

1 that our employees understand what ownership means; and  
2 more importantly, to support them, to give them the support  
3 they need to be stewards of the program.

4 Oversight. That's a management monitoring of  
5 activities. Our effectiveness, not just time, but quality  
6 time. I get a lot of feedback from my supervisors about  
7 that, relative to they would like more time with this. We  
8 need to be more effective when we're out in the field.  
9 Also that's being looked at from the higher organization as  
10 far as oversight roles.

11 Outside of the company, we have company nuclear  
12 review board oversight. We have internal quality assurance  
13 oversight. We're looking at their roles also and that's  
14 what our new Vice President of Oversight is tasked with.

15 Standards, that's very important. Two activities  
16 relate to standards. Expectations are what we  
17 communicate. Standards is what we accept. You have to  
18 make sure our standards are consistent with your  
19 expectations. We have to make sure our expectations and  
20 standards are industry best. So, it's up to us, this team  
21 up here, to enforce standards. Our people will do what we  
22 ask of them. We have to ask them to do the right thing.

23 The other issue of standards is standards of  
24 industry excellence. As we described, there are  
25 opportunities where as industry moved ahead, had constant

1 improvement, we stayed with some of our programs,  
2 processes. So, we're going to get on the process of  
3 researching the industry, finding those good opportunities  
4 and essentially being on the constant improvement  
5 treadmill.

6 Decision-making, that's the final one. That was  
7 real important as you go through the timeline. You can see  
8 where decisions were made, different organizations made  
9 decisions, how we got here. So, how we look at things, how  
10 we ask questions, how we even characterize our questions  
11 are very important.

12 Perfect example is, we were talking avoidability for  
13 quite a bit. We used to have the engineers provide  
14 operability justification. That's a good word, rather  
15 benign; however, from the engineer, when he heard  
16 operability justification, what he hears is, I want you to  
17 justify operability, i.e. with the input being  
18 operability.

19 We've already changed that culture. We're changing  
20 that name. We're making it operability determination. We  
21 want the engineer to determine if this equipment is  
22 operable or not, and we even reward them when they say, I  
23 can not justify operability. That to me is a strong,  
24 strong character when you come back like that.

25 We need to reward those good behaviors. So,

1 decisions as far as why the service structure modification  
2 is deferred has a very interesting story behind that. We  
3 need to look at how we go forward.

4 Our daily meetings, we challenge each other. We're  
5 more open. We're not afraid to challenge. We ask harder  
6 questions; making sure we understand the issues and more  
7 importantly, making certain we provide the support for our  
8 people to be successful.

9 Through this program's actions, we'll reassure our  
10 safety focus and verify we have organizational tools needed  
11 for success.

12 Questions?

13 MR. DEAN: That was a  
14 mouthful. You know, much like a baseball team or hockey  
15 team that's going bad or having problems and they  
16 eventually get rid of the manager; you all come in and you  
17 change a number of managers and made some alignment at  
18 management level. What it comes down to is, is really  
19 imbedding the standards all the way through the staff.

20 Looking at the restart plan and some other things, I  
21 see a lot going on relative to managerial issues. What I'm  
22 interested in hearing is how do you plan on, on assuring  
23 that you have embedded our expectation and standards? How  
24 are you going to measure that in terms of ensuring that,  
25 that the message that you want to convey is understood and

1 acted upon consistently?

2 MR. MYERS: I think as we go  
3 through this process, we move back on the chart on page  
4 25. We build in oversight review groups. Our engineering,  
5 here, all our engineering products go through engineering  
6 assessment. And as we look at these products, we look for  
7 those standards.

8 So, we've got trained people under standards;  
9 establish new standards, and continue to look at those  
10 standards as we go through the building block of discovery  
11 on the other programs; restart station, the review board.  
12 Once again, all those things go through there and we'll  
13 continue to look through those standards.

14 And finally, over at the very end, we have restart.  
15 We have Restart Oversight Panel. We created that, a group  
16 of industry experts, that we're using to continuously bring  
17 the programs in and present the programs as we go through  
18 this and provide feedback to us.

