UNITED STATES OF AMERICA NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION + + + + +ALL HANDS MEETING +++++ THURSDAY OCTOBER 31, 2013 8 + + + + +ROCKVILLE, MARYLAND 9 10 +++++ The All Employees Meeting commenced at 10:00 11 12 a.m., in the Marriott Bethesda North Hotel and Conference Center, 5701 Marinelli Road, Rockville, Maryland. 13 14 NRC COMMISSIONERS: 15 ALLISON M. MACFARLANE, Chairman 16 17 KRISTINE L. SVINICKI, Commissioner GEORGE APOSTOLAKIS, Commissioner 18 19 WILLIAM D. MAGWOOD, IV, Commissioner WILLIAM C. OSTENDORFF, Commissioner 20 21 22 23

24

PROCEEDINGS

10:02 a.m.

MR. SATORIUS: Good morning.

(Chorus of "good mornings" from the audience.)

And welcome to the 22nd Annual All Hands Meeting of the Staff and the Commission. This is a public meeting. So, I would like to also welcome those members of the public and the media who might be present.

I would like to thank the staff for attending, and thank the Chairman and her fellow Commissioners for taking the time to meet with us and discuss topics that are of great interest to us all. We very much value this interaction and, on behalf of the staff, I thank the Commission for your continued support of this important meeting.

In addition to the Headquarters staff that are here today, the staff in the Regions and the Technical Training Center and locally here at Church Street are viewing this meeting via video broadcast, and our Resident Inspectors are receiving the audio portion of this meeting.

The purpose of this meeting is to facilitate communications between the Commission and the staff, and for the Commission members to share their perspectives on NRC's accomplishments and challenges. The Chairman and each of the Commissioners will begin the meeting with individual remarks.

The remainder of the meeting is reserved for questions and answers. This is an excellent opportunity to interact directly with

the Commission regarding Agency policy and strategy matters.

There are several microphones throughout the ballroom that are for your use in asking questions. We are also handing out cards, if you would prefer to write your question. You can pass the card to one of those volunteer staff that are populated around the ballroom. And in addition to those cards questions that we will receive, telephone, fax, or emails in from the Region and other sites will be read by our volunteers.

So, please, first take a minute to put all of your electronic devices on silent or vibrate.

I would like to thank the volunteer readers today who are Kate Raynor, Chelsea Nichols, Stacy Schumann, and Woody Machalek. Thank you also to the volunteer ushers who are helping today, our sign language interpreter, and the Offices of the Secretary, Administration, Information Services, and the Chief Human Capital Officer for their work to organize and provide technical and logistical support.

Finally, I would like to recognize the officials of the National Treasury Employees Union who are here with us today. NTEU will have an opportunity to address us near the conclusion of the meeting.

It is now my privilege to turn the meeting over to the Chairman.

Chairman Macfarlane.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Thanks, Mark.

So, good morning.

(Chorus of "good mornings" from the audience.)

It's great to see so many of you here filling up the seats. There are seats for all of you, that huge crowd standing in the back, there's a lot of seats in the front.

(Laughter.)

You know, I found as a professor that there's always empty seats in the front.

(Laughter.)

And I encourage you all to sit in them.

So, first of all, I want to start off by thanking you all for your patience and dedication during the recent government shutdown.

I know it was sometimes very complicated and sometimes very stressful for everyone, but we got through it.

It certainly did disrupt our operations, but it was clear that we were able to continue our mission of protecting our nation.

And I'm really proud of how everybody responded.

I would particularly like to thank our EDO Mark Satorius and our CFO Jim Dyer, and the other senior managers who worked so hard to minimize the impact and see us through this past month. So, let's thank them.

(Applause.)

So, setting aside these most recent events, it has been a very busy year for the NRC. Despite resource limitations that we had as a result of the sequestration, I'm pleased to say that we have had a number of important accomplishments.

We have continued to ensure safe and secure

operations of our licensed facilities.

We have made significant progress in implementing the Fukushima lessons learned.

And we are working to comply now with the D.C. Circuit Court's direction to resume our Yucca Mountain licensing work.

We are continuing to make progress in completing the Waste Confidence Rule and the Environmental Impact Statement. And though the recent shutdown did force us to postpone five of the 12 scheduled Waste Confidence public meetings, we have demonstrated our commitment, I believe, to public engagement by rescheduling these meetings and extending the comment period now to December 20th.

We have moved forward with cyber-security requirements for our licensees.

We are conducting oversight at the reactors under construction, Vogtle, Summer, and Watts Bar 2.

And we are overseeing the decommissioning at SONGS, Kewaunee, and Crystal River 3.

And in the coming months we will continue to have all of these activities on our plate and more.

We will be continuing to implement radioactive source security enhancements, including making sure that our agreement states are implementing compatible regulations.

We also anticipate that we will receive the first Small Modular Reactor design certification applications to review sometime next fall.

And, of course, we will be moving through the backlog

of work that we have as a result of the government shutdown.

You're also probably aware that the lease for Two White Flint North expires on December 14th of this year. So, let me at the outset assure you that, even if there were a change in our Two White Flint occupancy, it would be a very gradual one. And there's no need to worry that you won't have an office on December 15th. Your office furniture will not be put out on Rockville Pike on that day. Okay?

(Laughter.)

So, we are in the process of working towards a short-term lease and, then, a long-term solution. So, not to worry.

The staff has been working diligently with the General Services Administration, the Office of Management and Budget, and the House Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on developing a path forward to reduce the Agency's footprint while retaining the Two White Flint building. And GSA right now is simultaneously working as well on negotiating a lease extension for Two White Flint North.

So, like I said, while we don't know what the final outcome will be, we will, of course, keep you fully informed of all the developments. And let me just say that I appreciate the National Treasury Employees Union's active involvement in, and partnership with, the NRC as a member of our Two White Flint Working Group. This partnership has been instrumental in moving the process forward.

So, as I said, I have full confidence that our Agency will do a great job in tackling all the tasks on our plate. I do have to note, unfortunately, though, that we may still be impacted by issues that are

beyond our control.

And you're probably aware of the ongoing budget discussions on Capitol Hill. It is not yet clear whether we'll continue to be impacted by sequestration for another year.

Of course, we also face the possibility of another lapse in appropriations and perhaps another shutdown. I don't have any insight on this. I'm just saying that we should be aware.

And in the face of these uncertainties, I think the best thing for you guys to do is just to stay focused on your work. Agency management will continue to follow all of these issues closely, and we'll do our best to minimize any impact to our work or to you personally.

In the spirit of focusing on our mission and looking ahead, let me take a moment to share some of my priorities for the year ahead.

Obviously, continuing to ensure safe and secure operation of our licensed facilities is at the top of all of our lists.

In addition, I believe it is important for us to assess how the lessons from our recent experiences with the San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station can inform our future work.

I also think we need to work to further ensure that we're considering the entire fuel cycle and paying sufficient attention to back-end issues.

I would like to continue to enhance our Agency's public engagement. And to that end, I would like to commend the Waste Confidence Directorate and the Japan Lessons Learned Directorate for their efforts in this area.

And further, it's important that we ensure that we're building a talented and diverse pool of future Agency leaders and working in support of a healthy work-life balance.

I want to emphasize the importance of continuing to cultivate an open, collaborative work environment.

And finally, we should continue to strengthen our cooperation with international partners and to provide regulatory assistance to countries, with the objective of strengthening nuclear safety and security worldwide.

I'm proud of our Agency and the work that we're accomplishing. I'm grateful that we have such a dedicated expert staff working to achieve our objectives and uphold our mission.

I encourage you to use this opportunity this morning to ask us your questions. I know sometimes it can be intimidating to speak in front of your peers or in front of a large group, but let me assure you that we take all of this very seriously, and we like to be as responsive as possible.

I would also like to remind you that I and many NRC managers maintain an open-door policy. And so, you should feel free to make an appointment and come to talk to us about what's on your mind at any time, not, of course, just this morning.

Before I turn this over to my Commission colleagues, I would like to recognize an important event today. Of course, you know it's Halloween, but there's something maybe even more important that today is. Today is Bill Borchardt's last day at the Agency.

