

Official Transcript of Proceedings

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Public Meeting with External Stakeholders to
Obtain Input Relating to the FY 2014-2018
Nuclear Regulatory Commission Strategic Plan

Docket Number: (n/a)

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: Thursday, February 28, 2013

Work Order No.: NRC-3077

Pages 1-100

NEAL R. GROSS AND CO., INC.
Court Reporters and Transcribers
1323 Rhode Island Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 234-4433

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 + + + + +

4 PUBLIC MEETING WITH EXTERNAL STAKEHOLDERS TO OBTAIN
5 INPUT RELATING TO THE FISCAL YEAR 2014-2018 NUCLEAR
6 REGULATORY COMMISSION STRATEGIC PLAN

7 + + + + +

8 THURSDAY

9 FEBRUARY 28, 2013

10 + + + + +

11 The Meeting convened in Room T-2B1 at the
12 Headquarters of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission,
13 11545 Rockville Pike, Rockville, Maryland, at 9:00
14 a.m., Lance Rakovan and Lisa Clark, Facilitators,
15 presiding.

16 PRESENT

17 LANCE RAKOVAN, Facilitator

18 LISA CLARK, Facilitator

19 FRAN GOLDBERG, NRC/EDO

20 MILTON BROWN, NRC/OCFO

21 RICK BAUM, NRC/OCFO

22 GORDON PETERSON, NRC/OCRO

23 CINDY ATKINS-DUFFIN, White House Office of

24 Science and Technology Policy

25 DAN CRONIN*

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

PRESENT (CONT.)

CHRIS EARLS, Nuclear Energy Institute

JON EDWARDS, Environmental Protection Agency

TOM HOUGHTON*

ALAN JACOBSON, Organization of Agreement

States

JOE KLINGER, Conference of Radiation Control

Program Directors

SUSAN LANDAHL, Exelon Generation Company

DAVID LOCHBAUM, Union of Concerned

Scientists*

CHRISTOPHER MANNING, Federal Bureau of

Investigation

PATRICIA METZ, Department of State

ANDY MITCHELL, Federal Emergency Management

Agency

*by telephone

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

A G E N D A

INTRODUCTION.....	4
PARTICIPANT INPUT ON NRC STRENGTHS AND WEAKNESSES, AND EXTERNAL OPPORTUNITIES AND THREATS/CHALLENGES.....	13
NEXT STEPS IN DEVELOPING THE NRC STRATEGIC PLAN AND FURTHER OPPORTUNITIES FOR PUBLIC INPUT.....	98
ADJOURN	

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

P R O C E E D I N G S

(9:02 a.m.)

MS. GOLDBERG: My name is Fran Goldberg. I'm with the EDO's office and I'm here to welcome you to our Assessment of Strengths/Weakness Opportunities and Threats for the Strategic Plan, and I'm going to introduce to you our Deputy Chief Financial Officer, Milton Brown, who's going to kick this off. And we're also trying to get the folks who were on the GoTo Meeting call into the bridge line, so we're doing a little technology fix over there. And while that's going on let me hand this over to Milton.

MR. BROWN: Good morning, everyone. They have me seating at the back table because they want our guests at the front table, so please excuse me since I'm not sitting up with you.

As Fran stated, I'm Milton Brown, the Deputy CFO for the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. And, again, I wanted to welcome everyone and to participate in this important meeting as we, the NRC, solicit external stakeholders input for development of our Strategic Plan for FY 2014 through `18.

Participating in our SWOT analysis today are federal and state partners, representatives of industry, our licensees and public interest groups. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 also have in attendance today members from our Strategic
2 Plan Logic Model Group with representatives also from
3 each of our major offices. And the Strategic Model Logic
4 Working Group is headed by Fran Goldberg. Fran, could
5 you raise your hand, and Gordon Peterson sitting next
6 to her. These are two people that are really leading this
7 effort and they're doing a great job so far. Next slide,
8 please. Thank you.

9 The NRC Commission approves each phase as
10 we develop our Strategic Plan. We are now in the second
11 phase completing our Strategic framework and the
12 highlighted area that you see on the slide represents
13 where we are today.

14 Today's participation is an opportunity
15 for you to provide input prior to the NRC publishing our
16 Draft Strategic Plan for public comment which will be
17 published during the summer-fall time line. Next slide,
18 please.

19 Before you is a graphic showing of the
20 elements of the Strategic High Levels Plan approved by
21 the Commission. Strategic objectives, are a major focus
22 for today's session, so today's input that you will
23 share will be used in our next phase. Thank you for
24 moving forward.

25 The Strategic Goals have been established

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 by the Commission. How can the progress capturing those
2 goals relate to what hinges on the Strategic section
3 that's being today and its open dialogue. This is the
4 opportunity where you'll be able to express your
5 opinions briefly and openly, and after I speak I'm going
6 to leave so you'll have an opportunity to say whatever
7 you want to say and I won't get in the way as far as
8 progress.

9 Our planning framework defines Strategic
10 Objectives as what needs to change to make our goals so
11 that we can establish what needs to change and then how
12 we can measure it. This will allow us to track progress
13 and make key decisions, so we need to hear from you not
14 only with our clear and candid discussions, but how we
15 can make change in order to make our agency move closer
16 in order to obtaining its goals.

17 I ask that you not only be clear as far as
18 your opinions today, but whatever you feel that are
19 roadblocks in the way as far as what's hampering NRC as
20 far as security, the use of radioactive materials. Let
21 us know in order for us to incorporate these changes into
22 our Strategic Plan.

23 Keep in mind that both internal and
24 external environments are changing so we're interested
25 in hearing your suggestions on how NRC needs to change

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 along with that. And an example would be Fukushima; from
2 the day that incident started it has definitely been a
3 change to our Agency, so need to know from today's
4 discussion how internal and external factors can help
5 us change.

6 The sessions that are being held today will
7 be definitely proactive as well as productive if you all
8 here again speak freely, and I guess I can't encourage
9 that enough. I said that once, I said it twice, I'd like
10 to say it again, speak freely and you'll see Lance as
11 your facilitator, he will definitely move you along. And
12 he makes sure that if people are not speaking, he'll make
13 sure you get your opportunity to speak.

14 Once again I want to thank you for coming
15 and, hopefully, like I said, I'm going to leave shortly
16 but it's not because I don't want to be here. I don't
17 want to stand in the way of progress, and I'm going to
18 turn it over to Lance. Thank you, Lance.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, thanks for the
20 introduction. Good morning, everyone. My name is Lance
21 Rakovan. I am a Communications Specialist here at the
22 NRC, and it's my pleasure to facilitate today's meeting
23 along with Lisa Clark who will be taking over for me from
24 time to time.

25 Again, today we're here to hopefully get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 some input from you on our 2014 to 2018 Strategic Plan.
2 This is a Category 2 public meeting by NRC's definition
3 which means that we expect the primary discussion to
4 more or less be here around the table, and I believe at
5 least one person who is participating through the phone
6 lines on the webinar. We will be opening the discussions
7 up to the public in general, if you will, at certain
8 points during the agenda, at least once for the Safety
9 Goals and once for the Security Goals as we go along.

10 Our agenda is fairly simple. We're
11 basically going to be hitting our two goals, the Safety
12 Goal and the Security Goal, and focusing on the SWOT
13 which is strengths and weaknesses which are internal to
14 the NRC; opportunities and threats which are external
15 to the NRC.

16 I've got Joan over here at the computer
17 right now, and Toby is going to be transcribing. So, I'm
18 going to be doing what I can to make sure that we keep
19 one discussion going at a time, minimize extraneous
20 noise, if you will, like turning your cell phones off
21 and that kind of thing, trying to make sure we don't have
22 side discussions.

23 One of the things that I'm going to ask you
24 is that when we're having these discussions, if you have
25 a point that you'd like to make, if you could get my

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 attention somehow. One of the tricks we use, if you want
2 to turn your tent to the side. That let's me know that
3 you want to participate, and I'll get to people in the
4 order that I see hands. I'll be going to the phone lines
5 from time to time to see if our panelists there would
6 like to input something.

7 But one of the things that, again, I'd like
8 to focus on is in order to assist Joan or whoever is
9 scribing for us, is to let us know what your point is,
10 whether it's a strength or weakness, an opportunity or
11 a threat before you make it. That gives Joan an
12 opportunity to get to the right place in what she's going
13 to be typing up, as opposed to trying to listen to you,
14 get what kind of point you're trying to make, then get
15 there, because by the time that happens then she may have
16 lost your point that you were attempting to make.

17 I'm also going to probably give her a little
18 bit of extra time if she needs it as we're going, you
19 know, checking with you to make sure that what the points
20 that she has on the screen reflects the points that
21 you've made, et cetera. So, hopefully, just going to
22 kind of take this as it goes, make sure that we get
23 everybody's points up here. We're going to try to go in
24 the order more or less of strengths-weaknesses,
25 opportunities and threats but, again, I mean, if you

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 have -- if you're talking about a strength and it brings
2 up an opportunity and you want to go right to that, we'll
3 certainly do that. But make sure we take the time to make
4 sure that that happens.

5 Let's just keep in mind here that we are
6 here to discuss matters. There's an excellent chance
7 that everything that everybody else says you're not
8 going to agree 100 percent with and that's okay. We're
9 not here to debate the issues, we're here to give input,
10 have a lot of ideas and a lot of discussion flow, so let's
11 make sure we focus on that.

12 We will be taking a break in between the
13 safety and security discussions. Obviously, if you need
14 to take a break during, that's fine. I mean, we're all
15 adults here. If you need to step out for a moment or two,
16 take a conversation, do something, just come on back and
17 we'll join right back into things.

18 Before I go ahead and start jumping into
19 things, why don't we go ahead around the table and then
20 I'll go to the phone lines after for people to introduce
21 themselves. Again, my name is Lance Rakovan, and I'm
22 here to hopefully make this meeting more productive for
23 everyone. I'm going to go to the corner, you ready?

24 MS. METZ: Ready. I'm Patricia Metz. I'm
25 Deputy Director of the Office of Nuclear Energy Safety

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 and Security, State Department.

2 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, good morning. I'm Jon
3 Edwards. I'm Director of the Environmental Protection
4 Agency's Radiation Protection Division.

5 MR. KLINGER: Hi, I'm Joe Klinger. I'm the
6 Chair-Elect of the Conference of Radiation Control
7 Program Directors, and also the Assistant Director of
8 the Illinois Emergency Management Agency.

9 MR. MITCHELL: Good morning. I'm Andy
10 Mitchell. I'm the Director of the Technological Hazards
11 Division in FEMA. We do the -- we collaborate with NRC
12 on the safety and security in and around the nuclear
13 power plants.

14 MR. MANNING: I'm Chris Manning. I'm a Unit
15 Chief in the FBI's WMD Directorate, the Nuclear
16 Radiological Countermeasures Unit.

17 MR. JACOBSON: Good morning. Al Jacobson,
18 Chairman, Organization of Agreement States, and Health
19 Physicist Supervisor, Maryland Department of the
20 Environment, Radiological Health Program.

21 MR. EARLS: Good morning. I'm Chris Earls
22 with the Nuclear Energy Institute. I'm the Director of
23 Safety Focus Regulation.

24 MS. LANDAHL: Good morning. I'm Susan
25 Landahl. I'm Senior Vice President with Exelon, and we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 are the largest operator of nuclear plants in the U.S.

2 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: I'm Cindy
3 Atkins-Duffin. I'm a Senior Policy Analyst in the
4 National Security International Affairs Division of the
5 White House Office of Science and Technology Policy.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. And if we could
7 go to the phone lines, please, and see who we have with
8 us.

9 MR. LOCHBAUM: Dave Lochbaum for the Union
10 of Concerned Scientists.

11 MR. CRONIN: Good morning. My name is Dan
12 Cronin, and I'm a Licensing Engineer with the University
13 of Florida Training Reactor Facility.

14 MR. HOUGHTON: Tom Houghton, Sertrec.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: I'm sorry, once
16 again, sir, what organization?

17 MR. HOUGHTON: Sorry. Tom Houghton,
18 Sertrec.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Anyone else on the
20 phone lines? Okay. For those of you on the phone lines,
21 if you could make sure that you keep your phones on mute
22 when you're not participating in a discussion. That will
23 cut down on the noise on the phone lines and in the room,
24 as well.

