

Official Transcript of Proceedings
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: Mock Adversary Force Options/Alternatives
 Public Meeting

Docket Number: N/A

Location: Rockville, Maryland

Date: August 22, 2018

Work Order No.: NRC-3853

Pages 1-27

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

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

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION
+ + + + +
PUBLIC MEETING
MOCK ADVERSARY FORCE OPTIONS/ALTERNATIVES
+ + + + +
WEDNESDAY,
AUGUST 22, 2018
+ + + + +
ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND
+ + + + +

The Public Meeting convened in the
Commissioners' Hearing Room at the Nuclear Regulatory
Commission, One White Flint North, 11555 Rockville
Pike, at 9:00 a.m., Marissa Bailey, Director,
Division of Security Operations, Office of Nuclear
Security and Incident Response, presiding.

BEFORE:
MARISSA BAILEY, Director, DSO, NSIR
DAVID BRADFIELD, DSO, NSIR
DANTE JOHNSON, DSO, NSIR

1 ALSO PRESENT:

2 ALICIA WILLIAMSON, NSIR, Project Manager

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

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

CONTENTS

Welcome and Introductions	3
Alicia Williamson, Project Manager, NSIR	
Introduction of Panel Members	6
NRC Staff Presentation	6
Marissa Bailey, Director, Division of Security	
Operations, Office of Nuclear Security	
and Incident Response	
David Bradfield, Force-on-Force Program	
Discussion	14, 26
Next Steps	24
David Bradfield, Force-on-Force Program	
Marissa Bailey, Director, Division of Security	
Operations, Office of Nuclear Security	
and Incident Response	

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1

2

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433

1 P R O C E E D I N G S

2 9:01 a.m.

3 MS. WILLIAMSON: (presiding) Hi. Good
4 morning, everybody.

5 I want to welcome everybody to NRC's
6 Office of Nuclear Security and Incident Response's
7 public meeting on stakeholder feedback regarding
8 potential long-term options for the Mock Adversary
9 Force used in NRC-conducted force-on-force
10 inspections.

11 My name is Alicia Williamson, and I am a
12 Project Manager within NSIR's Division of Security
13 Operations.

14 Before we get started, I would like to
15 quickly step through a few housekeeping items and
16 meeting groundrules. First off, for anyone who may
17 not be familiar with NRC facilities, we are located
18 in the One White Flint Commissioner Hearing Room
19 today. The badges you have will allow you to access
20 this first level of the building, which includes the
21 cafeterias, the convenience store, and bathroom. If
22 you need to go to the bathroom, just go out these two
23 doors here, turn left. The women's room is on the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 lefthand side, and the men's room is on the righthand
2 side. If you past the double doors, you've went too
3 far.

4 Next, if there's a fire drill or any type
5 of emergency, we will proceed right out those same
6 doors, go right up the steps to the right, and out on
7 the front plaza. Please stay with an NRC staff member
8 until the emergency is over, so that we can return
9 back to the building, we can return you back to the
10 building.

11 I would also like to ask if folks who
12 have cell phones, if you could keep them on silent or
13 vibrate, so we do not interrupt today's meeting,
14 since we are having it transcribed. We have a
15 transcriptionist here with us today to capture the
16 meeting.

17 Also, if you need to speak, for folks in
18 the room, we ask that you please come up to one of
19 the freestanding microphones here or the podium, or
20 I could bring you the cordless mic as well, so that
21 we can get a clean transcript, as well as the folks
22 on the phone can hear you.

23 Speaking of getting a clean transcript,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have Brittany, our conference call operator,
2 working the conference line. Brittany, could you go
3 ahead and describe the directions again to the folks
4 on the line on how they can ask questions or provide
5 feedback?

6 OPERATOR: If you would like to ask a
7 question, please press *, then 1, and record your
8 name clearly when prompted. If you need to withdraw
9 that question, you may press *, then 2.