19 This is not a one-time shot process. This is going,  
20 this is going to take us not only at startup, it's going to  
21 take us after startup, too. And we have to get them back  
22 to the highest industry standards. It's going to take time  
23 to do that.

24 MR. MENDIOLA: I don't think I  
25 understood. How are you going to, if you will,

1 institutionalize this for long-term gain?

2 MR. POWERS: One of the areas  
3 we plan, is the engineering drives a lot of engineering  
4 programs and where all the plan is, Engineering Assessment  
5 Board is a piece of the oversight that Lew described.

6 The Engineering Assessment Board looks at, it's  
7 going to look at the output of all these building blocks,  
8 technical perspectives. It's also going to look at  
9 modification. It's going to look at products, calculations  
10 and corrective action.

11 The way we're going to use to ingrain this for the  
12 future, for the long term, is starting up this board  
13 initially, core deposit of outside supervisors to solve our  
14 expertise product, instead of just planning, demonstrate  
15 question-asking characteristics.

16 And they're going to get this board up, and get it  
17 moving. And it's supplemented by staff from the floor.  
18 So, if you're reviewing, let's say reviewing a electrical  
19 topic, we have an independent electrical engineer on  
20 board on that review.

21 As we move forward, we'll be mentoring the staff as  
22 I, as they sit on the board, to be critical thinkers, to  
23 ask critical questions, to ingrain that into the practices  
24 as part of the process, which are not on the engineering  
25 documents. This is something we've done at the other

1 stations; Perry Station, for example. Really given some  
2 benefit.

3 As we go through the restart, then we'll be  
4 releasing the contractors, once we've achieved our  
5 objectives and got performance of the board and questioning  
6 attitude well established. And the individuals there will  
7 have been mentors, there will be an onus for the  
8 Engineering Assessment Board who continues forward as the  
9 chairman. And, that, I think, is a very effective way to  
10 assure that the, that questioning attitude is in the  
11 culture ingrained.

12 If we were to rely solely on boards, they come and  
13 they go. We want something that's going to last. So, this  
14 is the concept that I have developed as part of the new  
15 process in the engineering area.

16 MR. ESHELMAN: From a bigger  
17 picture, this is an area where we need to lead.  
18 Leaderships need to be out front. We need to lead by  
19 example. That means bringing in expertise, looking out in  
20 the industry, identifying these high standards, bringing  
21 them back, communicating it to our people.

22 And through communication, then next, then we do  
23 follow-up. We need to be out observing our people. Making  
24 sure that they understand our communications and therefore  
25 fulfilling what we expect of them. And then the coaching

1 process. So, this is truly a leadership message.

2 Our daily meetings is the start of it. That's when  
3 management team gets together. We set the standards for  
4 people; not just for program performance, procedures; it's  
5 our standards of behavior comes from the management team.

6 MR. MENDIOLA: I hear what you're  
7 saying. I don't mean to interrupt what you were saying  
8 before, but I'm curious to make sure you are not following,  
9 if you will, a timetable, and that we reach this amount of  
10 time, we restart it, we're done, you contractors can go.

11 What I'm after is to be sure that the long term run,  
12 that you've reached the point where you are, what's  
13 happening on-site is satisfactory to you, but at the same  
14 time not satisfactory to you and that you're seeking to  
15 reach a higher level of excellence.

16 MR. MYERS: Once you get the  
17 maintenance program, who uses the other plan is management  
18 program and corrective program. We've been on corrective  
19 actions all our -- for example, you ask the question, how  
20 could the operators be doing containment walking past the  
21 time switching and causing the rust, and not identify  
22 that.

23 We expect our management program to pick that up  
24 early. And the Corrective Action Program has found this  
25 problem, so it will go long, long after startup. You know,

1 it's not something we can just hit one time and walk away.  
2 We've got to thoroughly understand it and change with the  
3 ages.

4 MR. GROBE: I just really  
5 appreciate Bill and Tony's questions, because I have  
6 several questions of the same ilk.

7 On slide 30, could you see last bullet there;  
8 "Management Root Cause - Discovery". I think you have an  
9 ongoing kind of a global effort that is looking at all the  
10 data you collected. So, I've been hesitant to engage in  
11 this issue yet, because you're still looking at it, and I  
12 would like to look at what you completed.