I know that many of you have heard me say goodbye

to Bill so many times that you thought for sure he was gone already.

(Laughter.)

But today is truly his last day at the Agency.

So, Bill, I would like to thank you for your leadership, your wise counsel, your sense of humor, your passion for golf and jazz, and your friendship to all who have known you and worked with you over the years here at the Agency.

We look forward to having you back in January, when we can toast and roast you in equal parts at a celebration in your honor.

So, won't you all join me in please bidding farewell to Bill Borchardt?

(Applause.)

Okay. Thank you.

So now, let me turn things over to my colleagues, so that they can make a few remarks.

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Thanks, Allison.

Well, the Chairman has done a wonderful job of outlining a number of Agency challenges that we have conquered since we last met in this forum, and that we will be taking head-on in the months to come. So, the real objective here, of course, is to hear from you, and I look forward to an opportunity to do that.

But I do sincerely thank you for taking the time out of your day to come over here, so that we are looking at a lot of wonderful, energetic faces and not empty seats. So, I appreciate that.

We also have a lot of employees who are tuning in, and I appreciate them taking the time to be a part of this Q&A and,

hopefully, some discussion and back-and-forth today.

I want to join in the recognition of Bill Borchardt, and I know we will have more formal recognition of his service, his fellowship with all of us, his service to the American public. I had a real honor of voting for his selection as EDO.

And, Bill, I outlasted you. I never would have predicted that, that I would still be here on the day you're leaving, but go figure.

(Laughter.)

And I have worked with now three EDOs in my time as a Commissioner, and it is a heavy, heavy title to carry around, in all seriousness. So, I'm appreciative of any person who is willing to take it on.

And, Bill, I thank you for your phenomenal service.

And again, I know you're leaving very big shoes for Mark to fill, and I'm sure he'll capably do that.

I wanted to do one other recognition that comes very much from where I sit. You know, I have long held the view that Commissioners who come to this Agency from various diverse backgrounds were really only as good as those capable and expert NRC staff who are willing to come and, either on a temporary rotational basis or permanently, come and work in our offices. You know, we come. We're not as familiar with NRC. So, we're really tapping into the vast expertise of this Agency.

So, I want to thank those who have been willing to come and spend some time in my office. I assume that my colleagues

on the Commission feel similarly. So, thank you for those of you who have had a willingness to do that.

And I am very, very encouraged that under Chairman Macfarlane's leadership we can revitalize some of the opportunities to provide an opportunity to come to a Commission office as a developmental opportunity for the staff here. I think that under her leadership I am confident that we can maybe make that opportunity and program a little more vibrant than it has been in the last few years.

So, with that, I will turn it back over to you, Chairman.

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: I would like to thank all of you for coming today. And most importantly, I would like to thank you for the important work that you do day-in and day-out.

In the year since the last All Employee Meeting, the staff has supported the Commission on many important policy matters, such as the Waste Confidence Policy Statement, post-Fukushima requirements for containment vents, and many others.

I know that between the federal lack of any pay raise in recent years and the negative comments you often hear in the media about government employees, you may sometimes feel like your work is not appreciated. I want to let you know that you are appreciated by this Commissioner every single day.

The Chairman and Commissioner Svinicki mentioned that this is Bill Borchardt's last day today. And I look over there where he is sitting, and I see empty chairs around him.

(Laughter.)

Bill, don't take it personally. This is what happens

when you fall from power.

(Laughter and applause.)

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: It's okay to fall from power; just don't fall from grace.

(Laughter.)

Well, first, good morning to all of you. It's great to be here again. I think this is the third of these I've been to, but I'm looking at Patty. Is it three or four? Whatever. I lose count.

Over the years I've been here, I keep waiting for a normal year. This wasn't it.

(Laughter.)

But what I think I have concluded, and perhaps those of you who have been here much longer than I have, there really is no such thing as a normal year. Every year has surprises. Every year has twists and turns. Every year has its own story. And this year has certainly had some interesting developments.

Regulatory Commission, you can certainly say that it's never boring. And that's a good thing because I think, for those of us who care very deeply for the subjects and for the issues that we work on, the fact that we have challenges, the fact that we are challenged to think about what we do and how we do it on a regular basis, I think that's a good thing. I think if we ever became too complacent and too comfortable, we might see problems develop, as we have seen in some of our overseas colleagues' organizations. So, I don't think that's necessarily a bad thing.

But, that said, I also think that, despite the uncertainties of the present, that the future is actually quite bright. I was having a conversation with Mark just this morning, sort of mentioning the fact that, while there's a lot of uncertainty in a lot of agencies, the NRC is still hiring at a pretty rapid rate. We're still bringing over 300 people onboard this year, and those are people that we need to populate this great Agency, to make sure that we maintain the strong expertise and staff experience that we have had for these many years.

You know, I actually had a question in mind yesterday. I remembered a Resident Inspector that I thought could help me answer it. So, I went into my BlackBerry. And I couldn't remember the name. So, I just put in the word "inspect," thinking I'd get a list of Inspectors and I'd be able to figure out who it was from there. And it was just one of those weird things of life that one of the names that came up, because I never throw anything away -- if you know anything about me, I'm a pack rat. The name of an Associate Director for Inspection from NRR came up, some guy named Bill Borchardt.

(Laughter.)

And I don't know where in the world I ran into you when you were Associate Director for Inspection with NRR, but I'm sure it was a very valuable conversation, Bill.

(Laughter.)

So, obviously, Bill's exit is one that will be marked in January. He contributed a great deal to the Agency through very difficult times, and he is going to be remembered for that, I think, by

9

11 12

13

14 15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24 25

26

many people in this room for a very, very long time.

But, Mark, you, of course, will have your own challenges. I can't tell you what they're going to be, but I suspect that they'll be significant. And I think you're up to the challenge. I think I and other Commissioners look forward to working with you through that.

Finally, I appreciate that many of you have given me condolences for the performance of the Pittsburgh Steelers over the last month or so.

(Laughter.)

And many of you probably have noticed that I'm not particularly upset by it because I'm still on a baseball high from the Pirates' season where the Pirates made the playoffs for the first time in 20 years. And that will probably carry me through to the next baseball season. So, no matter what happens to the Steelers, I will continue to smile and I will continue to be very pleased with that.

So, with that, I look forward to the discussion today. And again, thank you for all the work you do on a daily basis.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Well, good morning.

I think this is the biggest crowd I've seen in this room since the fall of 2010, when I came to my first one. It's terrific to see so many people here.

Since Commissioner Magwood has already thrown out some trash talk about football -- (laughter) -- and I told him that my wife of 36 years is a huge Redskins fan; I'm a big Dallas fan. I had a chance to talk to Miriam on the way in about her Steeler fan club, how

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

they are faring. And I told Commissioner Magwood several times in the last year that the Cowboys are a very inclusive group; we would welcome him at any time.

(Laughter.)

It's always fun to come to this and get a chance to chat with people. I had a chance to talk to, I asked Sheryl how Pinto was doing, her dog. I have a dog named Ralph. And so, we exchange stories. And I talked to Cindy Carpenter about her dog, talked to Eric about his family.

And so, I think this reiterates for all the Commissioners, when we come over here, that we really are one family, and that at the end of the day, putting aside whatever challenges or differences we may have at work, that we really are human beings at the end of the day and we all have the same values and the same concerns. It really reinforces the uniqueness of working here.

Bill, I add my thanks to those of my Commissioner colleagues. Mark and I and you are all graduates of the same institution. I've had a chance to brag on both of you guys at recent Navy home football games in Annapolis. And so, I'm very proud to be associated with you and your leadership roles here.

I saw this morning Cindy Jones at the IAEA had a reference to Bill as the EDO Emeritus. Did you guys see that in her newsletter?

(Laughter.)

That's pretty special, Bill.

But, seriously, Bill has done a terrific job here. I know

that we are all very proud of what he has done and, also, extraordinarily thankful for his service.

I want to also talk real quickly about the shutdown.

Chairman Macfarlane made some very appropriate comments there.