10 MS. WILLIAMSON: Thank you, Brittany.

11 And finally, please keep in mind that
12 this is a public meeting, and no safeguards,
13 proprietary or sensitive information will be
14 discussed here today. Therefore, while in the
15 discussion portion and the feedback section of the
16 meeting, please be mindful of what you're saying.

17 Also, I understand that there's a lot
18 of.. variety of issues behind this particular
19 meeting. We're going to ask folks to stay focused
20 and stay within the scope of what the meeting is here
21 today.

22 Now, before I turn things over to the
23 panel, are there any questions about the groundrules

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or the housekeeping items that I just mentioned?

2 (No response.)

3 Are there any questions from anyone on
4 the phone about the groundrules or housekeeping
5 items, although I know you're not necessarily in the
6 room and they don't apply to you all?

7 OPERATOR: No questions on the phone.

8 MS. WILLIAMSON: Thank you.

9 All right. With that, I'm going to go
10 ahead and turn the meeting over to the panel members,
11 and ask them, first, to all three introduce
12 themselves. And I think Marissa is going to start us
13 off.

14 Thank you.

15 MS. BAILEY: Thanks, Alicia.

16 I'm Marissa Bailey. I'm the Director for
17 Division of Security Operations in the Office of
18 Nuclear Security and Incident Response.

19 MR. BRADFIELD: Dave Bradfield. Work for
20 NRC in the Force-on-Force Program.

21 MR. JOHNSON: Dante Johnson. I'm the
22 Chief of the Security Performance Evaluation Branch
23 in the NSIR Division of Security Operations.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BAILEY: So, good morning. And,
2 first of all, I'd like to thank all of you here in
3 the room, and also on the phone, for participating in
4 this meeting and, also, for your interest in this
5 subject matter.

6 For this meeting, we are seeking
7 stakeholder input on the options for the Mock
8 Adversary Force and, also, for the criteria that we
9 use to evaluate those options. And specifically,
10 we're asking for input on two things: are there other
11 options that the NRC should be evaluating, and are
12 there other criteria that we should be using to
13 evaluate those options?

14 Can you go to the next slide, please?

15 I'll start with some background
16 information. In April of this year, the Commission
17 approved the use of the Joint Composite Adversary
18 Force for exercises at NextEra and Entergy sites for
19 2018 and for 2019 only.

20 In that same Staff Requirements
21 Memorandum, the Commission also directed the staff to
22 provide an assessment of the JCAF and, also, options
23 for a long-term alternative to the NEI-managed CAF.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 Next slide.

2 And as I've mentioned before, the purpose
3 of this meeting is to solicit input on the options,
4 what options we should be considering, and on the
5 criteria we're using. And I would like to emphasize
6 the scope of this meeting. It is to ask you the
7 question, though, there are other options we should
8 be looking at? Are there other criteria we should
9 be using? The purpose of this meeting is not to seek
10 input on the options themselves. We're not asking
11 you to give us your thoughts on what the advantages
12 or disadvantages of the options are. It's simply,
13 should we be looking at other options and should we
14 be looking at other criteria?

15 As for the agenda, we're going to start
16 off with Dave Bradfield giving you a pretty high-
17 level overview on the preliminary options that we're
18 looking at, at this time, so that you have a sense
19 for what they are and, also, for the criteria that
20 we're using. And then, we'll open it up to the floor,
21 to the stakeholders, for input.

22 So, Dave?

23 MR. BRADFIELD: So, as Marissa indicated,

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I want to just cover quickly kind of what we're
2 looking at right now. Our goal, obviously, is to put
3 the most viable options in front of the Commission.
4 And part of that, in doing so, we wanted to vet a
5 number of different options. So, some of the
6 preliminary options that we're looking at you could
7 basically break into two categories, industry options
8 and, then, NRC options.

9 Under the industry options, so far, what
10 we're considering is a single Mock Adversary Force
11 that would be provided by the industry via NEI. So,
12 that would be kind of the previous status quo where
13 we were before this SRM came out and the events that
14 occurred back in January-February.