25 And I think unless anyone has any questions

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 we might as well go ahead and jump into it. Joan, if you
2 could bring up the Safety Strengths. And this gives you
3 an idea kind of of the format that we're going to be
4 using. We have essentially four different Word
5 documents for the Security and for the Safety that Joan
6 and our other scribes are going to be toggling back and
7 forth to. So, again, if -- we'll start out with the
8 Strengths, if you will, kind of start on the positive,
9 but in the flow of the discussions if you come up with
10 something that fits better in the other categories, just
11 let us know. We'll give Joan a chance to toggle over to
12 that and put it in.

13 Now, the good thing is that as long as we
14 get your idea down some place, later on afterwards the
15 staff can sit down and say okay, well this really kind
16 of belongs in this other category. The important thing
17 is that we get your -- the nugget of what you're trying
18 to express down here. So, again, I'll probably be
19 pausing from time to time just to make sure, you know,
20 hey, does this reflect the point that you're trying to
21 make. Yes or no?

22 So, our Strategic Goal number one is insure
23 the safe use of radioactive materials. The performance
24 indicators are number of risk-significant exposures to
25 radiation and number of risk-significant releases of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 radioactive materials to the environment.

2 And as the discussions go, I'll probably
3 bring us back to that a couple of times just to kind of
4 make sure that we're focused on those particular
5 aspects.

6 Again, we're looking for actionable items,
7 things that the NRC can do something about. There's
8 going to be any number of things out there that affect
9 our Agency that we can't really do but respond to as best
10 we can, but these are things that we can take action on,
11 things that we can either see coming or prepare for as
12 best as possible.

13 So, I'll be quiet now and let the important
14 people do the talking. Who has a strength that they'd
15 like to toss out there?

16 MR. EARLS: I'll go ahead and start.

17 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Please, Chris.

18 MR. EARLS: Hi, there, Chris Earls again.
19 What I'd like to put on the table is the NRC processes.
20 We think that the processes that are established out
21 there are well thought out and are very good when used,
22 so we want to encourage that for the future.

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, so well thought
24 out processes. Susan, I think I saw your hand up.

25 MS. LANDAHL: I would say response to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Fukushima. You know, from the very beginning the NRC's
2 engagement in understanding the issues, in addition to
3 supporting the efforts in Japan, and then the subsequent
4 actions that have gone out to the utilities, I think was
5 very strong.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, very good. Joe,
7 please.

8 MR. KLINGER: Yes, I think the overall
9 regulatory control program, especially in the
10 radioactive materials area. The Agreement State
11 Program, of course, we certainly laud that program. The
12 comprehensive laws and rules to protect people from
13 unnecessary exposure to radiation. I think those are
14 strengths for this Agency.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Jon, please.

16 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, I think that the
17 Commissioners have done an excellent job of building,
18 not surprisingly, some very, very strong technical and
19 scientific expertise throughout the Agency. EPA, of
20 course, interacts quite frequently on regulations
21 development, guidance development, that kind of thing,
22 and we always get very, very high-quality scientific
23 interaction, and high-quality technical input on that.

24 I think I can also say that my sense is that
25 the Agency does a good job of thinking about how to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 recruit the kind of talent they need, how to foster and
2 train it, and also to somehow manage that knowledge as
3 they look at retirements. Of course, you're blending a
4 little bit into challenges and threats when you say
5 that, you know, drawing from that highly technical field
6 is always a challenge when you're looking at recruiting
7 young people and that sort of thing. But I think overall,
8 you can say they've done a very good over the years and
9 over the decades of fostering that high-quality level
10 of scientific thought.

11 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Andy, please.

12 MR. MITCHELL: Our experience in working
13 very collaboratively with the NRC Staff here is they are
14 very open and easy to engage. I mean, the collaborative
15 environment is -- makes the inter-agency challenges
16 diminished somewhat. I found them to be open for change,
17 and in the federal government that's not an easy thing
18 to consider, but I think that's one of the hallmarks of
19 my experience with them, is just they're willing to
20 engage and consider what's the best approach to take on
21 a given topic.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Alan, I'll get
23 with you in a second. As you can see, Joan is attempting
24 to scribe down and put up here in front of you all the
25 points that are being made. If at any point you don't

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 necessarily agree with the way that she's kind of
2 captured, you know, definitely let me know. We can go
3 back, revisit, tweak the language a little bit, if
4 necessary, et cetera. So, Alan, please.

5 MR. JACOBSON: The training and support that
6 the NRC provides the Agreement State Programs is an
7 important strength.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, training and
9 support to Agreement State Programs. Joe, please.

10 MR. KLINGER: I think your Agency funding
11 seems to be pretty strong an asset that you have where
12 I know a lot of States and other entities not quite as
13 fortunate. We've been struggling for a long time, but
14 your funding is really important, and seems to be good.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Cindy, let's go
16 to you first, and then to Chris.

17 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: So, I think it's
18 embodied in several of the ones up there, but that would
19 be the concept of nuclear culture. And I think we saw
20 the -- some of the possible ramifications of not having
21 that in Fukushima, so if I could call that -- I don't
22 know if it's a separate thing.

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Chris?

24 MR. EARLS: Yes, I just want to add on to some
25 of what Andy was mentioning. And I'd like to put down

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the push towards more transparency with what the Agency
2 is doing, I think is a positive move, and it's something
3 that we should continue in the future; try to make the
4 processes even more transparent.

5 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Jon, please.

6 MR. EDWARDS: Yes. I'll add that one thing
7 that we're aware of that the NRC does probably more than
8 some other departments and agencies is they are very
9 conscientious about rotating your executives and
10 managers around from program to program. And we get the
11 sense that that builds a really good, strong overall
12 health and context within the decision making of the
13 executives and managers.

14 Of course, the drawback of that, of course,
15 is you find that when you're working with a particular
16 manager/executive on a long-term project, say a
17 long-term regulation that we happen to be developing or
18 something, if that rotation happens at sort of a
19 challenging moment then, of course, it's a little bit
20 more challenging to get a new person up and whatnot. But
21 I think overall the sense of that executive rotation and
22 development is pretty well thought through here at the
23 Agency.

24 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Did we want to capture
25 that part under -- as a weakness?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. EDWARDS: That makes sense, too, yes.

2 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Joan, could we
3 toggle over there and maybe put something about
4 rotations of managers also being a weakness. I wasn't
5 ready to transition there yet, but that's okay.

6 MR. MITCHELL: You can add the process to
7 that, as well.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, that's fine.
9 That's fine.

10 MR. MITCHELL: This is my first experience
11 in working in a regulated environment, and the pace of
12 process and all the steps they have to go through. I
13 mean, our lawyers talk all the time and it's -- I
14 understand that it's necessary, but that to me
15 -- sometimes we kind of lose impetus because it just
16 takes so long. It's no one's fault, but it's just a
17 fairly protective process to make some what might be
18 considered by some people some fairly simple changes.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: So, it's the length of
20 time that the process takes to get through?

21 MR. MITCHELL: Yes, and just the complexity
22 of it. And I understand the need for it, so I'm not saying
23 that it's not appropriate. But, again, it kind of
24 overlaps on Jon's things, and things take so long you
25 kind of -- people come and go. It's the ability to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 maintain some consistency, and Agency perspectives, and
2 you're constantly kind of retraining the new people that
3 come in.

4 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Please, Jon.

5 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, I can add to that,
6 although I don't want to dominate the conversation here,
7 but I can add to what Andy I think is getting to there;
8 is, again, this is both a strength and a weakness.
9 Sometimes the time it takes to build and seek direction
10 and input from the Commission formally, or even early
11 on in things, it's our perception from the outside, at
12 least, that that sure takes a long time, and that sure
13 takes a lot of effort; whereas, in other departments and
14 agencies we used to be able -- although it's not
15 particularly super-easy to get on our executives and
16 politicals' calendars, yet you can get to them, brief
17 them, and get decisions fairly quickly. And it's our
18 sense that while it's no doubt a strength, too, but it
19 just -- building on Andy's thoughts, I think it just
20 takes some time to get to that, you know, direction from
21 the Commission kind of thing.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, so help me
23 understand how that's a strength. I want to make sure
24 we get that nugget and then the strength, but --

25 MR. EDWARDS: I think it's a strength in the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 sense of you do get a more formalized documented
2 position and direction from the most senior politicals.
3 I think that is a strength; whereas, maybe informally
4 when we're briefing our politicals, you know, we get the
5 feedback and all that, but it's not quite captured as
6 formally, that sort of thing, and well documented. I
7 guess I'd lean to that as a strength, and maybe other
8 folks have ideas on that, too.

9 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, thanks.

10 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: So, I would capture
11 -- I'm sorry.

12 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Go ahead.

13 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: You're insured a
14 thorough review.

15 MR. EDWARDS: Right. Right, right.

16 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: A thorough,
17 deliberative review.

18 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, so let's make
19 sure we get that nugget, Joan. Direction well documented
20 and then the thorough review. I'm going to have to go
21 to Patricia, she hasn't spoken yet. So, Andy, I'll be
22 with you in a moment.

23 MS. METZ: I do have a strength to begin
24 with, but then I will also follow-up on what Jon had
25 said. But from State Department perspective, we have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 worked very well with NRC on multiple fronts. They were
2 certainly very support with our G8 Presidency this past
3 year, and Cindy had mentioned nuclear safety culture.
4 And they were certainly walking with us hand-in-hand.
5 In fact, we were so successful that the UK has picked
6 that up for their Presidency this year. But one of the
7 issues that sometimes we have, which would be a
8 weakness, I guess, oftentimes we press forward and I
9 think a little too quickly for pulling NRC with us
10 sometimes.

11 Many of our meetings with our international
12 colleagues are done, of course most of them, in the
13 margins of meetings, and that's where everything really
14 happens, because by the time you sit at a table you know
15 what the end result is going to be usually. You know,
16 you have some surprises but -- and I think that has been
17 more of a challenge working with NRC, because I think
18 they do have a much more formal process than we do when
19 we're saying, you know -- you know, countries will say
20 what do you think about this, and we're like yes, we'd
21 like to consider that, or what do you think? And we sort
22 of move forward in that direction, and we are able to
23 come back and we know where our politicals are going,
24 and we know that this is along the lines that they want.
25 But then I think it takes some time to get it through

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the Commission and for NRC to feel comfortable moving
2 forward.

3 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, so let's make
4 sure we get this up. NRC does not always keep up with
5 informal agreements, or --

6 MS. METZ: Not even agreements, but sort of
7 like the fast pace of change in international meetings
8 almost. I'm trying to think of another word that's not
9 agreement because agreement covers a --

10 MR. EDWARDS: Arrangements, maybe?

11 MS. METZ: Yes, or potential. Yes.

12 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Are we okay with
13 that?

14 MS. METZ: I'm sorry, maybe. Pace of change
15 with potential, I don't know, arrangements or
16 agreements, not so much -- I mean, these come to pass
17 in international meetings but not -- the meeting itself
18 is not the end game. Yes, yes. Yes, that would work.

19 MS. GOLDBERG: International interactions
20 maybe in international affairs.

21 MS. METZ: Yes, that would work, or even
22 changes in policy.

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Joe, please.

24 MR. KLINGER: This is a strength and a
25 weakness. I think the collaborative effort on the part

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 of the federal agencies; I mean, I'm impressed right
2 here. I don't know how many other federal agencies have
3 opened their Strategic Planning up like you have. That's
4 amazing, and sitting here at this table you've got State
5 Department, EPA, FEMA, FBI. That's very impressive, and
6 that coordination is essential in nuclear safety. So,
7 that's a strength.

8 Now, what I see as a weakness that was as
9 a result of Fukushima it came out, and in Strategic
10 Planning we look forward. What would we like to see NRC
11 look like in like 2018? And what we would like to see
12 is that if there is another event like Fukushima, that
13 the federal response at least in this country, but it
14 was a foreign event, it wasn't a national response
15 framework event, but some coordinated communication,
16 better coordination and a response so there's a single
17 point, if possible, who's communicating and somebody
18 stepping out in front, because all the states were kind
19 of left on their own volition there to handle the news
20 media, to handle the technical standards that were
21 involved. So, hopefully, the federal agencies will
22 learn from the experience of Fukushima, and if we have
23 another event that'll be better coordinated. That's a
24 State perspective, that's just the way we saw it. So,
25 that's what we would like to see improved in your

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Strategic Plan.