13 On page 31, slide 31, you conclude that "Management  
14 ineffectively implemented processes". There is no doubt  
15 that the management is accountable to the organization, if  
16 people implement processes. And I was glad to hear the  
17 words you used, Dave, was managers need.

18 If you go to slide 32. Dave, you put oversight in  
19 the context of the new Vice President of Oversight. Talked  
20 about ownership and standards and decision-making. I put  
21 these ownership standards and decision-making as the guy in  
22 the field with a wrench. Oversight is the first-line  
23 supervisor.

24 And, you know, it's the same question I think Bill  
25 and Tony are asking. How, haven't seen the details of how



1 you're going to get first-line supervisor, the workers in  
2 the field aligned with your expectations and your  
3 standards, because they're the ones that implement the  
4 programs. It's not the managers that implement the  
5 programs.

6 And how you're going to measure that? How you're  
7 going to assess where you're at, where you have problems,  
8 where you need to fix things, and how you're going to  
9 measure how you're making progress?

10 It's very difficult questions. I appreciate that,  
11 but they're very important.

12 MR. MYERS: You know, I think, do  
13 you have time?

14 MR. FAST: I was just going to say  
15 our supervisors model the performance of our leaders, our  
16 managers. And if our managers are not in the field helping  
17 to resolve issues and understand those issues, that's the  
18 supervisor's model. That's why when we go back to that  
19 lead by example, it's our direct involvement in the field,  
20 walking and talking and understanding, helping to set the  
21 standards, that models behavior for our supervisors. That  
22 ultimately becomes the model of success for high performing  
23 organizations.

24 MR. GROBE: I agree with you  
25 that you need to set the expectations and model those

1 expectations, and there is a number of different authors  
2 that have written all sort of books on organizational  
3 effectiveness, but I think the nirvana of organizational  
4 effectiveness is that none of you show up at work one day  
5 and everything happens the same as it would have happened  
6 if you weren't there. And I'm not, I haven't yet seen the  
7 plan on how you're going to get there and how you're going  
8 to measure progress.

9 MR. BERGENDAHL: We don't have it.

10 MR. GROBE: I know. I'm very  
11 interested. And we're talking about hardware. Hardware is  
12 essential to assess and fix. I don't mean to diminish the  
13 amount of effort you're putting into it. It takes a lot of  
14 effort. But it's not easy. This is the hard part.

15 I'm keenly interested in seeing that root cause and  
16 how you're going to fix this and how you're going to  
17 measure progress.

18 MR. BERGENDAHL: I will answer the  
19 question that you and Tony asked, but the starting point  
20 indicated that series of sessions where Dave and I are  
21 meeting with every supervisor on site. We go through the  
22 timeline, and exactly how we made decisions, how we  
23 provided oversight and identify where we did not meet  
24 expectations and what the expectations are.

25 Spent several hours with every supervisor on-site

1 establishing that baseline. Followed up then with the  
2 senior managers here. Will meet in small groups of  
3 employees until we've met with everyone on-site and do the  
4 exact same thing. Make sure we get a common starting point  
5 of understanding the difference between where we have been  
6 and where we need to be.

7 So, we'll set that standard and then our management  
8 oversight in monitoring will ensure that it's being  
9 reinforced by the first-line supervisor.

10 MR. MYERS: Again, once we finish,  
11 our management will sit down and lay out specific actions  
12 over the long term that we're going to check. We're going  
13 to change and take, change behaviors and monitor the  
14 effectiveness of that. So, it's not only, maybe training  
15 programs, maybe it's monitoring programs. You know, once  
16 we finish that, we'll decide on those things and we'll use  
17 that for the long term. We'll monitor the performance.  
18 That's what we're doing.

19 MR. MENDIOLA: Like a lot of  
20 groups, a lot of licenses like yourself have sat across  
21 from groups like us, and had these very same conversations  
22 and said these very same things a number of times; and to  
23 various degrees it's been a lot of successes and there has  
24 been a lot of not very good successes.