I was Commanding Officer of a submarine in the mid-1990s when the government shutdown. It was kind of difficult having a submarine, trying to operate that while you have a shutdown. I won't go into that.

But I have some appreciation for the challenges of what it takes. And again, I add my kudos to that of others here, to Mark and Jim Dyer and Miriam for their work to really manage this in a very appropriate manner. I think it has been done very professionally.

And I applaud, in particular, Mark, your communications to the NRC staff. Every day I saw EDO updates, and I think that's just a hallmark of the communications within the entire family here. So, thank you for doing that.

Others have highlighted work. I add my kudos to those of colleagues who have preceded me this morning.

I continue to be extraordinarily proud to be associated with all of you. I am going to cite two examples recently, external validators, not that we need those, but I think it is helpful for you to sometimes hear what are Commissioners hearing in our travels, in our interfaces with other parts of government or international organizations. So, everybody here at this table has examples. I will only give you two.

Earlier this month I was asked to appear before a

congressionally-appointed panel whose charged in the Defense Authorization Act of 2013 to look at governance and some problems at the National Nuclear Security Administration. And this panel had some very prominent individuals; in that group, four former Congressmen, a number of other people that have been involved in the nuclear enterprise for decades.

And I'll tell you that I had a number of questions of me as a witness that were about NRC regulation. And I won't go into the details, but I will comment. The recurring theme for this group was the professional reputation of you and how highly regarded you are in doing the nation's business for regulating nuclear safety in this country. All 12 members of this panel made comments or nodded their head, basically, at different times, confirming their understanding, awareness, and appreciation for what the NRC staff does.

The second example, overseas. Again, we have many of these. I will just share one. I was in Romania at the end of September, visited a Romania nuclear power plant, and had a lot of interface with their regulator. And I was a bit taken aback with one of the Romanian regulator staff persons who quoted verbatim NRC Reg Guides.

And I'm saying this because I was taken aback, but it was from the standpoint that these other regulators have such tremendous regard for the high quality, the technical foundation, the objective confidence of your work. And that's just one example. All of us see that time and again in our interface with international regulators.

So, you should all be very proud of what you're doing.

any additional reactors announcing decommissioning. I don't know if any of my colleagues have any awareness. No? No. But, no matter what happens, we'll be ready to manage it.

QUESTIONER: Good morning.

Would you please provide an update on the migration strategy of the Office of Regulatory Research back to the White Flint campus?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I would love to give you a date and a time and a place, but that is still in process, as we figure out strategies for reducing our footprint in general with the GSA, in combination with GSA, and as we work on finalizing a lease extension and the plan for the three-building campus.

So, unfortunately, I can't give you a detailed answer right now, but it's all very much in play. We are in contact with OMB and with GSA. And there's a small group of folks who have been working very hard and very diligently to make sure that we have a good plan in place.

I personally would like Research back here sooner, so I can call you into my office right away.

(Laughter.)

QUESTIONER: Good morning.

The staff works very hard to deliver products to the Commission on time and on schedule. Yet, very often, the Commission takes an extraordinarily long time to vote. Can you explain why this is so?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: It's a good question.

3 4

5

6

7 8

10

9

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25 26 (Laughter.)

I don't think we always take an extraordinarily long time, but sometimes we do. And, you know, partly, for me, I am going to speak personally, and I am going to turn it over to my colleagues to give their perspectives.

You know, sometimes there is a prioritization. We have a whole slew of things that we are dealing with. And sometimes other things will come up at that moment.

For instance, the Yucca Mountain decision sort of dropped out of the sky in August, not completely unexpected, but it could have happened anytime for quite a while, and it happened at a certain time. And, you know, that adds to the workload. So, there are issues like that.

I am dedicated to trying to get us to be as timely as possible, though. I think it is important that we do act in a timely manner.

But let me ask my colleagues, who wants to jump in? Anybody? Yes, go ahead.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Yes, it's a fair question. I would just tell you that there are on some votes -- and I'm going to use one example, because I think sometimes context is helpful. I'll give you two examples.

filtered vent strategy vote So. the extraordinarily complex paper with a lot of interface, a lot of discussion outside the context of that paper in order to form a well-informed decision for a Commissioner vote.

Part 61, very complicated, extraordinarily complicated, and a lot of interfaces.

And I realize it's frustrating for you that are waiting to receive votes at times. I believe this Commission of five people is doing its very best to thoughtfully and carefully evaluate before we put pen to paper. And I think we are doing that. It's not as fast as any of us would like, but I think it's perhaps at the end of the day getting to where we -- and I'm going to speak for the rest of us here; I think it is safe to do that -- I think the time we take to craft a vote is time we believe it is necessary to take.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Anybody else want to jump in on that one?

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Yes, I guess I'll jump in. It is evident from the vote sheets that I actually last on a number of matters that come before the Commission. And you might say, "Well, she's the longest-serving member of the Commission. So, why is that?"

But, you know, I'll speak for myself, but I wouldn't be surprised if my colleagues feel the same way. When I sign my name to that vote sheet, that means that I understand what's in that matter and I'm approving it or disapproving it. So, I need to have the time to acquaint myself with the complexity of what you do.

Now I can't out-expert all of you because you've spent your careers on various topics, but I have to at least honor enough of your hard work that I acquainted myself at some level. So that, when I approve or disapprove something, that it reflects something; it's

meaningful. It means that I looked at what you did, evaluated, understood it at the non-expert level that I could understand it.

And it's not just technical issues; it's legal issues as well. I know I have one colleague who has a law degree, and at times the Commission has had more people with legal expertise on it than now. But I will say that, in our judging role, our adjudicatory role, we are expected to be able to make some pretty nuanced decisions about very complex fact patterns and legal matters.

I am working right now on deliberate misconduct and willful ignorance. For the first time, this Commission wants to incorporate for people we might accuse of actions, if it's not just that they took a direct action, but they could also perhaps have demonstrated willful ignorance or willful blindness.

You know, I sit there and I look at that, and I say, if we are going to accuse someone, protecting the rights of that accused person is really important. So, I'm going to take the time to look at case law, to look at model jury instructions, to really understand, you know, if we're going to have some sort of action against somebody, are we striking the right balance?

And so, I am amazed myself with the diversity of things that Commissioners are expected to deliberate, to muse upon and think about, and factor into their decision-making. But, when I sign my name to something as having approved it, I am going to be accountable for answering why.

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: I agree with what my colleagues have said, but I will add one thing. I take longer to vote

23

24

25

26

when I disagree with something that the staff is proposing because I believe I owe it to you to explain the reasons why I disagree. So, that takes a little longer. I want to discuss it with my staff, with the staff that wrote the SECY, and my colleagues. So, that is sometimes a delaying factor.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Well, I guess I'll bat cleanup. See, I'm still in baseball mode.

(Laughter.)

Oh, by the way, congratulations to the Red Sox fans. I hope you choke on it.

(Laughter and applause.)

One thing I would add is I agree with all the comments you have heard, but let me give you a couple of perspectives.

First, my observation is the Commission actually works pretty efficiently through most votes. I think that when votes come to us, we work through them. And some happen more quickly than others; there is no question of that.

As Commissioner Ostendorff pointed out, filtered vents, for example, was one that was extremely complicated and one that we spent a lot of time dialoguing with each other, talking to outside experts, talking to staff. I can't even count how many meetings I had with people on filtered vents. So, that was the good example of one that took a while, but these things take as long as they take sometimes.

There however, the occasional paper languishes. And I think that is something we ought to give some thought to. There are these occasional papers that come to the

Commission, and we just don't take action on them. Is that because we're not interested in the subject? No, I think it's more a prioritization. It simply isn't an issue that is of urgency. Other things come up, and we keep pushing it away.

I think we need to look at that and see if there is a way of assessing what's sitting out there where we haven't taken action.

And if we don't want to take action on it, we ought to just send it back to the staff and just terminate the action.

So, there are a few, not many, but very few examples where that does happen. And I think it's fair that we try to be more disciplined and try to deal with those.