2 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Is that specific
3 international emergencies, emergencies in general?

4 MR. KLINGER: Well, it happened to be an
5 international emergency. I think one of the problems was
6 because it was an international emergency.

7 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Exactly.

8 MR. KLINGER: Had it been a domestic one, it
9 probably would have been very well coordinated. I think
10 that probably is, but it is real, it did happen, it could
11 happen again, and we don't want to experience that
12 again. So, looking at international --

13 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: International,
14 international in parentheses?

15 MR. KLINGER: Yes, probably should. I think
16 it was the international nature of that event is what
17 really caused our side of the problem.

18 MR. EARLS: I'd like to try to suggest that
19 we don't limit it to international. We're actually
20 concerned that a domestic event might be even more
21 challenging because we're going to have a lot of people
22 who want to talk and take the lead, as opposed to not
23 knowing who's taking the lead. So, I think it's kind of
24 the flip side of it, but we're actually almost more
25 concerned with how that's going to all play out if it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 happens in the U.S.

2 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Alan, please.

3 MR. JACOBSON: Thank you, Joe, that's a very
4 important point. It's our expectation as these events
5 unfold that the NRC will be providing accurate
6 information to the general public in a timely manner
7 when necessary.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, and that's
9 -- do you consider that a strength that we do that, or
10 where do you see that falling out on this list?

11 MR. JACOBSON: We saw weaknesses in the past
12 several years.

13 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, so you saw that
14 as a weakness specifically towards Fukushima and maybe
15 a few of us --

16 MR. JACOBSON: Fukushima, and we had some
17 international events with contaminated imported
18 products.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Before we get
20 too far from the strengths, I wanted to let David
21 Lochbaum who is on the phone line have a chance to weigh
22 in. And I know we have your comments already so, Joan,
23 if you could drop the strengths in for Dave as he's
24 talking. Dave, would you like to go?

25 MR. LOCHBAUM: Yes. Thank you, Lance. I can

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 repeat the strengths that I had submitted last week.
2 First has kind of come up several times this morning but
3 we restated it slightly. In general, we believe the NRC
4 does an excellent job of establishing safety
5 regulations that provide adequate protection to the
6 public and worker safety. Put another way, we generally
7 feel that the NRC sets the safety bar at an appropriate
8 level.

9 We have two other strengths that are
10 related to the NRC's Reactor Oversight process. We
11 believe that your Reactor Oversight process provides
12 early detection of declining performance trends, and
13 couples that with mandated and graduated Agency
14 responses with the objective of rectifying those
15 adverse trends. And we think related to the Reactor
16 Oversight process, the fact that it has built in formal
17 self-assessments helps reallocate inspection and
18 oversight resources as necessary to deal with emerging
19 trends or external drivers. And we think all those are
20 strengths.

21 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thanks, Dave. We're
22 working on getting your strengths dropped in the
23 document. There you go.

24 Okay. Anybody have a few other strengths
25 that they want to toss out there? We can definitely come

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 back to it, but it seemed like we were already moving
2 towards the weaknesses more and more. But, Joe.

3 MR. KLINGER: I think your external
4 communications are pretty exceptional. I mean, I get
5 -- it used to be I didn't get enough notifications about
6 the various activities of NRC, now I get more than I
7 need, but that's okay. I can cull through there, but that
8 is great. NRC does an excellent job of letting people
9 know what they're working on and that, and provides
10 ample opportunity for comment. I think that's a huge
11 plus.

12 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Jon, please.

13 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, I think the NRC does an
14 excellent job of promoting further discussion. And, in
15 particular, I'm thinking about Radiation Protection,
16 Health Physics, and that sort of thing. Many times we've
17 joined together with them on conference sponsorship, on
18 NRCP projects. They're very willing to join funding
19 together with other federal agencies to promote the kind
20 of robust scientific discussion that furthers the
21 science, and furthers Radiation Protection.

22 In particular, I'm thinking of the first
23 ever conference that we joined together with them of the
24 ICRP, the International Council for Radiation
25 Protection. It was a little over a year ago. It was just

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 over at the hotel just across the street here. That was
2 a fabulous conference, and they do many of things
3 joining together with other federal departments and
4 agencies in the funding, so that's just a real positive
5 thing they do.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: All right. Joan, if
7 you could scroll up to the top of the page once you're
8 done with this nugget. I just wanted to go again, you
9 know, to refocus in terms of where the goal that we're
10 working towards is insuring the safe use of radioactive
11 materials, and the performance indicators are number of
12 risk-significant exposures to radiation, and number of
13 risk-significant releases of radioactive materials to
14 the environment.

15 So, let's go ahead and move to the
16 weaknesses. What weaknesses does NRC have? We have a few
17 on the page already, but let's take a little bit of time
18 to discuss where you see other weaknesses that the NRC
19 has in terms of how we do our business, if you will. Joe,
20 go ahead.

21 MR. KLINGER: Yes, I've got one, and it's not
22 just NRC, it's as we look forward to 2018. What we would
23 like to see is, you know, we still have some
24 discrepancies in Radiation Protection Standards
25 between NRC, EPA, OSHA, DOE, and others, and it's still

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 kind of frustrating because if by 2018 all those
2 Radiation Protection Standards were consistent, that
3 would be wonderful. And it takes a lot of time, you have
4 to update your standards, agree on what the standards
5 are and all that, but they should be consistent and they
6 still aren't across the whole suite of federal agencies.
7 So, in its course and others, I know NRC is working on
8 that with ICRP-103 in a recent SRM, so there's efforts
9 going that way, but maybe by 2018 if they were all
10 consistent that would be a great thing.

11 MS. GOLDBERG: What were the other agencies
12 you mentioned?

13 MR. KLINGER: OSHA, US EPA, NRC. Just some
14 fine tuning that needs to be done on those standards.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Susan, please.

16 MS. LANDAHL: I would say in the general
17 categories is an increase in regulatory uncertainty
18 that we're seeing. And a couple of examples are just -- I
19 think a piece of it can be related to the knowledge
20 transfer discussion we talked about earlier. While
21 there may be aspects that are done well, there are a lot
22 of new inspectors and folks new in role that in some
23 cases what we see is past rulings or past NRC documents,
24 Safety Evaluation Reports, things like that where we
25 used to be able to use precedent to make an argument.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Today, for example, it appears that, you know, with new
2 people looking at it, that's no longer a path to take.
3 You know, we see individual inspectors -- you know, what
4 we see is, it's like changes to rules based on individual
5 inspector findings, and just inconsistency in how the
6 various regulations are being applied. So, I know
7 there's a lot in there, but I think it comes under
8 regulatory uncertainty. A piece of it is the knowledge
9 transfer, a piece of it I believe is process knowledge,
10 you know, understanding of the Backfit Rules and things
11 like that. And just, you know, past precedent, ways that
12 things have been handled in the past and, you know,
13 safely, not being able to use those same arguments, same
14 codes, same documented previous positions any more.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Are we getting
16 our points up here?

17 MS. LANDAHL: Yes, I think so.

18 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Yes?

19 MR. EARLS: I'll help.

20 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Chris will help.

21 MR. EARLS: Yes, she captured a lot of the
22 things that I was going to bring up. We're going to put
23 another bullet that is process-related. You know, I
24 mentioned that the NRC does have good processes, but
25 they don't always follow them. And we see that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 particularly at the lower level, inspector level, and
2 it goes along with what Susan was saying. So, I guess
3 my bullet would be, you know, NRC management needs to
4 continue to have a focus on making sure the processes
5 are used, appropriate processes are used.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: So, need to insure
7 processes are used, and used consistently, as well?

8 MR. EARLS: Yes.

9 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. All right. I'll
10 give Joan a moment to catch up.

11 MS. GOLDBERG: I'm not sure we got that.

12 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Ensure appropriate
13 processes are used consistently.

14 MS. GOLDBERG: Okay.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Are we good? Okay.
16 Other weaknesses? Jon, please.

17 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, my comment builds very
18 much on what Joe said, and certainly this isn't entirely
19 confined to the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. All of
20 the federal agencies labor under an outdated regulatory
21 development process.

22 And if you think about it, that process goes
23 back to mid-century, 20th century, so it's 50, 60 years
24 old now, and it's worked very well, obviously. But it's
25 got to the point where in the 21st century here it's very

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 cumbersome and slow to respond to quick changing forces
2 that are out there, which is both a strength and a
3 weakness, but it takes so long to update the regulations
4 that you get the very thing Joe is pointing to here,
5 where you get standards that are out of joint. Some
6 standards are based on older guidance, some of the
7 standards are based on newer guidance, they don't quite
8 marry up. So, it's not particular to the NRC, but
9 certainly the NRC is right there in it, so like the EPA,
10 other regulatory agencies, the standards are out of
11 date. It's very, very hard to quickly get them up to date
12 and evolve them the way they need to evolve sometimes.
13 So, it's just something we've got to figure out how to
14 improve when we can.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Before we get
16 too far into this, why don't we go ahead. Joan, can you
17 go to the UCS document and go ahead and drop Dave
18 Lochbaum's comments in? And, Dave, if you want to step
19 in and kind of walk us through the weaknesses that you
20 submitted?

21 MR. LOCHBAUM: Thank you, Lance. I think we
22 mentioned the strength was that the NRC generally does
23 a good job of establishing safety regulations at the
24 appropriate height. The other side of that coin is we
25 think the NRC, in general, does a poor job of enforcing

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 those safety regulations, sits by and watches as
2 licensees limbo beneath the safety bar instead of
3 meeting it. And we think that needs to be fixed. That
4 dates back decades.

5 We think a related point but somewhat
6 different is that the NRC takes too long to resolve
7 Generic Safety Issues. There was a Generic Safety Issue,
8 GSI-191. It's about as old as my nephew, and he's
9 entering college this fall. Taking decades to resolve
10 safety issues that affect dozens of plants is
11 unacceptable.

12 And I guess the last weakness we think the
13 NRC really needs to address is its safety culture. Last
14 year's Safety Culture and Climate Survey revealed
15 weaknesses that the NRC needs to address, including the
16 fact that 41 percent of the respondents believe the
17 Agency hadn't done anything to address weaknesses
18 identified by the 2009 survey. And the fact that the NRC
19 discussed its results in private is not a really good
20 indicator of safety culture, so we think there's some
21 areas there for improvement. Thanks, Lance.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thanks, Dave. Any
23 other weaknesses that people want to toss out there at
24 this point? Joe, please.

25 MR. KLINGER: I've got one, it's pretty

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 specific. We feel like NRC needs to continue their
2 review and engage the States regarding the Nuclear
3 Medicine Patient Release Criteria, including the
4 drinking water pathway where patient excreta is being
5 picked up in downstream water supplies. Just that factor
6 there, just continue down that path to make sure that
7 we're doing everything we can to protect the public and
8 the environment.

9 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. I think they
10 need help on this one, Joe. Can you make sure that we
11 get the bullet?

12 MR. KLINGER: Sure. Yes, I would just say
13 that the Nuclear Medicine Patient Release Criteria
14 needs to include the drinking water pathway to address
15 a concern about patient excreta in downstream water
16 supplies. Excreta, that's close. Just get it up there.
17 In downstream water supplies. FACILITATOR

18 RAKOVAN: I'm sure Joan did not expect to be typing the
19 word "excreta" today.

20 (Laughter.)

21 MR. KLINGER: It's very specific. It is a
22 concern, and it's real, though.

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Just want to make sure
24 that everyone on the table -- we have quite a few people
25 who have been putting out a lot of ideas. For those of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you who have been a little quieter, please feel free to
2 step in, make sure that you're not keeping -- is my
3 microphone phasing in and out, because it certainly
4 seems like it is.

5 MR. KLINGER: It is.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: I can just yell, I
7 guess, but -- Chris, please.