25 I can just say after some experience in this matter,

1 I mean, you've said all the right words and made all the  
2 right slides; now it comes time to go out and do what you  
3 say you plan on doing.

4 And, my issue is quite simply, is that you have to  
5 do it, you know, immediately. You have to do it  
6 yesterday. Have to do it today. Have to do it tomorrow.

7 And since you've set this new organization up, the  
8 different phases obviously on your side of the table, there  
9 has been some opportunities, if you will, to take on these  
10 four focus areas. And I think you need to be sure that you  
11 are doing everything you can, if you will, this new way and  
12 get away from the old way; and make sure that your  
13 organization, your people, your procedures and all these  
14 plans that you've made are being implemented on the site.

15 We've had a few discussions with, and a few  
16 technical issues have come up in the last few days and we  
17 would like to think that your organization is working, if  
18 you will, under the new way, and approaching designs. We  
19 have some questions in our mind outside looking in that  
20 that's happened. And we'll obviously be following up.

21 MR. MYERS: It was a sobering  
22 experience. It was a new way to look at it. Instead of  
23 sitting back and waiting for the situation to control us,  
24 we have taken a more proactive approach.

25 And we're trying to do that after that morning

1 meeting. And that was too late. We should have, it should  
2 have been that night. That I understand.

3 MR. MENDIOLA: Everybody has a  
4 role and responsibility in this and everyone has to do it.

5 MR. MYERS: I understand.

6 MR. GROBE: Any other  
7 questions or comments in this area?

8 MR. DEAN: The only question  
9 I have is, do you have a sense when your collective  
10 assessment on the detailed root cause that you'll be  
11 prepared to talk with us on that?

12 MR. MYERS: Sometime after the  
13 end of this month, I plan on wrapping that up at the end of  
14 the month sometime, it looks like, as a team.

15 One thing, I'm sponsoring the team and I'm not  
16 pushing the admission of the group, but what we've done on  
17 the root cause is we have the team players that are  
18 performing the root cause. All our experience is root  
19 cause people.

20 We're also bringing in industry expertise from time  
21 to time. I've got that lined up a couple different days  
22 from some peer performance groups from other utilities.  
23 And then we're bringing in also an outside consultant,  
24 various phases, to look at, challenge our root causes, who  
25 we find.

1       So, this is not an easy issue. And we're going to  
2 take it on in a very serious manner. Hope to be through  
3 with that sometime the end of this month. Maybe next month  
4 we should be ready to present it to you.

5           MR. GROBE:       Lew, the meeting  
6 that you had Monday, I can't remember what that panel is  
7 called; the Restart Oversight Panel?

8           MR. MYERS:       Restart Oversight  
9 Panel, yeah.

10          MR. GROBE:       You indicated  
11 earlier today that the next meeting, maybe it was  
12 yesterday, the days are running together, that the next  
13 meeting is like the second Monday in July?

14          MR. MYERS:       I think so.  
15 15th. 15th, we have the next meeting scheduled.

16          MR. GROBE:       Maybe it would be  
17 best to have our next panel meeting the following day. And  
18 that way, some of us that are interested come out and view  
19 the functioning of that panel and then have our oversight  
20 panel. That might align.

21        Okay, we'll be talking about that schedule.

22          MR. MYERS:       I think that  
23 would, I would be able to present the management root cause  
24 issues to that panel at that time, you know, so that would  
25 work out.

1 MR. GROBE: Okay. I think  
2 we've been at it for two and a half hours. Do you want to  
3 go more?

4 MR. MYERS: No.

5 MR. GROBE: I certainly  
6 appreciate the dialogue.

7 Lew, did you have any closing remarks that you want  
8 to make?

9 MR. MYERS: Well, you know,  
10 our desire today, we hope we've done this for the public.  
11 We've got a lot of conversation between us and the  
12 regulators, but we would demonstrate that our management  
13 team will take the needed actions to assess all of our  
14 technical issues to restart the plant to the best of our  
15 ability; willing to see the plant operates safely and  
16 reliable and well proved and therefore trust, because right  
17 now the plant shutdown in a situation like this, it hurts  
18 the employee population.

19 And then we'll work hard to regain public and  
20 regulatory confidence. We took a step forward. And that  
21 desire after today, that would be a win.