QUESTIONER: Now that the budget for awards and training have been decreased, coupled with the offices losing their ability to decide and funnel training priorities, what other new initiatives or mechanisms are being used to incentivize staff?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: That's a good question for which I don't have a complete answer. So, I might turn to Mark and ask him to jump in here.

MR. SATORIUS: Yes, that is a very good question, and it's something that does not go undiscussed for very long amongst the senior staff at the Office Director and EDO level.

As we look into challenges, one of the things that the four Commissioners and the Chairman asked me when their interview process was going on for selecting Bill Borchardt's replacement is, "What are some of your priorities that you see on the horizon in the next three years or five years?" And along with maintaining highly-qualified

staff was also the challenges that I see over the next several years, especially in being able to identify those high-performers and acknowledge their high performance in a manner other than money.

So, while the fact of the matter is the budgets have been reduced, I think there are ways. I think a lot of people, while money is good to have, a lot of people are very satisfied to be acknowledged in having done a good job, and can acknowledge at the office level or at the Division level or at the Branch level.

So, my challenge out to the leadership of the Agency has been to get innovative and share those ideas with each other, so that we can certainly not replace the absence of monetary recognition; we can still demonstrate recognition of good jobs done by good people.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Great. Thanks.

Just a coda to that is that, when I had the opportunity to visit Region II earlier in the summer, I know that they were actively working on a couple of programs to deal with this. So, I know the Regions are also very concerned about this issue.

QUESTIONER: Can you share any specifics on the Agency's preparations for a possible funding lapse in January?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Well, I think we did a pretty good job preparing for this last funding lapse and getting through it. And we have done sort of a quick -- what do you call it? -- a hot wash. There is all this language that I have learned since I've arrived at the Agency, and hot wash is one of them, one of those terms. So, there was a hot wash on lessons learned from the shutdown and startup or shutdown termination.

And I know that we are doing a longer look at this, a month-long look, or something like that. So, after a month or so -- there is a more detailed look being done to make sure that we have figured everything out.

So, you know, I think we put a lot of thought -- and I won't actually take any credit for this myself at all. The management of the Agency, the EDO, the CFO, and their folks really took a very careful look at the shutdown and the startup, and I think that they did a good job.

We have a plan in place now. That doesn't mean that it won't be difficult or painful or stressful, but I think we're prepared at least.

QUESTIONER: This is a two-part question on safety culture. In the past, the previous Chairman and the Commission had an issue that was brought to Congress. Please explain what our Agency's view of our own safety culture policy is. Do we accept the Safety Culture Policy Statement ourselves, as we expect our licensees to do?

And the second part of the question: last year you were asked about extending the Safety Culture Policy Statement to the NRC. The Draft Policy Statement did include internal safety culture, but was dropped without an explanation. What are your thoughts about extending the Safety Culture Policy Statement to the NRC's staff, and what have you done to consider this issue since the last All Hands Meeting?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I will answer this briefly,

and I'll ask Mark to jump in, too, and any of my colleagues, if they want to.

But, certainly, safety culture is very important, not just to our licensees, but to ourselves. And this is an issue that has been getting attention. It hasn't been the top-burner issue. Events have sort of taken over the situation in terms of that. But I think it is something that does require constant attention. I think we are reminded of that on a daily basis, a weekly basis, a monthly basis, when we have situations at particular licensees that can be tied clearly back to safety culture, or not just our own licensees, but around the world you see events that can be tied back to safety culture and that remind us of the importance of safety culture.

But let me ask Mark if he wants to say anything about safety culture within the NRC.

MR. SATORIUS: Not a whole lot more than what the Chairman had mentioned. I do think that it's a focus area that we need to challenge ourselves to be just as conscious of our safety as we challenge or that we have licensees look internally towards their own safety culture. I can agree with one part of the question that we should not hold ourselves to any different standard than we expect our licensees to do.

QUESTIONER: With the centralization of training to OCHCO through the TABS effort, it seems as though the criteria may not take into account concerns of all offices. While conferences and courses may seem less critical, they allow staff to retain up-to-date technical knowledge that is critical to doing their jobs. How can the

NRC ensure that all office and staff needs are considered?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Well, certainly, we want to make sure that all offices and staff needs are heard and understood. And the TABS effort has been an ongoing effort for a number of years now. I think it is important that we move to a conclusion on it and finally put folks where we need to have them be to be the most efficient.

So, in general, I think it is important. If you feel that your concerns are not being addressed, I encourage you to take advantage of the open-door policies of your managers and the senior management at the Agency.

QUESTIONER: The lease for Two White Flint North is due in mid-December. Will the Agency be able to extend this lease?

If not, what are the contingency plans?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Yes, we are working to extend the lease. So, the contingency plan of everybody out on the 15th is not in existence. So, we will be extending the lease.

QUESTIONER: What is the short-term and the long-term plan for the Fitness Center at Two White Flint North?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: That's an excellent question, for which I have no idea.

(Laughter.)

I am a user of the Fitness Center on a regular basis.

And I had heard rumblings about it expanding, but I don't know what's happened. And I don't know if Mark can answer that question. No?

But it depends on the lease. Darren Ash tells me it depends on the lease and what we get with the lease.

So, unfortunately, the situation with the buildings has put a couple of things up in the air. And we just have to deal with it.

QUESTIONER: This question is about holes and it is directed to Commissioner Apostolakis. Last year Commissioner Apostolakis said that he was looking for any high-level holes in our regulations. What can be said today on this? Did you find a hole? And are you still looking for a hole?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: It must be in those Reg Guides you read at night.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: Not a real hole yet. But I'm working on it. Thank you for the question.

(Laughter.)

And I'm reminded once again that I have to be careful when I open my mouth.

(Laughter.)

QUESTIONER: One of the principles of good regulation we preach is openness. Nuclear regulation is the public's business and it must be transacted publicly and candidly. We are not following this principle.

NRC Commissioners and NRC managers have drop-in visits by the industry, licensees, NEIs, et cetera, without any public or staff participation. Often, they provide inaccurate, incorrect, and biased information. This causes credibility issues and confuses the staff and the public.

This practice needs to be changed. Will you change this practice to be open and transparent, so the NRC practices what it preaches?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: It is an interesting question, and I am going to let my colleagues answer as well, if they care to.

My own view is that it's important to entertain the diversity of interests in drop-ins. So, I hear from not just industry, NEI, or our licensees, but I also hear from any other interested groups, non-governmental organizations. I encourage them to drop in as well, because I do want to hear the variety of viewpoints.

And I think there is value in having the opportunity to sit in a room without, you know, a thousand attendees and have a conversation.

You know, I also extend the idea of drop-ins to government folks, whether they be local government, state government, Tribal governments, and Capitol Hill. Capitol Hill, I end up going to them; they don't come to me so much, but, occasionally, on the odd chance, they do come up to me as well.

So, I think it's important for us all to get a diversity of viewpoints, and drop-in visits is one way of doing that.

But let me turn to colleagues, if they have any comment.

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: Oh, I agree, these meetings are extremely valuable.

Several months ago I had the opportunity to meet with

18

19 20

21 22

23

24

25 26 some non-government organizations, and I encourage them to come to my office on a periodic basis, and several of them have started doing it. I find these meetings very informative. It is easier to talk, as the Chairman said, about the issues without having a larger audience listening in. And this is part of the process of understanding what the issues are out there, the different viewpoints. So, when I vote, I can take all this information into account.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: I want to add in that I agree with Commissioner Apostolakis and Chairman Macfarlane. Maybe there is a misperception about what happens here. And I'm going to spend a minute on this because I think the question, quite frankly, makes a very strong negative allegation about these meetings. Let me shed a little bit of light.

And I think what I am going to say is pretty standard. I think every one of us up here has an open-door policy. If anybody wants to meet with us, we meet with them, whether they are industry, state, government officials, non-governmental organizations who may be opposed to nuclear issues. We all meet with them.

Part of our responsibilities as Commissioners is to be engaged and to have a broad perspective and awareness of issues from the whole host of constituencies.

And independence -- and you have heard this said many times by many of us -- independence, as a regulator under our principles of good regulation, independence does not imply isolation.