15 And then, also looking at a single Mock
16 Adversary Force provided by the industry via some
17 type of independent advisory or oversight board that
18 essentially would perform the function that NEI had
19 performed in the past, where we would still have a
20 single Mock Adversary Force.

21 Another option would be to have multiple
22 Mock Adversary Forces in that each utility, or if it
23 was an independent site, would have their own

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 adversary, and that would similar be to what we're
2 doing with the JCAF option, but everyone would do
3 that on their own. There would be no NEI or
4 independent advisory oversight.

5 And then, the last option under the
6 industry-provided options would be multiple MAFs,
7 which is really the current status quo. And that is
8 to have the JCAF for NextEra and Entergy and, then,
9 an NEI CAF for the rest of the industry.

10 Under the NRC-provided Mock Adversary
11 Force options, there's really two primary categories.
12 That would be for us to enter into some type of MOU
13 or MOA with a federal partner or to look at an RFP
14 via third-party vendor, essentially do a contract.

15 Under the federal partners, there's a
16 number of different options that we're currently
17 vetting. Right now, what that looks like -- and this
18 kind of goes back to some of the options that existed
19 back in 2007, when we did the notation vote at that
20 time for the Commission, which would include DOE,
21 DTRA, and we are also looking at a potential
22 partnership with the National Guard Bureau.

23 Under the contract, that's pretty

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 straightforward. It would be putting out a Request
2 for Proposal for a bid for vendors to come in and,
3 basically, fulfilling that need for the MAF under
4 that.

5 You want to go to the next slide.

6 So, essentially, that's the current
7 options that we have on the table, which his really
8 what kind of facilitated this meeting and what we're
9 hoping to get. Are there some options that we're not
10 considering? Whatever options we have today, plus
11 whatever we get that comes out of this meeting, we're
12 going to evaluate against certain criteria. And a
13 lot of this criteria was developed previously in
14 2007, and we wanted to have some type of consistency
15 in that regard. But we also wanted to look at other
16 factors that weren't necessarily part of that 2007
17 criteria.

18 So, to kind of start off there, we're
19 going to continue to look at the credibility of a
20 Mock Adversary Force. And really, what that means
21 is, the consistency and reliability regarding
22 tactical application. Can they perform to the
23 expectations of the NRC and meet the standards that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 we have set for what an Adversary Force should look
2 like? And then, what is the team composition? Where
3 do those folks come from? And what is the makeup of
4 the team? So, we'll continue to do that.

5 And then, one of the criteria would be
6 sustainability and risk. That really encompasses a
7 few things. When we talk about sustainability, we're
8 concerned with how do we go forward and what are our
9 contingencies if another event occurred like this
10 January-February where the agency isn't able to meet
11 its requirements to meet the Energy Policy Act and
12 what that looks like, And then, what risks are
13 associated with each of these options as we go
14 forward?

15 And then, of course, we'll, again, as
16 before, look at impact on licensee activities. This
17 is really the non-financial piece of that. And what
18 we're looking at there is, what is the impact on a
19 site with regard to logistics? It could involve
20 things from fitness for duty, any number of
21 administrative tasks that would be an additional
22 burden to the site that maybe hasn't been before, or
23 currently is, and that wouldn't be in the future.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And then, the next would be knowledge
2 transfer. This was a big piece of our last
3 assessment, and we wanted to include it. This is
4 really referring to what happens when you take an
5 adversary member who is part of the Mock Adversary
6 Force, and you give him a little bit of extra tactical
7 training, and teach them about target sets, and what
8 happens when he's done with the team; where does he
9 go? Is he going back to the site to enhance their
10 program? Is he going somewhere else? And so, we're
11 definitely interested in analyzing the knowledge
12 transfer piece as a piece of that criteria.

13 And then, the conflict of interest, or
14 really what we should say is the perception of or
15 potential for conflict of interest. This is
16 something that we've worked with in the past and we've
17 mitigated it in the past. And there shouldn't be any
18 reason that we couldn't mitigate it in the future,
19 but it's something that we have to consider as part
20 of the analysis.

