

# Attachment 1

## **SUMMARIES OF INTERVIEWS**

- (a) Alex Murray
2. Joe Gitter
3. Drew Persinko
4. Mel Leach
5. Wilkins Smith
6. Bill Troskoski
7. Joel Kramer
8. Sharon Steele
9. Rex Wescott
10. Norma Garcia-Santos

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/ALEX MURRAY - 7/29/03 @ 9 AM**

- Mr. Murray commented that the format of the meeting with DCS was not ideal in that the applicant's information had not been provided to the staff for review prior to the meeting.
- Several staff "mini-caucuses" were held during the December 10-12, 2002, meeting w/DCS to discuss issues and determine if the applicant had adequately addressed an issue. It was during one of these mini-caucuses that Issue CS-5 was discussed.
- In Mr. Murray's opinion, these mini-caucuses put the staff "on the spot." Management stated conclusions regarding an issue and then asked the staff for input. Mr. Murray stated that several staff may have been intimidated by this approach.
- Paragraph 1 of the meeting report states, "DCS provided clarifying information contained in Attachment 5 and will provide revised CAR pages to reflect this information." According to Mr. Murray, Attachment 5 was provided after the meeting.
- Staff did not have the opportunity to review Attachment 5 prior to the mini-caucus that discussed CS-5. Although Attachment 5 had not been reviewed, management stated at that caucus that the applicant had adequately addressed the issue. Mr. Murray voiced his objection to this conclusion at the caucus.
- Mr. Murray reviewed the draft meeting report and Attachment 5 and he again voiced objection to management re: closure of CS-5. The meeting report was issued on 1/31/03. The report stated that CS-5 was closed.
- During the month of February, Mr. Murray raised general chem safety concerns to his supervisor. His supervisor responded that there were no chemical issues with this application.

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/JOE GIITTER - 7/30 @ 2 PM**

- Mr. Giitter was only intermittently involved with the meeting w/DCS and Mr. Giitter does not recall the portion of the meeting dealing with Issue CS-5. He believes that he was not present for that discussion.
- Mr. Giitter does not recall seeing Attachment 5 at the meeting nor does he recall at what point in the meeting that DCS provided this information.
- Based on input received from the Mr. Persinko, the Project Manager for this application, it was Mr. Giitter's understanding that there were no outstanding staff concerns and that the issue had been closed.
- Mr. Giitter was unaware of Mr. Murray's concern until he received the DPV.

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/DREW PERSINKO - 8/4/03 @ 9:30 AM**

- During the meeting, Mr. Murray did not express concerns after DCS explained the relationship of the admin controls to its assertions regarding operator actions outside of the emergency control room. Mr. Persinko took this to mean that the issue was closed. Mr. Persinko could not recall if there was a definitive statement made at the meeting that the issue was closed.
- Mr. Persinko could not recall if the information in Attachment 5 of the meeting summary concerning operator action outside of the emergency control room was provided during the meeting or after the meeting had concluded. However, he is confident that if it was not provided before the conclusion of the meeting, that it was provided either at the conclusion of the meeting or the day after the meeting concluded.
- Mr. Persinko could not recall if there was a sidebar meeting on this issue.
- In an email to Mr. Persinko, Mr. Murray stated that the proposed text provided by DCS at, or shortly after, the meeting with DCS closed the operator action outside of the emergency control room part of CS-5. [Copy of email attached]
- A draft meeting summary was prepared and distributed by e-mail on 1/6 to Mr. Murray and others for review and comment. The draft summary indicated that the issue was closed. [Copy of e-mail attached]
- In response, Mr. Murray provided some comments to Mr. Troskoski via an e-mail dated 1/6 for his consideration, including two comments on CS-5. Mr. Troskoski provided both his and Mr. Murray's comments to Mr. Persinko via e-mail dated 1/6. None of Mr. Murray's comments reflected concern with closing the operator action outside of the emergency control room portion of CS-5. [Copies of e-mails attached.]
- When the meeting report was signed out on 1/31, Mr. Persinko was confident that there were no remaining staff concerns with the operator action outside of the emergency control room portion of CS-5.
- Mr. Persinko was unaware of Mr. Murray's continuing concern with this item after it had been discussed with DCS at the meeting until Mr. Persinko read the DPV.
- Mr. Persinko was not interviewed by the DPV panel. [Note: Mr. Persinko volunteered this information to explain why the e-mails he provided during the interview were not considered by the panel.]