Mechanics, when we have a drop-in meeting with industry, the EDO's office typically prepares a package for us. The

14

21

24

25

26

EDO's staff is involved. More often than not, it's not just a meeting with the Commission; it is also a meeting with other senior office directors or the DEDOs or the EDO.

And so, this is not just -- you know, there is a perception this is a cloak-and-dagger midnight rendezvous when you have three flashes of the flashlight. That's not the case. I can assure you that's not the case.

And I would suggest -- I am going to compare this to my experience with the Department of Defense and the Department of Energy -- that how this Agency does business in this particular area is, in fact, more open and communicative with our staff at the NRC than occurs elsewhere.

So, I'm strongly supportive of us needing to be able to meet with anybody who wants to come and see us. So, I'll stop there.

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: I would just add to that by saying that no regulator should take action with a lack of awareness of the real world impact of what it is that they are about to do. And the implication of the question that this is somehow shady or illegitimate, I reject completely.

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: I forgot to mention that during those meetings at least one member of my staff is present, and they prepare a summary for the record of what was discussed during the meeting. So, it's not a secret meeting.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Yes, and I'll just add in, yes, I actually have a calendar on my web page where you can see who I have met with for any day. Go pick a day. I invite you to go

bore yourselves by looking at my schedule.

But I think one other additional thought is, you know, we are empowered with making decisions as Commissioners on a variety of issues. And so, we have to have the ability to make our own judgments and be able to determine whether the information that's being provided to us at any one time from anybody, be it the staff or licensees or non-governmental organizations or government people, anybody, is legitimate or not. That's part of what we do.

QUESTIONER: Hi.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Hi.

QUESTIONER: I'd like to lend some support for the last questioner, because what I'm perceiving from you guys is that you are taking that as a personal attack. I think what the questioner was suggesting -- and I think it's vitally important -- is that there are a lot of people in this Agency that are very concerned about the credibility of the Agency. And that's because for most of us in this Agency this is our home. We live here. We will be here for a very long time. And so, the credibility of the Agency is terribly important to us, as I'm sure it is to you, too.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Uh-hum.

QUESTIONER: I think the questioner was merely pointing out that, while we're not perceiving what you're doing as inappropriate, it could be publicly perceived as inappropriate. And I think that the thread of importance in that question is to ensure that we all agree and we all are on the same page that the credibility of the Agency has to be a primary value of this Agency, because the historic

precedence of this Agency is that there were problems.

And we want the public to know that we're not just government employees that you can bash. We do a really good job. We work really, really hard. And so, we want you to know that that's important to us, and we hope it's important to you, too.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I really appreciate your comment, not too much a question but your comment. I think you're right on.

The way I deal with that is making sure that I hear from a variety of viewpoints, that I don't just have a steady stream from one direction coming into my ear. I try to achieve balance. I think balance is exceptionally important. I think it's exceptionally important that we demonstrate balance when we have Commission meetings, for instance, and external speakers on Commission meetings. So that we don't end up with any kind of public perception that we are one way or another.

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: Well, there is another kind of balance. I agree with the Chairman, but there is another kind of balance.

If, in order to not be perceived by some members of the public -- I hate to just use the word "the public"; there isn't one public --

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: That's correct.

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: But let's say some groups feel that it's inappropriate for us to meet in our offices with anybody. If I stopped doing that, I truly believe that the quality of my

votes would go down. So, there is a balance here, trying to not be perceived as being biased or influenced by some particular group, but also making sure that we understand, as Commissioners, what the issues are out there and what are of concern to various groups. So, it is a delicate balance.

And as I said earlier, we have members of our staff, my staff present when I meet with these people. So, there is nothing secret about them.

So, there are many balances that we have to address, in other words, in these things. But I do believe that the value of these meetings is so high that I believe I have to continue doing it.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: I think that many of the other Commissioners have said this in one way or another, but let me just sort of give a little bit of a more specific perspective on this.

When we meet with members of the industry, you know, utility executives or others, it isn't an exercise in trying to find, let's say, an alternate view to what the staff is saying. The exercise is to simply understand how they are understanding what we have asked them to do and how they are reacting to it, and how they're responding to it.

And if we understand their responses, it makes it a lot more practical for us to craft guidance and regulations that are more effective. It's part of the exercise.

And all the Commissioners have said this basic thing in one way or another. It's how we inform ourselves.

But the truth is that I think we all spend a great deal

24

22

23

25

26

more time with the staff. We receive staff briefings on a very regular basis, some of which are very in-depth and take a lot of time. If there is an imbalance that one would point at, it's simply that perhaps we are more insular than we should be, that we talk to ourselves a lot. I think Commissioners spend more time talking to each other, the five of us here spend more time talking to each other than we do a lot of other people, a lot of people on the outside.

So, I think that the real risk is that we aren't listening to what people outside are saying. I think the real risk is that we do so much group-think that we forget that there's public groups, there's industry groups, there's academic groups that have different views on the issues than we do. And if we close ourselves off from that kind of dialogue, I think we run the risk of becoming an Agency that's deaf and dumb to what's happening outside of our walls. And as Commissioners, part of our responsibility is to listen to what others have to say, including people in the industry.

Like the Chairman, I publish all my meetings on a regular basis. So, anyone can see who I meet with outside the Agency, outside the federal government, and they can make their own judgment.

But I think at the end of the day the true transparency comes when my votes are read. You know, my votes are all on public record, and you can see what I decided and you can make your own judgment as to how I got to those points.

But I think that that's how the system is designed to work. I am very comfortable with that approach, and I think that it

works. I think it works quite well. Because I think the contrapositive is one that I would not want to be part of, which is one where we are not allowed to talk with anyone outside these walls. And that would be a huge mistake.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Okay. Next question.

QUESTIONER: Thank you, ma'am.

I'm really pretty much coming from the corporate side of the organization and still learning some of the mission side. And I'm an old Navy guy, too.

But, anyway, having said that, you spoke earlier about Yucca Mountain. From a corporate perspective, can you provide maybe a little insight as to why Yucca Mountain went the way it went? Just looking at it as an observer and a taxpayer, it seems to be as though we wasted a lot of money building the environment, getting it ready to be a consolidated material management and waste facility.

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Thanks for your question.

Unfortunately, because this is an issue of active adjudication, I can't really provide more insight. But there are folks who have done research on this issue and who have written about it outside the Agency. I encourage you to look up their analyses.

QUESTIONER: With a declining number of operating plants, new builds, and licensing actions, why are we continuing to aggressively hire more employees?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I don't know that we're

5 6 7

aggressively hiring more employees. We're certainly hiring in the places where we need to fill spaces.

There are particular areas where we need to fill spaces because people have retired and we need to replace them. You know, we need to maintain a certain set of employees to deal with our operating reactors. We need to have a certain set of employees to deal with decommissioning issues, you know. So, we need to maintain a certain suite of expertise, and when that expertise leaves the Agency, we do need to replace it.

Did you want to add anything, Mark? Okay.

Go ahead.

QUESTIONER: This question is for the Chairman. Have you given feedback to OMB, OPM, and our oversight committees about the negative effects of pay freezes and furloughs on staff morale and accelerated retirements?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I haven't gotten recent data on this issue. We're waiting to get, I think it's the most recent survey results, back from the rest of the government to see what the actual data says.

You know, I suspect that it doesn't make it -- you know, the current situation, the sequestration, the pay freeze, the pay raise freeze, you know, the lack of bonuses, now the government shutdown, you know, it doesn't make it pleasant to be a government worker.

And I certainly didn't understand that before I came to this Agency, but, you know, I see how hard all of you work and how much dedication you all have to the Agency and to the mission. And

as Commissioner Ostendorff said earlier, I mean, the reputation of the NRC is extremely high, and it is only because of you and your hard work.

And, you know, the way that government workers in general are treated as a political football is extremely unfortunate, I would say. I'm worried that it will result in overall for the government a lack of talent pool in the future. So, that is a concern of mine.

Besides walking around and telling folks on Capitol Hill what a great job you do and that they need to give you the respect that you deserve, I certainly personally can't make it change. But I'll do what I can.