8 MR. EARLS: Yes, I'd like to add another one.
9 It's not apparent that the NRC, at least it's not clear
10 to us that the NRC has a means for prioritizing its
11 regulatory activities, including rulemaking, guidance
12 development, and things of that nature. And we think
13 that's an area where some focus needs to be placed and,
14 in fact, is being placed, so we really want to reinforce
15 that. It will help the licensees in terms of managing
16 their work. Right now it doesn't appear that the
17 safety-significance of one regulation to the other is
18 really factored into schedules or when they're
19 occurring.

20 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Did we get that nugget
21 on there?

22 MR. EARLS: Yes.

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, this sounds
24 better. This feels better. Thanks. Okay. Any other
25 weaknesses that we have? It seems like we're kind of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 winding down. We can move on to the opportunities. One
2 or two more weaknesses anybody want to toss out there?
3 And, again, you know, this isn't kind of a speak now or
4 forever hold your peace kind of thing. If one occurs to
5 you we can certainly come back to it.

6 MR. CRONIN: Are you going to open up the
7 weaknesses for public comment later? This is Dan Cronin.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Yes, we're going to go
9 through all of them, and then we'll open it up for public
10 comment and discussion.

11 MR. CRONIN: All right, thank you.

12 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: All right. Why don't
13 we go ahead and move on to the opportunities. Dave, why
14 don't we go ahead and start out with the UCS comments
15 for this one?

16 MR. LOCHBAUM: Okay, Lance. I think there's
17 a couple of opportunities, one being the Blue Ribbon
18 Commission recommendations that are likely to result in
19 some federal legislation to deal with onsite spent fuel
20 storage. The NRC doesn't have full control over that,
21 but there are some things that the NRC can do to support
22 that.

23 Somewhat related is the last year when the
24 Court of Appeals kicked back the NRC's Waste Confidence
25 decision, we think it gives the NRC an opportunity to

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 recognize spent fuel pools is more hazardous than spent
2 fuel in dry storage, and take appropriate regulatory
3 decisions based on that recognition. We think those two
4 external opportunities are chances to have a better
5 tomorrow.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: This is actually two
7 very good bullets to start out with, because this is
8 exactly what we're kind of looking for. These are
9 external things that are impacting the Agency that are
10 opportunities for the Agency to excel. So, these are two
11 very good examples to start with. Anyone want to add on
12 to that? Susan, go ahead.

13 MS. LANDAHL: I think this is external to the
14 Agency, but some of it may be internal, I'm not sure.
15 But the 123 Agreement Licensing requirements, and the
16 interactions we have, you know, it doesn't -- it seems
17 that even countries that have an existing agreement,
18 that the specific licensing and the administration
19 around it still seems to be extensive. So, like we have
20 this process to gain the agreements, but it doesn't
21 significantly change the interaction afterward. So, I
22 don't think there's good understanding of that process,
23 and there may be an opportunity to make changes.

24 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. I was running
25 around with microphones. Joan, did you get that? Okay.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Let's make sure what Joan gets up here reflects what you
2 said, Susan. I'm sorry that I --

3 MS. LANDAHL: No, that's okay. Countries
4 with, yes, with existing agreements still have
5 -- there's still significant work to do, you know, any
6 kind of sharing of information or communication. That's
7 good.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Good? If not, step in.

9 MR. EARLS: I'd like to add on because I
10 think this is -- I want to make sure this one doesn't
11 get bounced down the road because somebody is going to
12 recognize this is actually handled by somebody else.
13 Patricia I know is about to say that, so I think what
14 we can add on to this is, to get it to the NRC, is NRC
15 needs to be actively engaged with State Department and
16 others in pushing this forward and getting to -- getting
17 these agreements in place. So, I guess it's the NRC
18 -- well, she's got it there, actively engaged.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, so this
20 captures the --

21 MR. EARLS: Yes.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay.

23 MS. GOLDBERG: To put more of these
24 agreements.

25 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: NRC needs to be

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 actively engaged with State Department and others to
2 what?

3 MR. EARLS: To push, I guess finalize, what
4 would you say, Patricia?

5 MS. LANDAHL: Yes, I was going to say even
6 negotiate with us in terms of the regulatory person
7 having move forward with other countries. Although, you
8 probably don't need with other countries because that's
9 what a 123 is. That would be understood, you can skip
10 that.

11 MS. GOLDBERG: Is it 123?

12 MS. LANDAHL: Yes, it's -- yes.

13 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: 123 Agreement, that's
14 - okay.

15 MS. LANDAHL: Agreements for cooperation.
16 We call it a 123 Agreement.

17 MR. EARLS: Staff will understand that.

18 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. I'm glad the
19 Staff will understand it, because you lost me on that
20 one. All right. Other opportunities? Cindy, please.

21 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: So, now we've put that
22 one up there. We've just done some actions, and I would
23 say to continue -- for the NRC to continue to work
24 closely with State Department and other organizations
25 to implement the American Medical Isotope Production

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Act that was just enacted. And that will help to
2 implement the Administration's policy to eliminate the
3 use of highly-enriched uranium in the production of
4 medical isotopes.

5 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. So, that was the
6 -- what was the Act, I'm sorry?

7 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: American Medical
8 Isotope Production Act, I think is the name of it.

9 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: American Medical
10 Isotope Production Act. Other federal agencies, Medical
11 -- we'll give her a second to catch up. You guys are
12 getting really specific and technical here, kind of
13 starting to lose our strength.

14 (Laughter.)

15 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: After Act,
16 implementation.

17 (Off microphone comments.)

18 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: Yes.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. And after Act,
20 implementation.

21 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: Implementation.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay.

23 PARTICIPANT: Production and
24 implementation?

25 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Production Act

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 implementation.

2 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: Product Act, implement
3 the Act.

4 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay? Okay.

5 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: To eliminate the use of
6 HEU.

7 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: HEU.

8 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: All caps.

9 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Staff will
10 understand.

11 (Laughter.)

12 MS. GOLDBERG: Thank you.

13 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Do we have any -- some
14 general opportunities, something -- Jon.

15 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, I hope I can articulate
16 this well. First, I wanted to definitely underscore and
17 reinforce the first two that came in from UCS. Those
18 definitely were very, very high on our list. Both of them
19 are extremely challenging, the BRC follow-up as well as
20 the Waste Confidence decision. But just underscore,
21 those two are very big ones for the next four years for
22 the Agency and other federal agencies, and state
23 agencies too, obviously.

24 But going to the more general, again, I hope
25 I can articulate this well, but the point I want to get

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to is the Agency having an even more robust outreach and
2 communication about what it's thinking and what it's
3 doing. And where I'm going with this is there's
4 incredible host of stakeholders and citizens that want
5 to give input to the NRC, and I think the NRC genuinely
6 wants to hear them. And I think the NRC's website is a
7 pretty strong website as federal agency websites go, but
8 some input I heard as I was preparing for this meeting
9 were that comments would go in, technical comments or
10 just other general comments would go into the Agency,
11 and too often feedback didn't come back about what the
12 thinking was, or why a decision went one way or another.
13 And I'm not saying the Commission has to explain itself
14 on everything, but maybe a better job of communicating
15 exactly how the kind of stakeholder input was resolved,
16 and how it changed policy, and how it affected how the
17 Commission does business.

18 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Joan, are we good?
19 Jon, does that capture it?

20 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, I think that's good right
21 there. Yes.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Other opportunities?
23 Please, Patricia.

24 MS. METZ: We're facing a grand opportunity
25 now to strengthen the Convention on Nuclear Safety in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 a way that would be -- in a way that we feel is best for
2 countries internationally. We had an extraordinary
3 meeting in August where the U.S. pressed to change the
4 guidance and procedures. We felt that had very good
5 impact, but at this point there are other meetings going
6 on at IAEA -- I'll shorten this at the end -- at IAEA
7 that we are concerned about because these working groups
8 are trying to do what we had already done at the
9 extraordinary meeting in August. And that was a tough
10 meeting that we were able to get through, and we don't
11 want to have the Convention open because we haven't had
12 a chance to see what their guidance and procedures
13 changes have been able to do. And we won't see that for
14 another year when we have the next review meeting. But
15 I think now we have the opportunity for the U.S. to step
16 forward and say we haven't had a chance to see what we've
17 already done. Why do we want to continue and encourage
18 other countries to have the opportunity to step up and
19 try to make changes in the Convention which, to us, will
20 be totally crazy right now because it would take years
21 to implement. We could have a two-tail because some
22 countries will ratify one Convention, and other
23 countries will ratify another version, and we're
24 concerned about this. And now we have the opportunity
25 to step up and come back. And we think many other

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 countries are with us on this, but we hate to see us lose
2 this opportunity that we have this year.

3 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. So, how do we
4 capture this? We've got strength in the Convention
5 Nuclear Safety, too soon to invite changes to the
6 Convention?

7 MS. METZ: Right. I mean, we have this year
8 simply because these meetings are ongoing during 2013,
9 and they will be ending in November. And we just want
10 to make sure that we don't move --

11 MS. GOLDBERG: So, would you concede until
12 after November?

13 MS. METZ: Yes. Yes, that would work.

14 MS. GOLDBERG: After the -- it's going to
15 happen in November?

16 MS. METZ: The working groups will report
17 out. I think you could even cut it off too soon to invite
18 changes to the Convention, because we've already
19 changed the guidance and procedures. We just haven't had
20 a chance to see how those will be rolled out at the next
21 review meeting, because it hasn't happened. And
22 countries are now in Vienna discussing different
23 changes to this Convention when we've already made
24 changes to the guidance procedures, but we have no idea
25 how those are going to roll out because we haven't had

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 another meeting under which those have been in the
2 process. So, I think you're good where you are, too soon
3 to invite change.

4 MS. GOLDBERG: Until the existing changes
5 roll out?

6 MS. METZ: Yes, until we see what we've
7 already done. I mean, we're trying to make changes on
8 top of changes, and that makes no sense to us. Until we
9 see the impacts of changes made at EM in August,
10 Extraordinary Meeting. EM, Extraordinary Meeting, yes.

11 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. A few other
12 opportunities? Please, Chris.

13 MR. EARLS: I'd like to add the opportunity
14 with the small modular reactors. I think in the future,
15 the NRC has an opportunity to get some licensing
16 processes in place in a timely manner that could really
17 jumpstart that area. And I know that there is some focus
18 on it now, but I think maybe a more aggressive focus on
19 getting the appropriate licensing in place for the small
20 modular reactors would be a positive direction.

21 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, very good. A few
22 other -- Andy, please.

23 MR. KLINGER: On the relationship with the
24 offsite response organizations is good, but I think we,
25 both FEMA and NRC, have an opportunity and a challenge

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to really step back and take a look at how we evaluate
2 progress for planning and work more closely with our
3 state and local partners. And we do an enormous amount
4 of coordination, but I think a lot of it -- and I'm
5 relatively new to this, but I don't think I'm the first
6 person to experience this. There's a lot of histrionics,
7 we do things because we've always done it, and this is
8 the way we are comfortable doing it. And I don't think
9 that -- in the long run I think we can improve our
10 preparedness and response posture by being a little more
11 challenging in how we approach this. And I know there's
12 a willingness with our partners here at NRC and our
13 stakeholders to do that, but I think that's a real
14 opportunity we have to kind of reform how we go about
15 this planning and evaluation process.

16 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. So, are we
17 capturing the nugget?

18 MR. MITCHELL: I think yes, that's good.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay.

20 MR. EARLS: And, Lance, I'd like to go back
21 to the previous bullet. I don't think it quite captured
22 the --

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Licensing of small
24 modular --

25 MR. EARLS: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: What kind of a
2 revision?

3 MR. EARLS: Yes, there is no licensing
4 process in place right now, so it's not getting through
5 the process, it's establishing the licensing process.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay.

7 MR. EARLS: And doing that in a timely
8 manner.

9 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Chris, please.

10 MR. MANNING: From the FBI perspective,
11 that's one of my interests, too. Since it is an emerging
12 technology and will pose future threats, I definitely
13 would like to see the licensing piece. And as far as to
14 the re-evaluating the emergency preparedness, I'd like
15 to see a push with some of the plants to get more engaged
16 with the 3D modeling and the Tabletop Exercise and the
17 FTX that our Infrastructure Unit runs, the WMD
18 Directorate.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: So, take advantage of
20 technologies for the emergency preparedness?