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/MEL LEACH - 8/4/03 @ 1:00 PM**

- Mr. Leach recalls that it appeared to him during the meeting that everyone had an opportunity to comment on the issue. No one felt stifled.
- Mr. Leach does not recall any details regarding CS-5.
- Sidebar discussions took place on several issues but Mr. Leach could not recall if there was a sidebar for CS-5.
- Mr. Leach stated that he believed Attachment 5 was submitted after the close of the meeting.
- Mr. Murray did not discuss CS-5 with Mr. Leach after the meeting. Mr. Leach was not aware of Mr. Murray's concern with CS-5 until he read the DPV.

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/WILKINS SMITH - 8/4/03 @ 1:45 PM**

- Mr. Smith was not directly involved with this issue.
- Mr. Smith recalls that the discussion re: CS-5 at the meeting seemed to be complete - there were no loose ends. The discussion seemed to come to a logical conclusion. He couldn't recall if the item was determined to be closed at the conclusion of the discussion.
- Mr. Smith could not recall any sidebar discussions on this issue.
- Mr. Smith had no involvement with this issue after the meeting.

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/BILL TROSKOSKI - 8/5/03 @ 8:30 AM**

- The only actions required in the event of a chemical release would be by operators in the control room. Other operator actions are not required in such an emergency. Confident that Mr. Murray understood this.
- Not aware of any remaining staff concerns on this item at the close of the meeting.
- After the meeting report was published, Mr. Troskoski had no further contact with Mr. Murray on this topic.

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/JOEL KRAMER - 8/6/03 @ 1:30 PM**

- Overall recollection of 12/10/02 meeting - Discussed issue at length. Talked about wording of an appropriate response that all could agree to. Issue was thoroughly discussed.
- Mr. Murray & Mr. Kramer agreed that, with the appropriate wording, the issue should be closed for the CAR. Additional information would probably be needed for the operating license.
- Mr. Kramer had to leave the meeting early so he is unaware how the meeting concluded. However, Mr. Kramer was surprised that Mr. Murray still had an issue - thought they were "on the same page."
- The wording in Attachment 5 is "about right."
- Mr. Kramer has not discussed the issue with Mr. Murray since the meeting.
- Mr. Kramer recalled that subsequent to the meeting, Mr. Persinko sent the meeting participants an e-mail asking us whether they agreed with the closure of this open item. Mr. Murray & Mr. Kramer told Mr. Persinko that they did.

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/SHARON STEELE - 8/8/03 @ 11:30 AM**

- Ms. Steele had no involvement with this issue after the meeting concluded
- Ms. Steele will review her notes from the meeting to determine if she has any information concerning how this issue was closed. She agreed to respond during the week of 8/18. [She responded with no additional information.]

## **SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/REX WESCOTT - 8/14/03 @ 9:00 AM**

- A consensus was reached at the meeting that the issue was closed. Pre-start testing would identify any concerns.
- Mr. Wescott could not recall if there were any sidebar meetings to discuss this issue.
- Mr. Wescott does not have copies of any post-meeting e-mails regarding the meeting report but he would have agreed that this issue was closed.
- Mr. Wescott did not have any discussions with Mr. Murray on this issue after the meeting.
- There was no reason to question the statements made by the operator at the meeting.

**SUMMARY OF DISCUSSION W/NORMA GARCIA-SANTOS - 8/19/03 @ 9:00 AM**

- Ms. Garcia-Santos did some modeling of chemical releases prior to the meeting as input to the draft SER.
- She recalls a very long discussion of this issue at the meeting but does not recall if, or how, the issue was closed.
- Sidebar meetings took place but she does not recall any specifics related to this issue.
- She was not a principal reviewer in this area.
- She was not in attendance for the entire meeting and may have missed part of the discussion on this issue.
- She does not recall if she was involved with this issue after the meeting.