And you should feel proud of the work you do.

QUESTIONER: This is another multi-part question.

This one has three parts, and it is on sequestration and its effect on the staff.

If the 2014 sequestration is implemented, will there be furloughs, permanent reductions in staff, or a hiring freeze?

The second part of the question: considering five years of budget space, what's the maximum amount of budgeted funds that the NRC can have as carryover money by law?

And the last part of the question: since it's arguable that the nuclear renaissance hasn't occurred, where do you think staff size will go?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Well, a good, detailed set of questions.

In terms of sequestration's effects in 2014 and

4 5

6 7

> 8 9

10

11

15

16

17

18

19

25

26

furloughs, et cetera, there won't be any.

In terms of carryover money, I think I might let Jim Dyer handle that one.

And we are going to have to evaluate where things are going in terms of staff size. I think this is something that any agency should do on a regular basis, is to review the current situation, project out into the future, and have a look. So, it's something that we're all actively working on.

But let me ask Jim about --

MR. DYER: Thank you, Chairman.

With respect to carryover, there's no legislative limit, but, you know, carryover is money that you don't spend in the year that it was appropriated. And when you don't spend the money in the year that it's appropriated, what you're telling Congress is you had too much money. And so, from that perspective, we have an obligation to effectively manage our resources and do it.

And to the extent that, thanks to all of you, the NRC has gotten much, much better at managing our resources, and we have consistently reduced our carryover every year since I've been the CFO for the last five or six years. So, that's well-done.

The consequence of that is we have less resources to operate during a shutdown on the carryover, but we are doing better.

Thanks.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Thanks, Jim.

Next question.

QUESTIONER: Yes, actually, my question relates, is

somewhat of a follow-on to some of the discussions that you're having related to staffing. And I really have two parts of it.

The first part is other independent government agencies, like the Securities and Exchange Commission, have found ways to basically change pay scales. I recently saw a list of government employees. The number 3,000 or so on the list of SEC gets paid higher than anybody that works in this Agency. They put additional resources towards employee healthcare.

My understanding is that, as an independent agency, we have similar authority to do things like the SEC does and the Federal Reserve and other independent agencies.

And I guess my first part of my question is, have we explored all those opportunities and will we do that?

And the second part of it is that it seems like we have done a noble job over the last five or six years of hiring younger folks, making sure their pay is competitive, kind of pushed them to make sure that they're competitive with industry. But, once you're here a few years, and certainly the more senior staff, the pay compression for someone who has been here for five years compared to the most senior technical people is very small.

And it seems like there, again, in the same lines of what the SEC has done of working with ways to try and appreciate more that there is a difference between, you know, someone who has gone through this program, has been here five years, compared to the more senior staff, who we count on particularly for events like after Fukushima. The first thing we did was call in the most senior staff we

had, call in people that had retired, and we want to make sure that we develop those kind of people and have them stick around the Agency, so when we really need something, they're here.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Thanks for your question. I do appreciate it very much.

In terms of the pay compression, et cetera, I do understand that issue here. I am going to look to Miriam, yes, yes.

We will certainly look into comparing, look at what other agencies, independent agencies, regulatory commissions are doing with what we're doing, and see if there are any changes that we can make for staff. I think that's a great idea.

I like the idea of looking outside the Agency. I'm always asking questions about how do others do it, you know. So, I like that idea. So, we will definitely look into that and see if there are opportunities there.

And know that it can be worse. You could be in academia.

(Laughter.)

And you would be significantly lower paid and the pay compression is extreme.

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: And I would like to say on a sober note of the effects of sequester and just the overall fiscal environment, I read last week that Chairman Gensler of the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, which is another independent commission, as you made reference to, has informed all employees at that Commission that 14 furlough days will be necessary in FY14, given

24

25

26

just their overall tight budget cap. And they've also assessed that they don't have the liberty to further cut contract dollars because they have some projects that have to get done.

So, you know, I do try to keep an eye on other independent boards and commissions. I agree that it's beneficial. But some are experiencing more severe impacts than we are.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: But thanks for the question.

QUESTIONER: Is there any movement towards folding NRO back into NRR?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I think at this moment, no, but it's something that over time, you know, we'll have to see. We'll have to see how things shake out, you know. We'll see what kind of Small Modular Reactor design certification applications we get this summer. We'll see where that goes. You know, we could get just one. We could get three, four. We'll see. So, I think we don't want to make any rapid changes.

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: Well, I have a question. Do you think we should?

(Laughter.)

Silence. Okay.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: There is an undercurrent. Let me sort of speak to that. And the undercurrent is -- and I think someone over on this side said, with sort of the collapse of the nuclear renaissance, in effect, do we need to readjust our

expectations for the future? I mean, it's a fair question. It's a question a lot of people ask. Let me just give you my perspective on where I think things are.

First, let me say that what people called the nuclear renaissance was a little inflated in the first place. So, I think expectations were probably a little outside of reality from the very beginning. I just personally never believed that the kinds of numbers we were hearing from industry five or six or seven years ago were realistic. I just didn't think that and have said that contemporaneously.

And I think that, given that, where things are today shouldn't be a particular surprise to much of anyone. We do have some movement. There's two new plants under construction, four new reactors under construction. TVA is remanufacturing one reactor. There's essentially five in the pipeline.

And the question is, what happens from here? And I think a lot of the answer to that question depends on two basic things. One is on how well these projects that are underway right now go. Industry is watching those very, very closely. If there is a significant delay, significant cost overruns, that will definitely impact future utility decisions. So, that is something that they are watching.

Another thing to watch is what pretty much I think all of you recognize: what happens to energy prices in this country? What happens with natural gas prices long-term?

Those are two issues that today we just can't see.

Today we don't know. But I don't think it's a certainty that the answer is

no new plants will be built in the United States. I don't see that as an

26

being here.

answer. I think that a more likely answer is something in between a very aggressive renaissance and a complete decline. I think that there's going to be a need for energy in this country for the long-term.

But what that looks like, no one can tell you today. No one knows. And I think it certainly would be premature on our part to take action to restructure the NRC in a fashion that anticipates a decline in the industry as opposed to continued growth. So, I think where I sit right now, I don't know what the answer is, and I think we have to wait a few years to see exactly what it is. But I don't necessarily think that it's a decline.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Next question.

QUESTIONER: Good morning, and thank you for

There was a rumor that I had heard that when the sequestration took effect that there was a call to the Agency of how come we weren't furloughing. Were there outside influences that attempted to extract pressure to furlough employees?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Nobody called me.

(Laughter.)

So, no, we didn't hear about it.

QUESTIONER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: It was clearly a rumor.

(Laughter.)

QUESTIONER: Commissioner Apostolakis, what is your favorite Regulatory Guide?

(Laughter and applause.)

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: 1.174.

(Laughter and applause.)

QUESTIONER: Chairman Macfarlane, you have consistently highlighted and championed the importance of public communication and engagement in the Agency's regulatory programs and processes. What do you think the Agency is doing well? What can the Agency do more of, better, or differently?

Commissioners, what are your thoughts on the same topic?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: That's a great question. Thank you.

What are we doing well? Well, we try to be very open. We put most of our documentation in the public record available for the public to view. Of course, it's in ADAMS, which is a little difficult for some people like me to negotiate. So, there is a plus and a minus there.

You know, we have a lot of public meetings, and there's a commitment here to meet with the public on a regular basis.

And we've really been demonstrating that, I think, you know, with Waste Confidence, et cetera. And so, that's a real plus.

I think we need to make sure that the public knows that we're really listening to what they're saying and we really understand some of the issues and concerns they have, and we are addressing those concerns. So, there's where I think we can do a little more work.

You know, we hold public meetings. The Commission has public meetings. I think those are excellent opportunities to show

the Commission's engagement in decision-making and in thinking through issues very carefully to the public and strengthens their ties with us.

So, those are a couple of examples. There are more, but that is a start.

So, let me turn it over to my colleagues.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Sure, I'll say it; I agree with everything the Chairman said. I'll just add two points.

One, I think the openness of this Agency is perhaps unparalleled in the Executive Branch.

