a

1 Restart Checklist that defines the specific  
2 activities that need to be accomplished before the  
3 NRC will consider a request to restart the plant.  
4 The first of those items had to do with the root  
5 cause of the technical aspects of the head  
6 degradation, that's the cracking and corrosion, how  
7 and why those things happened. The panel concluded  
8 that the technical root cause was adequately  
9 characterized in documents that we received from  
10 FirstEnergy, and that issue will be closed out --  
11 excuse me, in the next resident inspection report.

12 We also closed out six of the -- the only six  
13 licensing issues we currently have on the books. As  
14 Dave indicated a few minutes earlier, we may have  
15 another licensing issue coming up regarding the high  
16 pressure injections pumps, but all of the licensing  
17 issues that have been submitted to us to date and all  
18 of those having to do with the new head have been  
19 adequately resolved.

20 In addition to that, we conducted two  
21 inspections that have nearly brought to closure two  
22 other issues. One concerned the ability to safely  
23 shut down the plant in the event of a fire in various  
24 areas of the plant. Fires are fairly normal,  
25 industrial accidents at large industrial facilities,

1 at nuclear power plants. They take on a different  
2 challenge because they could be damaging equipment  
3 that's necessary to safely maintain the plant in a  
4 safe condition. We completed that inspection and  
5 only had one outstanding issue. The results of the  
6 inspection were fairly positive. The outstanding  
7 issue has to do with some thermohydraulic analyses of  
8 post-fire shutdown conditions. Those analyses  
9 weren't yet completed, so we'll be back to address  
10 that one issue, and then that specific checklist item  
11 will be complete from an inspection perspective,  
12 whether or not that inspection, that final  
13 inspection, is adequate. We'll have to wait and  
14 see.

15 Another area had to do with the radiation  
16 protection program. We held a public exit interview  
17 a few weeks ago. I was going to try to remember the  
18 date, but I don't remember exactly the date, where we  
19 presented the results of a follow-up inspection to  
20 the problems that resulted in workers getting  
21 unnecessarily exposed to airborne radioactive  
22 materials, and then eventually carried some of those  
23 materials off site. The inspection was fairly  
24 comprehensive and found that the company had made  
25 significant progress in that area. There's only one

1 outstanding issue there, and we'll probably perform  
2 one more week of inspection in the upcoming weeks.  
3 That outstanding issue was one of the root causes of  
4 the radiation protection problems was a lack of  
5 consistent strong leadership in the radiation  
6 protection department. Since that inspection --  
7 actually about the same time as the inspection --  
8 excuse me, the -- a new radiation protection manager  
9 was assigned at the plant, and it seemed inconsistent  
10 to be able to at that point say that that aspect of  
11 the root cause was adequately addressed since a  
12 brand-new individual had come on board, so we're  
13 going to focus some additional inspection -- that  
14 inspection effort in the areas of radiation area  
15 control, access control, radioactive materials  
16 control in the plant, and work planning, and DOSE  
17 planning, that's referred to as ALARA planning, over  
18 the next several weeks, so that's the one aspect of  
19 that area on the checklist that's still outstanding,  
20 so there's been significant progress. We have nine  
21 inspectors on site this week, most weeks are that  
22 way. We will continue providing the necessary  
23 inspection and oversight as we go forward to develop  
24 confidence in each of these checklist areas.  
25 I've talked enough. Is there somebody that

1 has a question or comment?

2 MR. HAWLEY: (Indicating).

3 MR. GROBE: Yes, sir.

4 MR. HAWLEY: Good evening. My  
5 name is Chuck Hawley, and I'm presently serving as  
6 the Engineering Duty Manager at the Work Support  
7 Center at Davis-Besse. Up until about seven years  
8 ago I spent 14 years at Davis-Besse in various  
9 capacities, and seven years ago I left to go to  
10 Beaver Valley. About 10 months ago, Mr. Myers asked  
11 me if I would come back out here and help with the  
12 restart efforts, and I gladly did that. I brought  
13 my family up here. I wouldn't bring my family back  
14 here if I didn't think it was safe, and in the  
15 current position I'm in, I see the culture every day  
16 at all levels whether it's craft operators or  
17 management that supports my opinion. I see good  
18 condition reports. I see good questioning attitudes  
19 at all levels, and I know we have the right  
20 management team and the right individuals on staff to  
21 restart this plant and to continue operating in a  
22 safe manner. Thank you.

23 MR. GROBE: Thank you for your  
24 comments.

25 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

1           MR. GROBE:       Anyone else have a  
2 question or comment?

3           MR. HARDER:       (Indicating).

4           MR. GROBE:       Yes, sir.

5           MR. HARDER:       You need more paper,  
6 we're running out of room here.

7           (Laughter).

8           MR. HARDER:       Good evening. My  
9 name is Lynn Harder, and I'm a Superintendent,  
10 Radiation Protection Superintendent at Davis-Besse.  
11 I have been there for 22 years. Had an opportunity  
12 to tour Mr. Zwolinski and his team in our containment  
13 today, and I had an opportunity to speak one time  
14 before, and opportunity is a good thing, I think,  
15 with respect to whenever you're invited to speak or  
16 have an opportunity to speak what's on your mind you  
17 need to do that, to tell people where you have been  
18 and what you have done and to share the facts, so  
19 when Mr. Zwolinski's team had an opportunity to go in  
20 containment today, I wanted to make sure they saw it  
21 from our perspective what we've done over the last  
22 year, and, though I wasn't invited, we kind of  
23 invited ourselves to make sure he saw it through our  
24 eyes and through the work activities and efforts of  
25 our team what we had to do this last year.

1 I shared before when we had an opportunity to  
2 speak here at Davis-Besse for myself, and I know  
3 speaking for the rest of our team, many of us are not  
4 proud where we came from with what happened, but we  
5 are proud of the transformation we've made -- not  
6 just the material condition of the plant, but also in  
7 the culture and the teamwork and going forward  
8 activities that faces us. I can speak for myself  
9 and for the Radiation Protection Organization, we are  
10 becoming one team. We have a ways to go as well as  
11 Davis-Besse, but we are working diligently to work on  
12 those issues, those areas and come together in our  
13 relationship so we understand what happened to make  
14 sure this doesn't happen again, so what I want to  
15 leave you with is not just myself, but many of us at  
16 Davis-Besse will bring it back to the safe and  
17 efficient workplace it used to be, and we expect it  
18 to be. Thank you.

19 THEREUPON, the audience applauded.

20 MR. GROBE: Thank you very much.  
21 Any other questions or comments? I'm supposed to  
22 allow seven seconds.

23 (Laughter).

24 UNIDENTIFIED: Time's up.

25 MR. GROBE: Well, I think you're



1 right.

2 Our next meeting is going to be here at Camp  
3 Perry, June 3rd. We'll have an afternoon business  
4 meeting with FirstEnergy and an evening meeting like  
5 this, and, in addition to that, tomorrow afternoon we  
6 have a meeting in the regional office to discuss  
7 engineering issues at Davis-Besse.

8 If you're interested in participating in that  
9 meeting, there's a number of telephone hookups that  
10 are available, and you can participate  
11 telephonically, or you can come to the lovely city of  
12 Chicago and participate personally. We'd love to  
13 see you there. If you need information on how to  
14 get telephonically connected to that meeting, you can  
15 talk to Vika Mitlyng, and she can help you out, so,  
16 with that, we're adjourned. Thank you very much.

17

18

19 THEREUPON, the hearing meeting was concluded.

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 25 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 6th day of May, 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