21 MR. MANNING: Right, and the active
22 trainings that are currently out there to try to get a
23 push, because some of the power plants are reluctant to
24 get engaged with that, so I'd like to see a little bit
25 more of a push to get that engaged.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: A little bit of push
2 to get the technology aspects engaged, or --

3 MR. MANNING: Just the training, and then
4 the preparedness piece.

5 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay.

6 MS. GOLDBERG: Could we get a summary?

7 MR. MANNING: All right.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Chris, can you help us
9 make sure we get that --

10 MR. MITCHELL: That would be on the
11 prevention side.

12 MR. MANNING: The prevention side, more of
13 a push on the prevention side for emergency
14 preparedness.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, more push on
16 prevention side for emergency preparedness.

17 MR. MANNING: Involving the state, locals.

18 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Involving states and
19 locals, et cetera.

20 MR. MANNING: Right.

21 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay?

22 MR. MITCHELL: That is an evolving thing
23 with the hostile action-based exercises that are new
24 requirement under the new rules, so I think there's an
25 opportunity there to take that step a little further.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. EARLS: Yes, and you may want to repeat
2 this comment or duplicate it when we get to the next
3 section, because I think that's really where that falls
4 out under the security side.

5 MR. MITCHELL: I think it's the effective
6 integration of the emergency preparedness and the
7 prevention side. Usually they're operated
8 independently, and that's not because people didn't
9 want them to, it's just the nature of the beast. You
10 know, you have your actions with the security side, and
11 then we work with the emergency preparedness side, but
12 I think it's more -- I think the push now with --

13 MR. MANNING: Investigative and the
14 consequence management to kind of work together to get
15 the information there.

16 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: So, it's better
17 coordination. Okay. Cindy, please.

18 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: So, I think again on the
19 opportunity and challenge cusp is continued role as a
20 world-leading nuclear regulatory agency, as more
21 countries stand up and revise their civil nuclear power
22 structure, we pretty much require them to have a
23 regulatory agency. Japan is now setting up an
24 independent regulatory agency, and they look to the NRC
25 for best practices. And that's an opportunity and a

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 challenge to be out in front.

2 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. It looks like
3 you guys got that. All right. A couple of more
4 opportunities before we move on to the threats. Chris,
5 please.

6 MR. EARLS: I'll go ahead since I saw Bill
7 come into the room. I want to put the subsequent license
8 renewal, the regulatory process for that. We're quickly
9 entering into that time frame.

10 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: License renewal?

11 MR. EARLS: Subsequent license renewal. And
12 I think the NRC, it's an opportunity to reinforce the
13 existing process, or if modifications are made to make
14 the changes in a timely manner to support getting into
15 that process in a timely manner.

16 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. What else do you
17 want to put along with the subsequent license renewal
18 for this --

19 MR. EARLS: Subsequent license renewal
20 establishing a -- I'm losing it here. A predictable
21 licensing process.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay.

23 MS. GOLDBERG: What type of license renewal
24 are we talking about?

25 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: We're talking about

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 power plant.

2 MR. EARLS: Oh, yes, this is power reactor.

3 I'm sorry.

4 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Power plant --

5 MR. EARLS: Yes.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: All right. One or two
7 more opportunities before we move on to threats, or are
8 we ready to go ahead and plunge in? Go ahead, move on
9 threats. Okay? All right, let's go ahead and hit the
10 threats. These are external challenges, things that are
11 going on around the NRC or that could impact the NRC's
12 ability to fulfill that safety goal, insuring safe use
13 of radioactive materials.

14 MR. KLINGER: The threat that bothers me and
15 concerns all of us I think is cyber security, how you
16 can best prepare -- be better prepared for cyber
17 security concerns. It's a real threat, and it's getting
18 more complicated and challenging every day.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, very good.

20 MR. EARLS: I'm going to add a nuance to to
21 that.

22 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Please.

23 MR. EARLS: I think one of the threats to
24 having good security regulation in place for us is the
25 competing agencies and entities who want to establish

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 regulation. So, you know, the Executive Branch,
2 Congress, DHS, there's a number of entities who are
3 considering regulations in this area, and I think that's
4 a threat to good implementation of those regulations if
5 we have competing or overlapping regulation in the cyber
6 security area, in particular.

7 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: So, you're talking
8 specific to cyber security?

9 MR. EARLS: Yes.

10 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Or do you think that's
11 a general issue?

12 MR. EARLS: No, I think --

13 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Just cyber security.

14 MR. EARLS: -- focus on cyber security.

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: All right. So, the
16 second bullet is an extension of the first bullet, if
17 you will, Joan.

18 MR. EARLS: Okay.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Can you make that all
20 one bullet, please? The first two bullets should be one.
21 They both involve cyber security. Thank you.

22 Okay, other challenges, threats? Patricia,
23 please.

24 MS. METZ: Certainly the terror threat
25 remains for RAD sources and for dirty weapons.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Is that a safety
2 issue, or is that more of a security issue, that one?

3 MS. METZ: Security.

4 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Am I cutting out
5 again? I feel like I'm cutting out again. I'm just going
6 to talk really loud.

7 MS. METZ: I'm sorry, that is a security
8 issue, and we're back on safety. Right?

9 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Yes.

10 MS. METZ: Okay.

11 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: We're trying to stay
12 towards safety at this point. I know we've veered a
13 couple of times into security. And we'll do some post
14 work on what we have here, but -- all right. Focusing
15 on safety. Susan, please.

16 MS. LANDAHL: Uncertainty of future funding
17 from Congress. You know, I understand the NRC is a fee
18 recovery agency, but I -- my understanding is it still
19 gets appropriated, and there are things that can
20 interfere with that.

21 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Very good. Chris, and
22 then Joe.

23 MR. EARLS: Yes, this is related to what
24 Susan -- I think with the way the economy is and what
25 we're seeing with the competition with natural gas, that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 sort of thing, the industry right now is struggling in
2 terms of -- from an economic standpoint. We've already
3 seen a couple of plants announce that they're going to
4 be shutting down, we expect there will be a little bit
5 more of that. That's going to be a challenge to the
6 Agency, as well, from a funding perspective. We also
7 think that's something that the Agency should be focused
8 on and considering in the Strategic Plan. As the
9 industry shrinks, does the Agency shrink in terms of
10 size and funding?

11 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. So, the second
12 nugget there, Joan, was as the industry shrinks does the
13 NRC shrink, as well. All right, Joe, if you would.

14 MR. KLINGER: Yes. I was thinking along the
15 same line. Industry -- I'm thinking more of radioactive
16 material licensees. Times are tough, safety is
17 important but, you know, I've got to make some money,
18 too, so I'm afraid, you know, the threat is they'll be
19 cutting corners here and comprising safety. And then
20 also the funding issue not only on NRC but on the States,
21 the Agreement States and other regulatory agencies, you
22 know, as their funding gets cut, then they're not able
23 to do as comprehensive a job as maybe they would like.

24 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. I think we're
25 getting your second point up there, but I want to make

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 sure we don't lose your first point, as well. As funding
2 gets cut, this is a safety concern both for licensees
3 and for States, local organizations as well?

4 MR. KLINGER: State and local regulatory
5 programs, you know.

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay.

7 MR. KLINGER: Federal and State programs.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Can we specify
9 licensees, state programs, local, et cetera on there.
10 Excellent. All right, Jon, hold on a second. Let Joan
11 get a chance to catch up.

12 MR. KLINGER: It's really just the poor
13 economic times for the industry.

14 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: All right. Joan,
15 Fran, we okay? All right. Let's go to Jon, and then I'll
16 go to Dave, and then we'll drop his points in. Jon,
17 please.

18 MR. EDWARDS: Yes. I'll tell my comment a
19 little bit later here to what's -- I think it was Susan
20 was saying about the NRC's potential to really serve as
21 a best practices example internationally. But first I
22 want to identify the threat in that as more developing
23 countries and internationally more radioactive
24 materials are worked with, more sources are worked with,
25 I think the threat is that we face potential for higher

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 contaminated products coming into the country. This
2 does not solely fall to the NRC, of course, but as the
3 country faces the -- more of these contaminated
4 products coming in, again tying in with Susan said, is
5 there a way that the Agency might be able to continue
6 to shine as an example of best practices with dealing
7 with these sources to the developing countries so that
8 there is a less chance of sources being melted, you know,
9 smelting accidents and those sort of things? That's
10 a threat I'm trying to capture here.

11 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: All right. So, it's a
12 higher probability of contaminated products?

13 MR. EDWARDS: Right, yes. And, again, it
14 doesn't fall solely to the NRC, but certainly they can
15 be very helpful, I think, in this area with other feds
16 and states as we respond to these sort of things.

17 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Andy, please.

18 MR. MITCHELL: This is not just NRC but the
19 other -- I think we'll see there's an increasing
20 awareness of the challenges, things that happen
21 overseas that we probably wouldn't experience here, but
22 that's neither here nor there. We are -- NRC, in
23 particular, is going to have the lead in responding to
24 how we do or do not do things. And I think that's only
25 going to increase as we see these emerging economies go,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 you know, getting more and more diverse in their energy,
2 engagements and there's a lot of planned production
3 overseas in nuclear power plants, and I think we're
4 going to see the good and the bad of that. And we'll have
5 to be able to respond to how that affects, or how the
6 U.S. compares to that more than we probably have in the
7 past.

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. So, the nugget
9 I want to make sure that we don't lose on this is it's
10 overseas, it's not domestic.

11 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

12 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Increasing awareness
13 of challenges overseas.

14 MR. MITCHELL: Well, the affect of potential
15 problems overseas. And that's a Fukushima-type thing.
16 I don't think that's the last one we'll see.

17 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: It's a different
18 portion of the risks.

19 MR. MITCHELL: Yes.

20 MR. EDWARDS: You want to capture that with
21 the bullet right above that, too. Higher probability of
22 contaminated products from overseas sources.

23 MS. GOLDBERG: From overseas.

24 MR. EDWARDS: The same concept you want to
25 capture there, too.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Dave, I wanted
2 to go to you. We could go ahead and drop the UCS threats
3 in. And, Dave, if you want to go ahead and go through
4 the -- what you submitted.

5 MR. LOCHBAUM: Yes. Thanks, Lance. It's
6 basically been said before, the economic distress
7 threat that's posed. But I think the aspect of
8 -- dovetailing on what other people have said, relates
9 back to what somebody said earlier as a strength of the
10 NRC, and that its funding is a little bit surer than some
11 other areas, some other agencies and the states. And
12 I think it's -- the economic distress threat relates to
13 the NRC's use of Agreement States where certain NRC
14 oversight and regulatory authorities are delegated to
15 the States. The States may have different funding
16 issues, so I think it's important that the NRC recognize
17 that threat and insures that all facilities and all
18 states are treated equitably, whether they do it or the
19 states do it, to make sure that economic distress
20 doesn't erode safety.

21 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thanks, Dave. Give us
22 a second and we'll drop that threat in.

23 MR. LOCHBAUM: Thanks.

24 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Other
25 challenges/threats? Things that are impacting NRC from

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the outside of the organization that may have an impact
2 on insuring the safe use of radioactive materials. Are
3 we out of gas? Do we need a break? A couple of more, come
4 on, couple more.

5 All right. While you're thinking about that
6 let's go ahead and open it up to the public to get their
7 input on it. Anyone here -- I need a different
8 microphone. Anyone here either in the audience area or
9 if anyone on the phones has something that they want to
10 bring as a strength/weakness, opportunity or threat
11 when it comes to insuring the safe use of radioactive
12 materials? I know there was one gentleman on the phone
13 line who had something that he wanted to make sure we
14 included.

15 MR. CRONIN: Yes, I had one. This is Dan
16 Cronin again from the University of Florida, but I'm
17 commenting on my own volition, not for my employer. And
18 I'm not representing the ERTR.

19 One, I call it a weakness because it's a
20 longstanding issue, is the applicable regulations
21 -- I'm screaming into the phone here because I hear all
22 this noise, is that -- is this coming through clear?

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: We can hear you fairly
24 well, sir, yes.

25 MR. CRONIN: Okay, thank you. This is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 concerning the applicable regulations for accident
2 analysis at research reactors versus test reactors.
3 Accident analysis for test reactors are evaluated in 10
4 CFR Part 100, but there is no accident analysis standard
5 for research reactors. So, research reactor accident
6 analysis is just compared against normal public
7 exposure limits in 10 CFR 20.