22 Since our last meeting, we made a lot of changes.  
23 We put together the restart plan that was only in draft.  
24 We put the individual plans into place. We've all racked  
25 out heads. We talked about at the last meeting, we were

1 studying, that at the time, the technical feasibility of  
2 buying a new head or repairing it. We walked away and  
3 basically from the head repair now and bought a new head.  
4 Major change in direction.

5 From a technical program standpoint, we're reviewing  
6 our technical programs already, so we're in the discovery  
7 phase already.

8 Containment condition. We're already into  
9 implementation phase. We're still doing discovery, but  
10 we're outfitting things like duct work already. So, we're  
11 somewhere in between.

12 System health plan; we've already been through a lot  
13 of system reviews and we've created a whole bunch of works,  
14 mods.

15 One of the things we're looking at is a new cavity  
16 seal. Major mod in the plant that kept some of the leakage  
17 from running down the side of the vessel, you know. So,  
18 we're looking at that mod, but we're creating a bunch of  
19 work and mods there.

20 From a restart plan, we have the restart plan  
21 basically in place.

22 And the management human performance plan, we told  
23 you we've been through a lot of reviews with corrective  
24 actions. We've had industry experts in. And then we have  
25 detail management review assessment going on. Root cause,



1 if you will. And we'll complete that before the next  
2 meeting.

3 So, since our last meeting, we've made a lot of  
4 progress. And before our next meeting, we'll make more  
5 progress. Thank you.

6 MR. GROBE: Okay, thanks,  
7 Lew.

8 I just wanted to comment that I know that we've  
9 asked a plethora of very intrusive questions and I think  
10 the dialogue has been very helpful. I apologize that this  
11 ran long. I think it's very important to get through these  
12 last two cornerstones or building blocks. I'm sorry. And,  
13 we'll do that early in July, and cover those  
14 comprehensively.

15 Again, I just want to thank you for your staying  
16 power, your ability to respond to our questions candidly  
17 and openly. I think that's very healthy and we'll continue  
18 providing our thoughts and insights. And I think the plant  
19 has made significant progress in planning its work, and has  
20 begun to accomplish some of these plans, begun to implement  
21 some of these plans.

22 My experience in the past is that it's absolutely  
23 crucial to develop the plan first and get a very solid plan  
24 and then go implement it. That way you don't have to redo  
25 work. You can go back and redo activities once you realize

1 the plan wasn't sufficient and comprehensive.

2 So, I appreciate the fact that these are still  
3 living documents and you're going to be updating them  
4 shortly. We look forward to seeing those revisions.

5 MR. MYERS: Thank you.

6 MR. GROBE: Any other  
7 comments? Bill?

8 At this time, I commented earlier today we had a  
9 meeting at 10:00 this morning, and it went for about a half  
10 an hour and they took a break before they had public  
11 comments.

12 We didn't have that situation. We've been at it for  
13 quite awhile. My recommendation is we not take a break and  
14 we provide for public comments.

15 We have a meeting at 7:00. If some of you have  
16 comments, but were planning on coming back at that time, I  
17 would ask you to save them for that period of time, because  
18 I'm sensitive to the fact that we're impacting on dinner  
19 hour, but I'm eager to hear feedback.

20 So, I would invite you to come forward and speak at  
21 the microphone, if you would, please. And I believe on the  
22 podium we have a sign-in sheet.

23 MR. HOWARD WHITCOMB: In respect to  
24 your request, at the dinner hour and so forth, is it my  
25 understanding that the same individuals are going to be

1 back here at 7:00?

2 MR. GROBE: No, that's not  
3 correct. The evening meeting is going to be NRC staff and  
4 might be some of the public. I'll provide a brief overview  
5 of what was discussed this afternoon, and then respond to  
6 any questions.

7 For those folks that want to have a detailed  
8 understanding of everything that transpired this afternoon,  
9 the transcript will be available in a couple of weeks, and  
10 they can read the transcript.

11 MR. WHITCOMB: Well, I would like  
12 to ask one quick question to First Energy, since they're  
13 not going to be back this evening.