Two, I would say an area we can continue to improve on is how to tailor communications to specific audiences, which I think is an ongoing challenge for all of us, looking at the interests of different audiences, their scientific literacy, and what they're trying to get out of a meeting.

So, those are my two thoughts.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Just very briefly, one thing I've discovered in my time with the Agency is that the most effective communication with the public and with public groups -- and I think the Chairman alluded to this -- isn't so much how we talk about what we do; it's really how carefully we listen to what we're being told. And that I think is actually much more difficult than it sounds.

For those of you who interact a lot with outside groups, there are many groups that are not technically-literate, can't speak in the language that we're familiar with, don't understand what a Reg Guide is, although I guess I know where to send them now.

(Laughter.)

And they have a great deal of difficulty in engaging us because what we do is so difficult for them to understand in many respects. But they have strong feelings about a variety of issues.

And I think that it is incumbent on us, as public servants, to be a little more patient, to take the time to just sit and listen and ask questions, and understand what the people we serve are trying to tell us. And it doesn't mean that they're always going to be right about their perspective. It doesn't mean we're going to change what we're doing. But I think the act of listening, the act of understanding is essential. That, to me, is a big part of communications. And I know it is a very difficult one to do, but I think it is one that we should try to practice as much as we can.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Anybody else? (No response.)

Let me just add a couple more thoughts. I appreciate Commissioner Ostendorff's and Commissioner Magwood's comments, and especially Commissioner Magwood's comment about active listening, that actually it is a challenging thing to do.

And I think we should be able to provide some training for that. I don't think we do that. I think we did that maybe in the past, my understanding is, but we don't do it so much. And I would like to look into the possibility for reactivating that. So that those folks who are interested and who would like to acquire that kind of training can. Because I think sometimes folks in the public have the impression that they get discounted offhand without actually being heard.

24

26

And then, I will just put in a plug because I've noticed some slippage at the Agency here. You know, when I first arrived, I pleaded with all of you to reduce the number of acronyms that you used. And, you know, now that I've been here for over a year, I know that you think that I'm one of you now and that I get all these acronyms, but I don't. So, please, please, please, let's really scale back on those acronyms.

QUESTIONER: Congress has authorized a program that would allow a retirement-eligible employee to receive a portion of their pension while continuing to work part-time. What's the status of the implementation of this program at the NRC?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Miriam We use it. Cohen is telling we use it. So, it's active status.

QUESTIONER: Please clarify the Commission's version of what constitutes an open, collaborative work environment.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I'll let all of my colleagues comment on this one.

To me, an open, collaborative work environment is where we do good research, rigorous analysis. We entertain a variety of viewpoints, and we encourage a variety of viewpoints among the staff and encourage debate. Okay. That's not open warfare; that's debate among ourselves.

We deal with very complex issues here, and there will be a variety of views on these complex issues. And it's important that they be vetted and that they be heard, so that we can make the most rigorous decisions possible.

And so, to me, that is the essence of the open, collaborative work environment.

Anybody else want to comment?

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: I agree with the Chairman's answer. I'll just add one piece.

I know the thought, what I am going to say has been a little bit of a focal point for some of the discussions with senior executives. I think having the open, technical discussions, the give-and-take, two-way, not a check valve, back-and-forth, we certainly have a DPO non-concurrence process which is important.

But, at the end of the day, collaborative does not mean decision by consensus. At the end of the day, after all the facts and figures and different perspectives are out there, the senior leaders in the Agency will need to make a decision. And maybe somebody doesn't agree with that. And so, I would just emphasize that there's a difference between collaborative and consensus.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I would like to add that, you know, if you all have suggestions about an open, collaborative work environment, on how to improve it at the Agency, I would welcome hearing them.

QUESTIONER: With the currently-known information, does the Commission support Yucca Mountain?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: An interesting question.

Can't answer it right now.

QUESTIONER: What is currently the greatest

challenge internally with the NRC and staff and externally, other than Congress?

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: So, greatest challenge with the NRC staff or the Commission's challenge with the -- I'm not sure I understand the orientation of the question.

QUESTIONER: What is currently the greatest challenge internally with the NRC and staff and externally, other than Congress?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Well, I think one challenge is what's already been discussed about here, which is, you know, keeping employees and morale up, given the larger situation of no pay raises, the sequestration, no bonuses, all this kind of cutback, you know, the general tenor under which the federal employee must operate now. So, that is an internal challenge I think for the Agency to manage.

You know, I think we manage our challenges related to our mission fairly well. I've been very impressed with the way you all handled the challenge brought by Fukushima. And so, I think that goes quite well.

But I think, you know, keeping folks happy is a very important focus for the management of the Agency.

I don't know if anybody else wants to comment. Yes?

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Well, it's always dangerous to make predictions, and I read all the same newspapers and watch the same cable news shows that you do. But I'm not

hearing that there's much probability that sequester can be avoided in January. It seems to me that the brightest thing I hear that's on the table for those negotiators is that maybe agencies would be given some flexibility in how they manage the cuts they're given.

So, I think our challenge is no different than a lot of other government agencies. It's going to be how best to manage ourselves and our work through this kind of a difficult fiscal situation. So, I know there's other challenges, but that one I think will be very dominant in the space going into the next year.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: One challenge I would point to is one that we sort of touched on peripherally a little while ago. And that is, we have a lot of new people coming into the agency, a significant number of new people. And some of them are entry level or younger people.

And at the same time, we are seeing a significant number of retirements. We have to say goodbye to a lot of very long-term, very highly-valuable, experienced people.

And as I have often pointed out, you can certainly replace expertise for expertise, but when you lose experience, you lose experience. You don't get that back. And that's something that not just the NRC, but really all technical agencies, particularly in the nuclear field, are going to have to deal with over the next five to ten years.

I think managing that shift is going to be one of the biggest management challenges facing the Agency and our licensees because we're going to see expertise go out the door. We're going to see new people come in who are very good, very smart people, but

they weren't there in the 1970s when we had transients. They weren't there for startups. They weren't there for a lot of things that people who are retiring now observed.

And they are also coming in with new ways of doing business and new questions. One of the things that was really quite interesting, when we were building White Flint 3, was to see how different the configuration of the offices is. And it was explained to me that that's more conducive to how people who are coming up through the system now do business. It's more collaborative. It is more flexible workspaces, and it reflects their way of doing business.

This cultural shift, this generational shift is a huge challenge. And it is really one, quite frankly, that I don't think we've had to deal with in this magnitude before. So, I think that's the big challenge both today and into the longer-term future.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: And I want to comment very briefly on the part of the question that dealt with what are challenges externally. And I am going to put the following characterization in this context: I think it's a challenge for everybody here in this room, not just the Commission, not just the front-row folks. I do think it's a challenge to communicate externally why we are taking certain regulatory actions. What is the basis for our regulatory decision-making? How do you explain that to the American public in a way they can understand it, such that they understand and should have confidence in us as a regulator. I believe that's very difficult. I know that you are all working very hard on that. I think it's an ongoing challenge.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: All right.

QUESTIONER: Is there any way to engage the insurance industry and its knowledge of actuarial science -- for example, through estimation of risk premiums -- and the NPP Safety Assessment process?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I'll let Commissioner Apostolakis take this one.

(Laughter.)

COMMISSIONER APOSTOLAKIS: No.

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: You don't want to elaborate?

(Laughter.)

QUESTIONER: What is each Commissioner's perspective on whether plant operating licenses should be renewed for 60 to 80 years; i.e., subsequent license renewal?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I will let everybody take a stab at that one.

I personally think that one has to be very careful projecting out. You always have to worry about the unknown unknowns that will come and get you. We have experience with this on a regular basis, the unknown unknowns.

And so, I think it's something that we really need to be very cautious about and look at very, very carefully before we make a decision to go in that direction.

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: I wouldn't prejudge any

particular application that would come before this Agency to extend or renew an operating license. But I would note that, you know, legally, in looking at our regulations, such extension is currently not precluded.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: One of the things that we have been having a lot of discussion about in the last year or so is the need to focus our decision-making on a site-specific basis, and to think about things as how they affect individual reactors, individual sites, and their particular circumstances.