21 And then, obviously, the financial
22 impact, both on the industry and the agency, as we go
23 forward, and what that looks like long term.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 And then, implementation schedule. You
2 know, with our main goal being to put viable options
3 in front of the Commission, one of the things that we
4 need to consider is, when the Commission decides what
5 option we're going to go with long term, what does
6 that look like with regard to impact of getting it in
7 place and up and running? And we'll talk a little
8 bit later about what some of our next steps and goals
9 are with regard to timeline.

10 And then, the last would be oversight,
11 and that's regarding the administrative and
12 operational oversight. I think everyone kind of
13 knows the current structure that we had, or I should
14 say the past structure we had with NEI with regard to
15 administrative and operational oversight, and how
16 that plays a part going forward with the various types
17 of options that might exist.

18 So, that's currently the criteria that we
19 have. Part of why we're soliciting, is there
20 something that we're not thinking of that maybe we
21 should be considering or something on here that maybe
22 isn't relevant anymore that maybe we should do away
23 with? So, that's kind of where we're at now.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 I think, with that, we open it up for any
2 discussion or questions with regard to potential
3 options and/or additional criteria.

4 MS. WILLIAMSON: And this is a quick
5 reminder. Anyone that comes to the microphone, could
6 you please introduce yourself and your affiliation?
7 Thank you.

8 MR. FENCL: Mark Fencl, NextEra Energy.
9 Under the evaluation criteria, one thing
10 I think is missing is long-term benefits from
11 establishing a national standard, as an example, by
12 having a national standard for CAF expectations for
13 your site teams, training expectations for your site
14 teams, and the benefits you could receive from that.
15 So, being a partaker of JCAF and seeing the work we
16 put into it, and the benefits I'm seeing outside of
17 triennials, how is that going to be evaluated under
18 the criteria? Because we can talk financials; that's
19 an easy number. But what's the downhill effect of
20 establishing, as an example, an industry team with
21 sites performing their own exercises to the site
22 programs? And how is that evaluated?

23 So, that's, I think, something that has

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 to be put into each of the actions, right, impact to
2 site and impact to site programs? Because if I have
3 a strong annual Force-on-Force Program with strong
4 CAF performance, and I'm challenging myself, I'm not
5 really worried about triennial exercises. You guys
6 are just a check in a box.

7 MR. BRADFIELD: Thank you, Mark.

8 MR. LaPLANTE: Yes, I'm Jon LaPlante from
9 Entergy.

10 And looking at the industry-provided Mock
11 Adversary Force options that you have listed here,
12 you do make reference to multiple Mock Adversary
13 Forces. Each utility or independent site would
14 maintain their own. There's a piece to that that I
15 think could enhance that. With standardizing
16 qualifications, selection, training, and re-
17 qualification, I think that we could put together a
18 program where the industry sends their folks to be
19 qualified, selected, go through the whole process,
20 sort of like what Mark and I did with just the two
21 utilities. It may take multiple selection courses or
22 multiple training courses, but I think it's an option
23 that the industry could implement.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MR. BRADFIELD: Thank you, Jon.

2 MR. ELLIS: Jim Ellis. I'm Director of
3 Nuclear Security and Emergency Protectiveness for
4 FirstEnergy Nuclear Operating Company.

5 One of the things I'd like to share a
6 view of, when we look at all the options going
7 forward, I previously worked in Region III as an
8 Operator Licensing Examiner and was an SRO on shift
9 earlier in my career.

10 And when I came to security, I owned
11 fleet emergency protectiveness and security. One of
12 the things that struck me was it's done a little
13 differently. Within the operator license programs,
14 the NRC does an assess and audit of our programs to
15 our training programs, to our commitments, and we
16 relicense our Senior Reactor Operators and Reactor
17 Operators every cycle within our program, and the NRC
18 inspects it.