8 This was noted by the Atomic Safety and
9 Licensing Board back in 1972, but there still hasn't
10 been a standard developed. And, basically, that Board
11 noted that the Part 20 standards are too low, and the
12 Part 100 standards are too high for research reactors.
13 So, how fast are you typing? All right?

14 And the other issue, it might be better if
15 I email this in. It's kind of a long script that I wrote
16 up. But in a nutshell it has to do with -- to try to
17 summarize. And, again, I'm speaking for myself, not for
18 my employer or the ERT organization. I'm concerned
19 there's some mission creep. Prior to his outgoing
20 speech, Chair Jaczko mentioned -- he kind of reiterated
21 the mission of the NRC, and mentioned that, you know,
22 the NRC was going to first and foremost insure the safety
23 of the American people based on the best technical
24 information regardless of what impact it would have on
25 the industry. Well, that has bled into the non-power

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 branch, and that same wording is being used in the
2 mission statement. You know, we're going to protect the
3 health and safety of the public regardless of the affect
4 on the licensees. And the problem there is on the
5 non-power side, there's a specific section of the Atomic
6 Energy Act that addresses that and requires -- it's
7 Section 104(c) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, and it
8 requires that only the minimum amount of regulation be
9 imposed on the non-power side.

10 So, to try to summarize it, I guess
11 basically I want to -- I'm afraid there's some mission
12 creep from the power side to the non-power side, and I'd
13 like to see the mission reevaluated with regard to
14 non-power reactor regulation to insure that Section
15 104(c) of the Atomic Energy Act is complied with.

16 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. I think we got
17 that. Wow, okay, this is definitely a different
18 microphone. I think we got that down, sir. Thank you.

19 MR. CRONIN: Thank you.

20 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Any other
21 participants either here in the audience or by the
22 phone/webinar that wish to participate now and put in
23 a strength/weakness, opportunity, or threat to the
24 safety goal? Okay, anyone else at the table have
25 anything --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. EDWARDS: It's you, Lance.

2 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: It's me. Jon, please,
3 what do you have?

4 MR. EDWARDS: Yes, Lance, since we're
5 wrapping up here under threats, I think it is worth
6 building on the early comments that we had under
7 opportunities, but putting it as a threat, though,
8 specifically dealing with the back end of the fuel cycle
9 and the BRC and Congress. As I mentioned, we had the
10 earlier comment under opportunity, but I think it's
11 worth noting here, and it's somewhat stating the
12 obvious, but listing as a threat the fact that there
13 isn't clear legislative direction apparent yet, and
14 that for the next four years as you look at the Strategic
15 Plan there may be no Congressional action on this. And
16 that's just a real challenge for the Agency and the
17 federal -- for this Agency, in particular, but the
18 federal family and the States and all to deal with.

19 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay. Did we capture
20 your nugget?

21 MR. EDWARDS: In particular to the BRC
22 recommendations, I think I'd make that specific.

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, in particular
24 to the BRC recommendations.

25 MR. EDWARDS: Right.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: All right. Is that our
2 parting shot, or do we have something else before we go
3 ahead and take a break?

4 MS. GOLDBERG: Lance, are we going to try the
5 voting?

6 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Let's go ahead and
7 take a break, 15 minutes. Oh, let's go ahead and creep
8 to the five, so let's start off at 20 of, okay?

9 (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
10 record at 10:22:46 a.m., and went back on the record at
11 10:40:25 a.m.)

12 MS. CLARK: My name is Lisa Clark, and I'm
13 going to be handling this part which is the -- can you
14 hear me? That's good, thanks.

15 I wanted to just let you know that we have
16 added just one more aspect to our process this morning.
17 After we finish, we are going to give you handouts which
18 are going to contain a list of all the things that we
19 have put on our -- for each item today. And we're going
20 to ask you to help us prioritize these, so each person
21 will be asked to check off the three items that they
22 think are the highest priority.

23 So, now moving on to our Security Goals.
24 And, again, these are -- we're looking for measures that
25 relate to sabotage, theft, diversion, or loss of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 risk-significant radioactive material. And, again,
2 we're starting with strengths and weaknesses. And,
3 again, these are drivers that are internal to the NRC.

4 So, I'll start off with strengths, anybody
5 want to start? Susan.

6 MS. LANDAHL: I would say a strength is the
7 overall improvement in security performance at least at
8 the utility licensees.

9 MS. CLARK: Okay, thank you. Anybody else?

10 MR. EARLS: I'm not just -- I don't know if
11 this is an add-on or a new bullet, but I think generally
12 the power reactor security from a commercial facility
13 is generally recognized as the best protected, or one
14 of the best protected facilities in the country. So, I
15 think that needs to be recognized.

16 So, that goes along with we -- our performance is
17 improving and our standing within the other critical
18 infrastructures is very high.

19 MS. CLARK: Okay. Patricia.

20 MS. METZ: Thank you. I would say some of the
21 innovative ideas that NRC has put together to secure
22 radioactive sources in medical laboratories and
23 hospitals, which I think is a real challenge.

24 MS. CLARK: Does that capture it?

25 MS. METZ: Yes, yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. CLARK: Okay. Joe.

2 MR. KLINGER: Yes, mine is related. It's the
3 increased controls required of the radioactive material
4 licensees. And I think of enhanced security of the
5 sources, so it's a strength.

6 MS. CLARK: And what's the second piece of
7 that? We have increased controls and?

8 MR. KLINGER: Those are increased controls
9 and requirements within the rules now I think have
10 served to help insure the security of radioactive
11 materials.

12 MS. CLARK: Okay.

13 MR. KLINGER: These are controls
14 established after 9/11.

15 MS. CLARK: Okay. Alan.

16 MR. JACOBSON: NRC and the Agreement States'
17 implementation of the National Source Tracking System.

18 MS. CLARK: Patricia.

19 MS. METZ: And similar along these lines is
20 the repatriation of orphan and non-used sources from
21 abroad.

22 MS. CLARK: Okay.

23 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: I would insert waste
24 into that, as well.

25 MS. METZ: Yes.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: After sources, sources
2 and waste.

3 MS. CLARK: Okay. And Joe.

4 MR. KLINGER: The continued support by NRC
5 of the CRCPD, the orphan source program for domestic
6 sources. That's helped take care of some sources that
7 have shown up in the public domain, so I think that's
8 a strength.

9 MS. CLARK: Did we capture that accurately?

10 MR. KLINGER: Good.

11 MS. CLARK: Okay, thank you. Jon.

12 MR. EDWARDS: Along the same lines here of
13 the secure sources, I believe the Agency runs an
14 inter-agency, federal agency, as well as I think state
15 participation, Secure Source Work Group, I believe. I
16 don't have the exact terminology for it, but that
17 appears to be a very effective planning and coordinating
18 mechanism.

19 MS. CLARK: Okay, thank you.

20 MR. KLINGER: The continued support by NRC,
21 I don't think it's financial any more, but it was, for
22 the SCATR Program, the Source Collection and Threat
23 Reduction Program. It's a DOE supported program but NRC
24 certainly has been involved in it, and supports its
25 efforts. It's S-C-A-T-R, Source Collection and Threat

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Reduction Program.

2 MS. CLARK: Okay. Anything else?

3 MR. JACOBSON: And there's two other
4 programs. There's the GTRI program, and the OSRP
5 program, all DOE programs supported by the NRC that have
6 excellent results.

7 MS. CLARK: So, could you repeat those, the
8 GT?

9 MR. JACOBSON: GTRI, OSRP.

10 MS. CLARK: OSRP?

11 MR. EDWARDS: OSRP. Orphan Source --

12 MR. JACOBSON: It's Offsite Recovery.

13 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: I'm going to add
14 something on that one on that repatriation. So, I would
15 say now orphan, non-used sources, spent fuel, and used
16 fuel, and waste.

17 MS. CLARK: Okay. Was there something else?

18 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: No.

19 MS. CLARK: Okay. Anything else, or maybe we
20 should move on to weaknesses. We can always come back
21 to strengths if something else comes up.

22 MR. LOCHBAUM: This is Dave Lochbaum.

23 MS. CLARK: Oh, I'm sorry, Dave.

24 MR. LOCHBAUM: No problem. Can I put my
25 strengths at this point?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. CLARK: Absolutely.

2 MR. LOCHBAUM: Okay, thank you. We think
3 there are three strengths in this area. One was in July
4 of last year when the NRC reintegrated the security
5 elements into the public Reactor Oversight process
6 information. I think that that was a huge plus.

7 We also found two strengths related to the
8 first International Regulators Conference on Security
9 that the NRC hosted last December. We thought it was a
10 great way of demonstrating the Agency's focus on
11 security had not been diminished or distracted due to
12 efforts to address the lessons learned from Fukushima,
13 or the passage of time since 9/11.

14 Related to the International Regulators
15 Conference, we thought that the fact that it was a public
16 conference and that the NRC posted the presentation
17 materials to an on line website greatly enhanced public
18 trust and confidence in the pursuit of the Strategic
19 Goal, and also spoke to some of the transparency issues
20 identified earlier today. Thank you.

21 MS. CLARK: Okay. Thank you, Dave. Can we
22 move to the weaknesses page, please.

23 MR. KLINGER: Can I make one slight change?
24 Back up there on continued support by NRC of the DOE
25 SCATR program. It's actually a CRCPD SCATR program, and

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 then and the -- yes, CRCPD SCATR, and the DOE OSRP and
2 GTRI programs. I just get in trouble if I don't point
3 that out.

4 (Laughter.)

5 MS. CLARK: Thank you. Want these to be
6 accurate as much as we can. Is that good?

7 MR. KLINGER: Perfect.

8 MS. CLARK: Okay. Weaknesses? Yes, Alan.

9 MR. JACOBSON: Yes, the NRC's performance in
10 the implementation of the new Part 37 in a timely manner
11 has been less than stellar.

12 MR. EARLS: I'd like to put one on there for
13 following established NRC regulatory processes
14 particularly in the security area. We see a lot of things
15 going outside of the process, or being done outside of
16 the process, so this is another area where focus on
17 making sure they stay within process would be good.

18 MS. LANDAHL: So, the weakness would be not
19 following. Right?

20 MR. EARLS: Yes, right, not following.

21 MS. CLARK: So, the weakness, yes.

22 MR. EARLS: Thank you.

23 MS. CLARK: Yes?

24 MS. LANDAHL: Mine is pretty specific, but
25 the -- it's the fact that we don't have a definition of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 what constitutes high assurance. So, when you're in the
2 security realm, how far do you go in terms of what, you
3 know, we're protecting against, when do you get to the
4 point where it's really more of a national security type
5 of issue versus an individual power plant issue?

6 MS. GOLDBERG: I'm sorry. I think that
7 elaboration would be helpful.

8 MS. CLARK: Just --

9 MS. GOLDBERG: High assurance of?

10 MR. EARLS: Well, that's a specific term.
11 High assurance is a specific term.

12 MS. LANDAHL: You could put that in quotes,
13 and then just say, you know, where is the line between,
14 you know, protection for an individual, I don't know
15 what the right phrase is, but you get to a point where
16 you're really talking about, you know, almost military
17 type of --

18 MR. EARLS: It's when do you transition the
19 threshold between commercial security and protection
20 from an enemy of the State.

21 MS. LANDAHL: That's it.

22 MR. EARLS: That's the term that's --

23 MS. GOLDBERG: And protection from?

24 MR. EARLS: Enemies of the State.

25 MS. GOLDBERG: An Enemy of the State.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. LANDAHL: Yes.

2 MR. EARLS: Yes, that line is not clear.

3 MS. CLARK: Yes, sir?

4 MR. KLINGER: I think the NRC has focused
5 some efforts on tritium releases at nuclear power
6 plants, yet at the same time we have multicurie
7 generally licensed exit signs that are being discarded
8 we believe by the tens or hundreds in unlined landfills
9 with the potential for groundwater contamination of
10 tritium. And I think Pennsylvania has a pretty good
11 history of that, so -- and that's just one example. So,
12 we've had some concerns about some sources that are
13 generally licensed that probably shouldn't be generally
14 licensed. So, to me, it's a weakness.