14 To Mr. Myers, you've heard Mr. Fast describe a  
15 situation in which he felt it necessary to invite certain  
16 of his management out into the plant, and undergo one of  
17 these teachable moments. I've never heard that before,  
18 but I think I understand what that means.

19 Mr. Myers, what would be your assessment at this  
20 point as to why was that necessary?

21 MR. MYERS: You know, I think  
22 our plant ran well and did well for many years. Probably  
23 one of the better plants in the country. Sometimes it's  
24 easy to get complaisant with that, because the plant has  
25 performed so well. And, our managers were not getting into

1 the industry as often as they should. Looking for the  
2 highest standards of performance.

3 There is minimum standards of performance, what I  
4 call regulatory performance; and then there is a margin  
5 above that. And we need to start teaching how to have the  
6 margin above that. And that's not in all cases, but it is  
7 in some cases.

8 Like the operator is walking into the containment,  
9 finding rust on stuff. We needed to address that one  
10 apparently some time ago. Missed opportunities that we've  
11 had in some areas are just a reflection of letting our  
12 guard down, our standards down. And that's, that's the  
13 reason I didn't blame it on the people. That's a  
14 management problem, because it's something we always have  
15 to guard against and that's complaisancy.

16 MR. WHITCOMB: Would you consider  
17 that to be a management problem from the plant management,  
18 plant manager level all the way down to the lowest levels  
19 of supervision?

20 MR. MYERS: Yes.

21 MR. WHITCOMB: Okay. Now, you  
22 also indicated that you don't have a plan yet completely  
23 developed as to how you address that, but it is your  
24 intention to address that?

25 MR. MYERS: Yes.

1           MR. WHITCOMB:       Okay. Mr. Fast,  
2 you indicated earlier in your VT-2 inspections, the five  
3 individuals that had prior experience. Are they somehow  
4 required to be part of the team that's out there in the  
5 field with the inexperienced people?

6           MR. MYERS:        Before you go on  
7 to Mr. Fast, I would like to clarify a statement. Don't  
8 look at our performance at the Davis-Besse plant. It's  
9 still, in a lot of areas, it's still performing at some of  
10 the highest industry standards. Our industrial safety  
11 records are outstanding. Protection technicians are  
12 outstanding.

13         There is still of lot of areas at our plant that I  
14 would say are as good or leading the industry. There are  
15 some areas like in the, that we're seeing, that some of our  
16 standards may have slid some. Operators not getting into  
17 containment results as they should.

18         So, I would not classify our performance as mediocre  
19 from top to bottom. There is some pockets of areas that we  
20 probably need improvement. Generally, our overall  
21 maintenance, the general condition of the plant appears to  
22 be good. So, I don't want to classify the plant as just  
23 falling apart. It's, the plant is in very good material  
24 condition still all in all.

25           MR. WHITCOMB:       But you would

1 agree with me, sir --

2 MR. GROBE: Howard, this point  
3 in time was intended not necessarily for questioning the  
4 utility, but it's intended for the NRC staff to receive  
5 input from the public, to respond to questions from the  
6 public. And, if First Energy has additional information  
7 that they want to present in response to a question, that's  
8 fine, but that's not the way we structured our meetings.

9 This time period was intended for members of the  
10 public to ask us questions; us meaning the NRC, and to  
11 provide us their insights. And if First Energy wants to  
12 provide another forum, a different forum for members of the  
13 public to directly ask them questions, that's fine, but  
14 that's wasn't the intention of this portion of the  
15 meeting.

16 MR. WHITCOMB: All right. Well,  
17 then, I'll be back at 7:00 and I'll direct to the NRC any  
18 other comments that I have at that time.

19 MR. GROBE: Okay.

20 MR. GUNTER: I'm Paul Gunter.  
21 I'm with Nuclear Information Services.

22 I guess my concern is directed to the Nuclear  
23 Regulatory Commission to statements we just heard here from  
24 First Energy. Does the NRC really believe that First  
25 Energy radiation standards are some of the highest in the

1 country after the most recent recorded incidents where  
2 employees walked out of there with hot particles?

3 That seems, it seems to fly in the, there is a whole  
4 list of information that we get from the utility that seems  
5 to fly in the face of what we just experienced.