19 Within emergency preparedness, which is
20 also a very important function for public health and
21 safety, we write our annual drills; we conduct
22 training; we conduct full-blown integrated drills
23 with FEMA, the state, the counties. And NRC comes

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 out and assesses. They assess our ability to run the
2 drill and meet the standards we committed to, which
3 is an NRC-approved plan.

4 And in the security world, we have an
5 NRC-approved security plan, working to a series of
6 regulatory documents, but in that world the NRC comes
7 out and runs the drill for us. We run those same
8 drills every year on an annual basis. And at least
9 for my utility, we approximately have 10 former CAF
10 members. We run a training program similar to what
11 the other previous speakers have spoken to, and we
12 get very positive feedback when the NRC assesses
13 those drills.

14 When we look at this holistically, I
15 would be curious why we do it in security different
16 than we're doing it in the Operator Licensing Branch
17 and the way we're doing it in emergency preparedness,
18 you know, to perform the same level of risk and
19 preparedness to protect the public.

20 MS. BAILEY: Could I just ask a question?
21 Because I want to make sure I understand the option
22 that you're suggesting that we consider. Are you
23 suggesting that the NRC consider an option where we

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 develop the standard for the Mock Adversary Force,
2 and then, give it to the licensees to implement?

3 MR. ELLIS: That's correct.

4 MS. BAILEY: And then, we would assess
5 how licensees, through an inspection program, are
6 implementing those standards?

7 MR. ELLIS: If you look at the suite of
8 the five major modules in the Inspection Manual as
9 it's written today, you inspect my equipment, that it
10 functions and we're testing it and maintaining it.
11 You also look at how we put that equipment, when
12 there's issues, in the corrective action program.
13 You look at my training and qualification. You look
14 at my target sets. And you come out and spend the
15 whole week watching us run our annual drills, and we
16 share with the inspectors, here's our training
17 program; here's how we select the members to the team.

18 As most of the utilities, I've talked to
19 my peers. We had a weighting of former military
20 personnel, a wide range of skill sets, Navy Seals to
21 Navy Master Divers, Marines, Rangers, blending those
22 with people that have went through a specific
23 Composite Adversary Force Training Program. We

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 believe we can run very effective drills and
2 challenges ourselves.

3 And one of the interesting aspects of
4 this is we actually believe we have a really good
5 challenge where we run an internal drill. Because I
6 have an officer who knows the physical layout of the
7 site, he knows the physical layout of the site well
8 enough, when we run a drill, that individual is very
9 proficient to implement the maneuvers that's in the
10 drill, because he does know the site. He knows how
11 to get from point A to point B efficiently with cover.
12 And we believe it gives us a very effective drills.

13 MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you.

14 MR. WHITE: Good morning. I'm Rob White
15 from Xcel Energy.

16 I had a couple of comments. One on the
17 MAF options, and it may be part of what in your list
18 here is item 3, where the multiple MAFs are done by
19 each utility or independent site. Another variation
20 to that would be regional, whether it be by the NRC
21 region groups or just through MOUs with utilities,
22 such as the STARS Alliance or USA or a few sites get
23 together to develop a team. I don't know if that

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 falls under the utility or independent or not, but
2 that would be a variation of that to consider. So,
3 for the single sites, they could form a group to
4 develop their team. I don't know if that's what was
5 intended in that option or not, but one to consider.

6 MR. BRADFIELD: Initially, Rob, no, it
7 wasn't. That wasn't something we had considered with
8 regard to like the STARS group. I think that's
9 something we can easily incorporate into that option
10 and put through the same criteria.

11 MR. WHITE: Okay. Good.

12 And then, with respect to the evaluation
13 criteria, a few comments. One, I don't see in here
14 any comparison. It may be of some value to compare
15 the effectiveness of the current program, the CAF,
16 the National CAF, and the performance and execution
17 of that as compared to what we're seeing right now
18 using the JCAF as an example, the comparative
19 analysis relative to performance. I don't know if
20 there's value there or not, but I sense there might
21 be. I don't know if that's in the evaluation criteria
22 or not.