15 MS. CLARK: So, if we make this a little
16 broader, do you want to talk -- can you capture your
17 concern about the generally licensed sources, perhaps
18 some inconsistency you see?

19 MR. KLINGER: Yes, it would be the generally
20 licensed multicurie tritium exit signs, that's the main
21 concern because we know those are getting into unlined
22 landfills. And then a broader, just continued review of
23 generally licensed devices.

24 MS. GOLDBERG: Help us with what we've got
25 there.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. KLINGER: Okay. Focused on -- they have
2 focused on tritium. That's an issue. The States are to
3 -- some sources are licensed that should be -- there are
4 generally licensed -- they are generally licensed which
5 is a lesser degree of security, so generally licensed
6 -- and these are multicurie, 10 and 20 curies of tritium
7 exit signs, and they're getting into landfills, and they
8 should be -- multicurie, generally licensed that should
9 not be generally licensed. I'd just say some multicurie
10 sources are generally licensed, example, exit signs --

11 MR. EDWARDS: Or should get higher
12 attention.

13 MR. KLINGER: Yes, they're getting into
14 landfills, and -- some multicurie sources are generally
15 licensed, example, exit signs. Okay.

16 MS. GOLDBERG: Sorry.

17 MR. KLINGER: Okay, no problem. Getting into
18 unlined landfills, but -- and those are potentially
19 contaminating the groundwater in those areas. Maybe
20 greater attention to those devices that are generally
21 licensed. They should be scrutinized more or something
22 like that.

23 MS. GOLDBERG: Need more scrutiny --

24 MR. KLINGER: Great scrutiny of the
25 generally licensed devices.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. GOLDBERG: Generally licensed devices.

2 MS. CLARK: Thank you. That helps. Anything
3 else?

4 MR. KLINGER: I've got another one, but I
5 don't know what -- if NRC can -- right now for waste,
6 low-level waste, Texas has a site now. That's great
7 news. We have access. The costs are still so prohibitive
8 that licensees are continuing to store sources,
9 unwanted sources in long-term storage, and that's never
10 a good thing. Three things can happen, and two of those
11 are bad, so whatever NRC -- it's a weakness. There's
12 still no economically feasible disposal option for
13 unwanted sources in this country.

14 MS. GOLDBERG: Let me just say no
15 economically feasible --

16 MR. KLINGER: Yes, disposal options for
17 unwanted sealed sources. So, we have programs like SCATR
18 that help that, but it's a real problem. It's a
19 challenge. Maybe I should have put that under threats
20 or challenges.

21 MS. CLARK: Yes, it might fit under
22 external.

23 MR. KLINGER: Yes.

24 MS. CLARK: But we can always move it.

25 MR. JACOBSON: That's an excellent point,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Joe, and I'll just follow-up on that. Also, there's no
2 federal regulation that prohibits a licensed facility
3 from stockpiling waste or unwanted sources.

4 MR. KLINGER: We've had some bad examples of
5 what can happen when you do that.

6 MR. JACOBSON: Safety and security risks go
7 up and you increase the cost of decommissioning.

8 MR. KLINGER: Oh, yes.

9 MS. CLARK: Chris, did you have something?

10 MR. EARLS: Yes. Right now it appears the
11 trend is to transition the security measures that we
12 employ at power reactors, starting to migrate to the
13 other licensees, and there's a concern that there's not
14 an adequate consideration of the actual source term or
15 potential for a problem at these facilities. So, I
16 guess, trying to, you know, encourage the NRC to keep
17 that in mind when you apply these security measures to
18 other licensees, and that we don't go overboard.

19 MS. GOLDBERG: Can you recap that one?

20 MS. CLARK: Do you need to have -- could you
21 perhaps try to summarize that?

22 MR. EARLS: Consider the actual threat and
23 consequences at non-power reactor facilities when
24 employing new security measures.

25 MR. KLINGER: Because right now they use the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 categorization document as the steps of priorities and
2 controls -- determined by what category those sources
3 are in, so just more attention to that, or --

4 MR. EARLS: Yes, more consideration. You
5 know, not all measures employed at a power reactor are
6 appropriate for a fuel cycle facility, or a medical
7 facility, or whatever facility.

8 MS. CLARK: Chris, I'm not sure that we
9 captured the last piece of your thought there. Consider
10 threat and consequences when?

11 MR. EARLS: When employing new security
12 regulations. Let's put it that way.

13 MR. EDWARDS: So, it's sort of tailoring the
14 new regulations to the facility, to the risks --

15 MR. EARLS: Absolutely, that's exactly the
16 point.

17 MS. CLARK: Dave, do you have anything to
18 add? We can put in -- we'll be putting in your input
19 on --

20 MR. LOCHBAUM: No, we didn't have any input
21 for this one.

22 MS. CLARK: Okay.

23 MR. KLINGER: On the one above the one you're
24 working on there, I think that we're -- on the last part
25 of it it says risks go up and you increase cost of

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 decommissioning rather than when you -- that when
2 should be an and, right?

3 MR. JACOBSON: Right. And, also, can we add
4 waste, stockpiling waste and unwanted sources?

5 MS. LANDAHL: Weakness in understanding and
6 application of the Backfit Rule by NSIR. Understanding
7 and application.

8 MS. GOLDBERG: We can't hear you too well.
9 Could you repeat --

10 MS. LANDAHL: Sorry. Understanding and
11 application of the Backfit Rule by NSIR, N-S-I-R.

12 MS. CLARK: Okay. Anything else before we
13 move on?

14 MR. EARLS: Yes. The distribution and
15 control of safeguards materials with non-licensee
16 entities.

17 MS. GOLDBERG: We didn't hear the end of
18 that.

19 MS. CLARK: Could you repeat it? They --

20 MR. EARLS: Distribution and control of
21 safeguards materials by non-licensee entities. And, I
22 guess, inadequate or insufficient -- no, leave it that
23 way. That's good.

24 MS. CLARK: Okay. Maybe this is a good time
25 now to move into the external drivers, and we'll start

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 with opportunities. So, any thoughts on this one?

2 MR. EARLS: I'd like to just --

3 MS. CLARK: Oh, do we need to go back?

4 MR. EARLS: No. Well, I'd like to see us
5 reproduce a comment from the previous goal area on cyber
6 security, and the overlap, and compatibility of cyber
7 security regulation.

8 MS. GOLDBERG: These are opportunities
9 under safety?

10 MR. EARLS: I think so. I think that's where
11 we put it. I think it may be the second bullet under the
12 opportunities. Maybe not.

13 MS. GOLDBERG: Maybe threats?

14 MR. EDWARDS: I thought it was on threats.

15 MR. EARLS: Maybe it's threats. Okay. Well,
16 then I'll reserve that for the threats category.

17 MR. EDWARDS: I think that's where we put it.

18 MS. GOLDBERG: First one?

19 MR. EDWARDS: Yes.

20 MS. GOLDBERG: Okay, let's put that
21 -- should we move that all together or does it belong
22 in both?

23 MR. EARLS: I'm okay with either way, move
24 it or reproduce it.

25 MR. EDWARDS: I think you're right. It does

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 bear on both, though.

2 MR. EARLS: It needs to be in security
3 because that's where the regulation is.

4 MR. EDWARDS: Yes.

5 MR. EARLS: But it has an impact on the other
6 area, as well.

7 MS. GOLDBERG: Move it where -- we can stay
8 here and go to opportunities after.

9 MS. CLARK: Okay, we can stay with threats
10 since we've started there.

11 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: So, I think terrorism is
12 the one we wanted to put in.

13 MR. KLINGER: I think a threat, too, is
14 inadequate control in other countries. If they lose
15 control over there, it ends up over here and causes
16 problems, so -- I know IAEA and others in the State
17 Department I'm sure are doing everything they can to
18 help these other countries, but we've had a number of
19 instances.

20 MR. EARLS: Can we go back to the second
21 bullet? You know, right now I think the NRC could argue
22 that they're already doing -- they're considering
23 threats of terrorism. When you all bring that up is there
24 something different or a different aspect of terrorism
25 that we should be having them focus on?

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. MANNING: Well, transportation is
2 always -- while it's in route somewhere it's always a
3 big threat. Traffic security --

4 MR. EARLS: Terrorism impacts on
5 transportation security.

6 MR. MANNING: That and just the realtime
7 tracking. I mean, you can't actually track the source
8 itself, you track the cab. So, if that trailer goes
9 somewhere else, the cab could be -- and you have no idea
10 where that trailer has gone, so that's --

11 MR. EARLS: Yes, I think the more we can get
12 that kind of focus, it will help them. So, Patricia and
13 Cindy, were there other aspects that you guys were
14 thinking about?

15 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: I was thinking is just
16 the very nature of terrorism itself changes, is an
17 evolving and changing threat and definition, so it needs
18 to be constantly refreshed, and how you think about it.
19 A threat isn't from a well-defined --

20 MS. METZ: Right. And, certainly, much
21 easier access to radioactive materials or sources than
22 you ever would have to nuclear material. And it's still
23 out there.

24 MR. MANNING: Like the accountability of
25 like the trans shipments, the stuff that's coming in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 from the other countries. You don't know like there's
2 stuff coming in from Canada and it goes out to the ports,
3 there's no accountability of how much actually went out.
4 And you don't know how much actually made it to the end
5 site, so somewhere in between you've got to have the
6 accountability of, you know, 1,000 curies went out and
7 1,000 curies made it there. But there's none of that
8 right now.

9 MR. KLINGER: That's a threat, but it's also
10 a weakness.

11 MR. MANNING: Right.

12 MR. KLINGER: Yes.

13 MS. CLARK: Does that capture everything
14 tracking sources?

15 MR. MANNING: Not just tracking the sources
16 but making sure that the quantity that went out made it
17 to the end location.

18 MS. CLARK: I'm wondering if we can talk a
19 little bit more about more access to radioactive
20 sources. What were you thinking for that?

21 MS. METZ: It's far easier for someone to get
22 a radioactive source than it is for someone to gain
23 access to nuclear material just because of the nature
24 of what the -- what it is, because nuclear material we
25 have secured tightly for years. And we've done that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 forever. Radioactive sources we became more aware after
2 9/11, and then went to tighten those, but still every
3 hospital has radioactive sources all over the world, and
4 it's just -- they're smaller, they're easier to walk out
5 with, and this is -- it's just a different issue.

6 MS. CLARK: So, do you have that, Fran?

7 MS. GOLDBERG: I think we got that.

8 MS. CLARK: Okay.

9 MS. GOLDBERG: I think we should separate
10 these maybe, though.

11 MS. CLARK: Any other threats? Dave, do you
12 have anything to add here?

13 MR. LOCHBAUM: Well, it's really a threat,
14 strength, weakness, or whatever the fourth
15 -- opportunity. But we do have a comment on the
16 performance indicator itself for this Strategic Goal
17 Number Two. The first performance indicator is the
18 number of instances of sabotage, threats, diversion, or
19 losses for significant quantities of radioactive
20 material. It seems more a measure of the bad guy's
21 performance than the good guy's performance. If a
22 facility fired all of its guards and tore down all of
23 its fences, as long as nobody tried to sabotage or steal
24 anything, his goal would be met. But I don't know that
25 that's what we want. So, it looks like that performance

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 indicator is way, way too reactive than proactive. We
2 would suggest something aimed at how well security
3 measures are being implemented and how effective they
4 are rather than what the performance of the bad guys
5 might be.

6 MS. CLARK: That's certainly what we would
7 need to measure. I guess I would ask just how would you
8 -- do you have any suggestions for how -- what we would
9 look -- how we would measure that?

10 MR. LOCHBAUM: Well, I think it's reflective
11 of when the NRC does security audits, inspections, and
12 so on, you know, if everybody across the board is doing
13 a lousy job, then I would think that your performance
14 goal is not being met. If on the other hand those
15 inspections reveal that licensees are meeting or
16 exceeding the NRC's security standards, then I would say
17 that this performance goal is likely met, so it's not
18 -- it should be a measure of how well licensees are
19 implementing the NRC's expectations rather than
20 reflective of how successful bad guys are carrying out
21 their nefarious deeds.