6 And even most recently, how is the public confidence  
7 to be restored, not only in this plant, but in the  
8 regulator? And that's the challenge that is before this  
9 regulator.

10 If any of us are caught running through Oak Harbor  
11 and exceeding the speed limit, jeopardizing public health  
12 and safety, there are consequences. This utility,  
13 particularly this management, should not be allowed to  
14 proceed without some consequence from the regulator.

15 And the question to the regulator, the challenge to  
16 you, is what consequence will you mete out to this kind of  
17 system, this management that's been going on for years?

18 MR. GROBE: Thanks, Paul. I  
19 think you asked two questions. The first one concerned the  
20 recent event involving hot particles; and, I think that's  
21 an excellent question.

22 I'm not sure what Mr. Myers was referring to. I  
23 believe there is a number of different indicators that give  
24 you an insight into performance into radiation protection  
25 program. Some of those include, for example, overall

1 exposure to the workers at the plant. And there is a whole  
2 series of other indicators. We have performance indicators  
3 that are posted on our web site that we look at. And the  
4 plants have many more indicators that they use to measure  
5 their performance.

6 With respect to the hot particle event, that's an  
7 issue where we conducted a special inspection. The results  
8 of that inspection are undergoing evaluation, and should be  
9 issued shortly. And those findings of the inspection will  
10 be characterized correctly.

11 There are a number of issues that were identified  
12 that were not good performance in the area of radiological  
13 protection. They were very narrowly focused on how the  
14 licensee handled individuals who perceived internal  
15 contamination; and that's part of radiation protection  
16 program and part of the risks at a nuclear plant.

17 It's possible for nuclear worker to receive what's  
18 called an uptake of radioactive materials. And when a  
19 worker does have radio uptake of radioactive materials, it  
20 complicates the ability to determine whether or not they  
21 have radioactive materials on the external of themselves.

22 So, there is a number of issues there and we're  
23 evaluating the issues of that inspection and violation with  
24 respect to that issue.

25 In respect to overall plant performance, the



1 findings, AIT inspection, there is a number of inspections  
2 to be done, referred to some of them earlier today. There  
3 is a number of ongoing inspections right now. One of them  
4 is conducting an evaluation of extended condition inside  
5 containment.

6 Don Jones is out at Midland watching radiography and  
7 evaluating that, and we'll see that activity. There is a  
8 couple of folks in the region that are continuing to work  
9 on following up the results of the Augmented Inspection  
10 Team. And concurrent in that, we have quite a few people  
11 working, both agency people and contractors, on evaluating  
12 the safety significance of this event.

13 And, once we complete the follow-up on the Augmented  
14 Inspection Team and the Safety Inspection Analysis, we'll  
15 be able to characterize the violations that have occurred  
16 and the risk significance of those violations and deal with  
17 those appropriately within our procedures.

18 But those are excellent questions and I appreciate  
19 your input. Thank you.

20 Are there others?

21 Nobody else has any questions?

22 Okay. Great. Thanks.

23 I certainly appreciate your attention to this  
24 meeting. As I mentioned earlier, we're going to have a  
25 meeting that will convene in this room at 7:00. The

1 outcome of that meeting will be to communicate, to  
2 communicate the result of the meeting that occurred this  
3 morning. That was a meeting of the Lessons Learned Task  
4 Force, and then also to communicate the results of this  
5 meeting this afternoon, and field questions from the public  
6 that they may have.

7 Thank you very much.

8 (Off the record.)

9 ---

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE

2 I, Marie B. Fresch, Registered Merit Reporter and  
3 Notary Public in and for the State of Ohio, duly  
4 commissioned and qualified therein, do hereby certify that  
5 the foregoing is a true and correct transcript of the  
6 proceedings as taken by me and that I was present during  
7 all of said proceedings.

8 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and  
9 affixed my seal of office at Norwalk, Ohio, on this  
10 27th day of June, 2002.

11  
12  
13  
14 Marie B. Fresch, RMR  
15 NOTARY PUBLIC, STATE OF OHIO  
16 My Commission Expires 10-9-03.  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25