23 With respect to the financial impact, it

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 struck me, you put in the parenthetical there
2 "industry and NRC". And if I'm not mistaken, most of
3 the cost for the NRC would be passed on to the
4 licensee. So, ultimately, I think the majority of
5 the financial impact of any decision is going to be
6 bared by the licensee. So, that was one other thought
7 I had.

8 Thank you.

9 MR. BRADFIELD: So, to comment on part of
10 your comment, Rob, with regard to the credibility
11 piece, we were initially trying to avoid the
12 comparison. Mainly, we wanted to make sure that we're
13 comparing to the standard and not one team to another.
14 And so, when we look at the National CAF or the NEI
15 CAF, what we're looking at is do they meet the
16 expectations of the established standards. And we're
17 doing the same thing with the JCAF. And so, it really
18 wasn't about comparing one team to another team. If
19 that's something that you guys think we need to
20 consider, you know, I can talk with Marissa and our
21 team internally and see how we shape that criteria.
22 But thanks for the comment.

23 MR. FENCL: Mark Fencl again, NextEra.

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 On that measure, Dave, I'm not trying to
2 throw my own team under the bus, but you've got a 15-
3 year established program to 15-week established
4 program. So, that's going to be hard to compare.
5 You know, you can compare, but there's a lot of "What
6 if's?" in that scenario, right?

7 I agree with the model, too, are they
8 meeting the standards of what the NRC has
9 established? But there may be some criteria that is
10 how well the JCAF has accelerated compared to the
11 National CAF at age one. If you have people, enough
12 on the teams that remember how it was in cycle one
13 for the National CAF, that would be the only
14 comparison when you're looking at that model.

15 Going back to Jim Ellis' comment on
16 evaluation criteria, as you said, the '05 module
17 itself has evaluations of your site CAF as part of
18 that. I think with a slight adjustment to training
19 modules, without increasing hours, you could add
20 something to your training qualification IT to assess
21 ongoing training similar to a security officer for a
22 National CAF standard for each site.

23 So, by establishing that, I think the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 other measure you need to take in the evaluation,
2 based upon the '05 assessments on site programs,
3 could you improve the overall industry by making that
4 change? Everybody's at a different level. I felt
5 they had a pretty established program. I think I've
6 taken it to the next level with JCAF, as the ability
7 for my teams to evaluate ourselves.

8 The second part of it, too, that is a
9 measurable that could be a change to the national
10 program also is, I see real-time input from the
11 adversaries in a critique process on my team's
12 performance. So, by being involved with a joint
13 adversary/controller critique, one of the benefits
14 I've seen that really came to light early is the
15 adversaries are providing input real-time on security
16 officer performance. An example being a guy left the
17 door open; he was flagging himself. An example being
18 that port was wider open than I would have expected
19 to see it, and I was able to snipe him.

20 So, we're seeing some real-time benefits
21 to our training program from having our own adversary
22 team. So, that is a measurable. I know we're not
23 getting with that, but --

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 MS. BAILEY: Okay. Thank you. And I do
2 want remind everyone, though, that we're not here to
3 discuss the advantages or disadvantages of the
4 options. So, I'd like to ask all of you to please
5 stay within the scope of the meeting.

6 Any more input from the room?

7 (No response.)

8 Should we ask the phone?

9 MS. WILLIAMSON: Hi, Brittany. It's
10 Alicia Williamson. Are there any folks on the phone
11 that have any feedback or would like to ask a
12 question?

13 OPERATOR: As a reminder, if you would
14 like to ask a question, please press *, then 1.

15 One moment as we wait for any questions
16 or comments.

17 (Pause.)

18 And there are no questions or comments on
19 the phone.

20 MS. WILLIAMSON: Okay. Thank you.

21 MS. BAILEY: Okay. I'll come back to the
22 room. Is there anybody else that would like to
23 provide input on options that we should be looking at

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 or the criteria that we should be using to evaluate
2 those options?