22 MS. CLARK: Thank you. That's a good point.

23 MS. GOLDBERG: Lisa, if I could just comment
24 on that. I think I might be able to help bring it out.
25 Thanks, Dave, you make a really good point. And that is

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 exactly where we're going with the next level of our
2 analysis. In other words, this is sort of the end
3 outcome, the very end outcome we want to prevent. But
4 then what does NRC do at the next level down, and several
5 levels down from here to prevent these threats and
6 things like having an ROP soon about security that then
7 looks at how the licensees are performing at a lower
8 level on specific elements of that. So, that's where
9 we're headed and you make a very, very good point. And
10 this group, and all the information we're getting from
11 this group is going to be helping us look at the next
12 level, and look at our objectives for how we meet these
13 goals.

14 MR. LOCHBAUM: Thank you.

15 MS. CLARK: Chris, you have another threat?

16 MR. EARLS: Well, it's not a threat. When
17 -- it would go back to a weakness, I guess, and then an
18 opportunity.

19 MS. CLARK: Well, this would be a weak -- can
20 we move --

21 MR. EARLS: I think she's putting in UCS.

22 MS. CLARK: Oh, you're putting in -- okay.
23 So, we'll pause here.

24 MR. EARLS: I'll just wait for her to catch
25 up.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MS. CLARK: Thanks.

2 MS. GOLDBERG: We're caught up. We're fine.

3 MR. EARLS: Okay. Can you go to the
4 weaknesses, please? NRC regulations make it very
5 difficult to employ advanced technologies in security.
6 Are you in safety or security? No, that's --

7 MS. GOLDBERG: No, this is security.

8 MR. EARLS: This is security.

9 MS. CLARK: Could you elaborate on that a
10 little bit?

11 MR. EARLS: We're not -- power reactor
12 facilities are not able to employ the state-of-the-art
13 security technology because of the current regulatory
14 structure.

15 MS. GOLDBERG: They're too prescriptive. Is
16 that what you're saying?

17 MR. EARLS: Not prescriptive, they're
18 -- they don't allow for the advances, so I'm trying to
19 think of a concise way to say that.

20 MR. EDWARDS: Too limiting? Is that a --

21 MR. EARLS: Yes, we're -- I guess limiting
22 I guess is the way of saying it.

23 MR. KLINGER: Now, why is that, is it because
24 they have to approve it, so you --

25 MR. EARLS: They have to approve it. We have

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 to go through a lot of hoops, and there's an
2 over-reliance on the tried and true old-fashioned type
3 security. So, I think it's just --

4 MR. EDWARDS: There needs to be an expedited
5 review --

6 MR. EARLS: -- a reluctance to go there too
7 quickly.

8 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: So, the
9 state-of-the-art of technological solutions out paces
10 regulatory change. I think that's what he's --

11 MR. EARLS: Yes, absolutely.

12 MR. MITCHELL: That could be added to the
13 safety side, as well, because all evolution of alert
14 notification systems have to be integrated and these
15 emerging technologies is --

16 MR. EARLS: Digital instrumentation would
17 definitely fall in that category on the safety side.

18 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: Or some of the analyses
19 like the seismic analyses --

20 MR. MITCHELL: Well, those whole beyond
21 design-basis threats and that stuff, it's the natural
22 -- impact of natural disasters is --

23 MS. ATKINS-DUFFIN: So, that would be
24 scientific understanding out --

25 MS. GOLDBERG: Okay. We've captured it in

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 safety, as well.

2 MR. MITCHELL: Great.

3 MS. CLARK: Anything else? Maybe it's a good
4 time to move back to opportunities. Yes?

5 MR. JACOBSON: The NRC has an opportunity to
6 explore, and develop, and implement a security culture
7 statement.

8 MS. CLARK: Do you mean a policy statement?

9 MR. JACOBSON: I was thinking along the
10 lines of a safety culture.

11 MR. EDWARDS: Parallel to the safety culture
12 review, actually.

13 MR. KLINGER: It seems like there could be
14 some -- and I defer to the State Department
15 representative, are there some opportunities in an
16 international level that can be strengthened or
17 something to improve the situation beyond our borders,
18 or is everything being --

19 MS. METZ: Definitely in terms of working
20 with IAEA and other countries, frequently turning to NRC
21 has -- you know, the -- I hate to say this because I know
22 how sensitive words get, like the premier regulator, and
23 this is an opportunity for them to go out in the security
24 side also. And I know in many cases they already have.

25 MR. KLINGER: Good. So, a continued

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 collaboration with IAEA on this.

2 MS. METZ: And other countries.

3 MR. KLINGER: That would be great.

4 MR. EARLS: I would add WINS in there,
5 because it goes along with -- you could put IAEA/WINS,
6 W-I-N-S.

7 MR. MITCHELL: What is WINS?

8 MR. EARLS: I believe it's World Institute
9 of Nuclear Security. It was formed a couple of years ago.

10 MS. METZ: I think they'll know.

11 MR. MITCHELL: Is that a UN group also?

12 MR. EARLS: No, it's loosely affiliated with
13 IAEA, but it's -- they're based out of Vienna, as well.

14 MR. EDWARDS: I'll offer something for an
15 opportunity, and I'm not sure if the Agency has already
16 done something similar to this or not, but I'll just
17 capture it here. An opportunity to learn best practices
18 from other industries also that are faced with these
19 kind of material security conditions, so I imagine maybe
20 they've thought of it, but just to capture it. An
21 opportunity to learn best practices from other
22 industries or other industry sectors that have
23 sensitive materials that must be safeguarded and
24 secured.

25 MS. CLARK: Dave, do you have anything to add

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 here?

2 MR. LOCHBAUM: No, thanks.

3 MR. EARLS: I think we heard it earlier, the
4 notion of better or more integration on security with
5 other agencies. You know, we're starting and have been
6 working on that but I think we have a ways to go, so I
7 guess I would say more continued integration with other
8 agencies.

9 MS. GOLDBERG: Lisa, we do have some input
10 from someone from NNSA that we can --

11 mS. CLARK: Okay.

12 MS. GOLDBERG: I'm not sure what NNSA stands
13 for.

14 MR. EDWARDS: National Nuclear Security
15 Administration.

16 MR. JACOBSON: They implement the GTORI and
17 the OSRP programs.

18 MR. EDWARDS: It's really good work.

19 MS. GOLDBERG: Are they on the phone?

20 MS. CLARK: Do we have anybody from NNSA on
21 the telephone?

22 MS. GOLDBERG: NNSI, I think.

23 MR. EDWARDS: SA.

24 MS. GOLDBERG: NNSA. I guess not, so you'll
25 have to just read these for yourselves. They start right

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 after -- the ones that have multi lines. (Off
2 microphone comments.)

3 MS. CLARK: So, are we -- anything else
4 anybody wants to add? I think we might be at a good place
5 to stop this process now and give you a chance to review
6 everything, so you can decide how you want to prioritize
7 them. Fran, do you want to --

8 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: And we certainly
9 check to see if they have any comments.

10 MS. CLARK: That's right, I'm sorry. So, we
11 have, of course, people on the phone. Is there anybody
12 who would like to add anything on security? So, you
13 should be getting now, and are we going to send one to
14 Dave Lochbaum, as well?

15 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: We're going to send
16 the files electronically.

17 MS. CLARK: Okay. So, Dave, you'll be
18 getting this file electronically. And this should be a
19 printout of all the items we came up on safety.

20 (Audio interrupted.)

21 MS. GOLDBERG: Lance, did you say three on
22 each page?

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Yes.

24 MS. GOLDBERG: If you could circle your top
25 three items on each page.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 MR. EDWARDS: And you want us to rank our top
2 three?

3 MS. GOLDBERG: Yes, you can.

4 MR. EDWARDS: Okay.

5 MS. GOLDBERG: But if you want to just circle
6 your top three, if you want to put one, two, three,
7 that's fine on each page. Meanwhile, we're going to
8 print the security ones.

9 MR. CRONIN: Hi, this is Dan Cronin. Can I
10 ask a question?

11 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Sure, go ahead, Dave.

12 MR. CRONIN: It's Dan. I'm sorry.

13 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Okay, sorry, Dan. Go
14 ahead.

15 MR. CRONIN: Is the prioritizing the bullet,
16 is that only for the participants, or is that something
17 to be emailed to me, as well?

18 MS. GOLDBERG: If you'd like we could
19 certainly email it to you.

20 MR. CRONIN: I would definitely like that.

21 MS. GOLDBERG: Okay. Would you send an email
22 to fran.goldberg@NRC.gov and I'll send you these.

23 MR. CRONIN: Okay. I'm sorry, can you give
24 that email again.

25 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Actually, are you on

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 the webinar, sir?

2 MR. CRONIN: Yes, I am.

3 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: If you're on the
4 webinar, can you just send it in as a comment on the
5 webinar, or a question on the webinar?

6 MS. GOLDBERG: With your email address.

7 MR. CRONIN: Okay.

8 MS. GOLDBERG: We'd be happy to send it to
9 you.

10 MR. CRONIN: All right, thank you.

11 MS. GOLDBERG: Yes. All right. We're going
12 to pass around the other ones for you, as well. I think
13 we probably only have what, two minutes for this,
14 because they're less.

15 (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
16 record at 11:27:31 a.m., and went back on the record at
17 11:33:07 a.m.)

18 MS. GOLDBERG: For those of you who aren't
19 finished, I'll give you a little more time at the end,
20 but for now I'll give you a little bit of a wrap-up here.

21 Appreciate everybody who came today. This
22 will be tremendously helpful to us. Let me just mention
23 again that I'm Fran Goldberg, and together with Gordon
24 Peterson over here from the CFO's office behind you, we
25 are the Co-Chairs of the NRC's Strategic Planning

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 Working Group, and we have had during the day, during
2 this morning quite a few members of the group, of the
3 Working Group have been sitting in listening to what
4 you've been saying. And we're going to take all of the
5 information that you've given to us, we're going to put
6 it together in a spreadsheet and with all your votes,
7 and we're going to take the highest priority items that
8 you voted for and integrate them into the work that we're
9 doing to develop the Strategic Objectives and
10 Performance Measures for the NRC's Strategic Plan.

11 We had the goals and their performance
12 indicators from the Commission, the next step is one
13 level down. That's the objectives and their indicators.
14 And that document will -- once we've completed this
15 work, what we are calling Phase Two which is up to that
16 point in the Strategic Plan. We'll be sending that to
17 the Commission. The Commission will be voting on that,
18 and giving us direction. Then we're going to actually
19 draft the entire Strategic Plan. That will be going out
20 for public comment in late fall or -- rather late summer
21 or early fall. Probably Federal Register Notice and
22 notices on our website and whatnot, inviting the public,
23 you all, and of course other members of the public to
24 send us any comments they may have on the plan. We'll
25 take that back, we'll incorporate the comments, we'll

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 send the draft plan incorporating the comments to the
2 Commission, and they'll be voting on the final plan.

3 So, this really is a very important part of
4 our process because it is the piece that has probably
5 the biggest impact on the part of the plan that is going
6 to change the most which is the objectives and their
7 measures. So, again, we do appreciate very much that you
8 came in today and gave us your time to do this.

9 Is there anything, Gordon, that you'd like
10 to add?

11 MR. PETERSON: I've been sitting back here
12 with this cold. I'm sure many of you heard me sneeze,
13 but I'd like to say thank you, as well, for attending.
14 Your comments were very forthright and open, and we
15 appreciate that. We will use the comments, as Fran has
16 mentioned, and we thank you once again for taking some
17 time out of your busy schedules to be here. So, with
18 that, Fran --

19 MS. GOLDBERG: Yes, those of you who have
20 finished, if you would just leave them for us and if you
21 need more time to work on them, go ahead. And can give
22 you the gift of 25 minutes.

23 FACILITATOR RAKOVAN: Thank you.

24 MS. GOLDBERG: And I just want to thank our
25 Facilitators, Lisa Clark and Lance Rakovan, and our

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com

1 scribe, the one who is still here, Sharon Schwartz from
2 the EDO's office, and all the other folks, Rick Baum and
3 others who helped us put this meeting together.

4 (Whereupon, the proceedings went off the
5 record at 11:36 a.m.)
6
7
8

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS

1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

www.nealrgross.com