3 (No response.)

4 Okay. So, with that, then, I will ask
5 Dave to talk about next steps.

6 MR. BRADFIELD: And we might also want to
7 offer, we know this meeting was kind of put together
8 on short notice. We didn't have a lot of time. And
9 so, if there is any input as you leave today, we do
10 have some time before we're putting this product in
11 front of the Commission. I would encourage you to
12 reach out to us and let us know, either through
13 Marissa or Dante and give us some feedback if
14 something does come up with regard to an option or
15 criteria.

16 MS. BAILEY: So, that's a good point that
17 I forgot to bring up. It's that we will accept any
18 input that you have. If you would like to provide us
19 input on those two questions in writing, we will
20 accept input in writing. The sooner you give it to
21 us, the better; we're more able to consider it in the
22 paper that we're writing. So, I think if you provide
23 us any input, we would prefer that you do it by the

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 first week of September. We'll take written input
2 from you at anytime, even beyond the first week of
3 September, but it's better for us, and we're able to
4 better consider it, the earlier that you provide it
5 to us.

6 MR. BRADFIELD: So, with that, really
7 where we're at, next steps, at a very high level, is
8 that our goal is to provide the Commission with a
9 notation vote paper in December. We would anticipate
10 that the Commission would vote sometime early in
11 2019.

12 And for those that may be privy to the
13 SRM, we were given one year for the assessment and to
14 provide these options. The reason we're moving that
15 timeline up, and we want to get that product in front
16 of the Commission sooner, is that we want to make
17 sure that we have time on both sides to be fair to
18 the industry and internally, that as we analyze this
19 and we look at the implementation schedule, can we
20 get this in place? And our goal would try to have
21 this option in place, whatever that option might be,
22 by January of 2020, which would start the new cycle.
23 So, that's part of the reason why we would anticipate

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 a vote sometime in early 2019. And that's really the
2 next high-level steps for us.

3 And I'll turn it back over to Marissa.

4 MS. BAILEY: All right. So, I don't
5 really have anything more to add. Again, I would
6 like to thank all of you for participating in this
7 meeting and giving us feedback on the options and the
8 criteria.

9 I guess we have one more person who wants
10 to come up and give us feedback.

11 MR. WHITE: I'm sorry, Marissa. A
12 question on the next steps. Again, this is Rob White
13 from Xcel Energy.

14 MS. BAILEY: Okay.

15 MR. WHITE: Regarding the assessment in
16 the paper that you're going to present to the
17 Commission, is there an opportunity for the industry
18 to comment or be part of the evaluation, or simply
19 respond once the paper is submitted?

20 MS. BAILEY: I would say we'll take a
21 look at our schedule and see whether we can
22 accommodate that. I'm not sure at this point.

23 MR. WHITE: Okay. Fair enough. Thank

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1 you.

2 MS. BAILEY: Any more questions on the
3 next steps?

4 (No response.)

5 Okay. Again, thank you very much for
6 your participation.

7 MS. WILLIAMSON: Make sure there's no
8 other last questions on the phone.

9 MS. BAILEY: Oh, any last questions on
10 the phone?

11 MS. WILLIAMSON: Brittany, can you
12 request if there are any last questions from the phone
13 before we close?

14 OPERATOR: And as a reminder, if you
15 would like to ask a question, please press *, then 1.

16 One moment as we wait for any additional
17 questions.

18 (Pause.)

19 There are no questions on the phone.

20 MS. BAILEY: All right. Thank you very
21 much, and this meeting is adjourned.

22 (Whereupon, at 9:32 a.m., the meeting was
23 adjourned.)

NEAL R. GROSS

COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8

NEAL R. GROSS
COURT REPORTERS AND TRANSCRIBERS
1323 RHODE ISLAND AVE., N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005-3701

(202) 234-4433

(202) 234-4433