So, I think really the answer to the question isn't so much what do you think about operations between 60 and 80 years. It is that you have to look at specific reactors. You have to look at specific circumstances.

And I think that the answer to the question is the NRC is well-equipped to make that decision using the tools and knowledge and people that it has. So, I don't know what answer will ultimately come of this, but I suspect that we're more than ready for the challenge. So, it is not one that keeps me up at night thinking about it, quite frankly. I think we can handle this one very easily.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: I agree with my colleagues. I'll note that especially Commissioner Magwood's last point about it's under this Agency and we have the ability to make these assessments. I'll look at the alkali-silica reaction at Seabrook as being a prime example of something that you all have worked on, or Region I has, the licensee has, to get to the bottom of technical issues associated with that phenomena. So, that is just one example of where it's within our technical ability to take a hard look at these aging

management issues or other phenomena that might occur in a particular plant's life expectancy, if we do look at life after 60.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Next question.

QUESTIONER: This is appraisal season. Do you expect that there will be awards given to the staff and management? Will these be distributed fairly between management and working-level staff?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Right now, we don't have any communication from OPM and OMB on performance awards for fiscal year 2013. So, we will just have to wait and see what we hear from those folks. Sorry I don't have a more specific answer.

QUESTIONER: This is a two-part question. Given that most of NRC's budget is funded from fees paid by industry, why does the NRC have funding uncertainty? Is there a way to protect NRC's operation from this disruption?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I don't think we have funding uncertainty. We are fairly certain with our funding. The difficulty comes because we collect the funds -- I hope I have it right this time -- and we put them into the Treasury, and Congress appropriates to us. And so, we are reliant on congressional appropriations.

Did I get it right, Elliott?

And so, that's where the difficulties come, and that's why we had to shut during this last government shutdown, because we ran out of our carryover funds, and we didn't receive the appropriation that we needed to continue.

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: I would note that I have

tried to incorporate this point in speeches that I make to more diverse audiences, so that they realize this potential -- I'll call it a curiosity -- of the budgeting process for NRC. I also have attempted to raise it with Members of Congress, if I can get their attention to talk about it, just to make certain that the beginning of any kind of thing is always potentially So, I do try to raise awareness of this point in my awareness. communications with people.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Next question.

QUESTIONER: What are the challenges that you've been made aware of with the Part 52 process and construction? And how do you see it changing as other design centers and combined licensees reach their conclusion of their review?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I think it remains to be seen, you know, what will happen with other combined licenses. But I think there's been a fair bit of lessons learned, and to be, of course, expected. Who would expect the process to work absolutely smoothly with no hiccups whatsoever, right? That's totally unrealistic.

But my understanding, having visited Vogtle, seen the construction there, spent a lot of hours with Glenn Tracy talking through these issues, it has worked well. We had some issues with the licensing at Summer and Vogtle in terms of some of the rebar that they were doing. And I think they understand very well, the licensees now understand, Southern Company and SCANA understand very well what their responsibilities are and what we will hold them to account for, and what they need to hold their vendors and contractors to account for.

And I think, from all appearances now, they are doing

16 17

12

13

14

15

19

18

20

21

22

23

24

25

26

8

9

11

13

15

a good job at that. So, I think we have reached a good point.

And I will let my colleagues comment on that, too.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: I would just add -- and I think most of you all know this -- but I think I applaud Glenn Tracy, and NRO leadership for on their own embarking upon a program to do the lessons learned to date. And I think that has been very important, to take a reflective self-assessment of how things are going.

Like the Chairman said, you can't build things without having some problems. That's just a fact of life.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Just briefly, I agree with what others have said on this. I think we have learned a great deal, both on the industry side and on the NRC side, about how Part 52 works. And one thing that has become clear is that the expectations on how Part 52 would be implemented were different on the industry side versus on the NRC side.

I think what we have seen over the last year or so -- and I give Glenn and his team a great deal of credit for this -- is the convergence of those expectations. And those lessons I think will benefit those who follow.

So, this has been, I think to some degree, as the Chairman has said, it is to be expected that there would be some differences in these perceptions. I think we have wrestled most of that to the ground.

Now I think that, going forward, we are going to have to make sure that the knowledge of what we have learned through these exercises is clearly disseminated, so that the next one in line fully

24

25

26

benefits from the experience we have already had.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: Let me add one, just one, comparison outside the commercial nuclear industry that is a data point. I'm going to date myself, but I'll do it anyway.

In 1980, my second submarine is a new construction submarine, the USS ATLANTA, being built in the Newport News Shipyard. That was, I think, the 23rd or the 24th submarine to be built in the Los Angeles attack submarine class. So, there were 23 predecessors before I got to this submarine.

I was a member of the Joint Test Group. Every week I had a meeting with Naval Reactors, with the Shipyard, the Supervisor of Shipbuilding, and with the capital representatives to discuss changes during construction. And this was the 24th, 23rd or 24th submarine being built of the same design.

So, just the complexity of detailed issues, it's just a fact of life.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Next question.

QUESTIONER: How is the Agency assessing progress and the effectiveness of the Knowledge Management Program, especially given the staff turnover?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I think I'm going to ask Mark to address that one.

MR. SATORIUS: Just so I understand the question, was it the question, how do we assess successes within our knowledge management activities?

QUESTIONER: Assessing the progress and the

effectiveness of knowledge management at the Agency.

MR. SATORIUS: There is a number of ways. One is I look for supervisors to judge their staff, their new staff as they come onboard, and how effectively are the tools that we're providing those new people that utilize knowledge from former employees or people that are going out the door. So, that's one way.

And circling around or back to those supervisors and getting feedback. We have folks that specialize on focusing on knowledge management. We have a number of activities involved within the staff to focus our knowledge management efforts.

So, I think it is that feedback mechanism more than anything else that is helping us to realize that we are getting there and we are capturing as much of the information. The Regions are particularly good at this, in my experience, because they are smaller, somewhat more nimble organizations that, while a part of the whole, still are somewhat remote from our Headquarters complex. And they capture a lot of knowledge, and are able to turn around and apply that knowledge to their new Inspectors and the Inspection Program to ensure that that doesn't go lost, that that knowledge doesn't walk out the door without being captured.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Thanks, Mark.

QUESTIONER: Can you tell us anything about the differing professional opinions on AP1000?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Don't sit down, Mark. (Laughter.)

I can't tell you anything about that detail, no.

-

Okay. Go ahead.

QUESTIONER: Using the Japan lessons learned items as an indicator, the NRC seems to be responding to political pressure instead of maintaining its independence and prioritizing based on risk significance. Is this the future of the Agency or do you see the Agency returning to its independent stance of resisting political pressure?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I think the question of political pressure is a valid one, but I don't see that the Agency is succumbing to political pressure. We certainly do come under it at times, but I think we try to resist it.

I would like anybody else to comment.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: I agree with the Chairman. Again, to protect the anonymity of anybody asking that question, I'm glad to have that person come by and chat with me. I'm sure other Commissioners would as well.

But I think one of the key issues -- and I think other Commissioners here mentioned it earlier; I think Commissioner Svinicki and Magwood, in particular -- when we write a vote and we put down here's the decision we've reached and why, and we sign our names to that, that signature means something. And I stand by the votes we cast, and each of my colleagues does as well.

And the question, though, I'm not surprised by it, I completely disagree that there is a sense that there is political pressure on Commission decision-making. I would challenge that.

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: I want to reflect upon

the feedback we were given earlier in this very meeting about perception being so important. And so, I want to honor and acknowledge the kernel of the question, which is that if this Commission or this Agency is developing the perception that we're yielding to political pressure, that in itself is enough to be concerned about, even if it is not true. So, I want to acknowledge the feedback we got earlier, that perception is also something we need to be thinking about.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: I think that it is important to say a couple of things about this.

First, you know, what happened at Fukushima-Daiichi is something that had tremendous importance to anyone involved in the operation of nuclear power plants. I think that it is an incident that taught us some lessons that we needed to learn. And I think it would have been very easy for us in the United States to criticize the Japanese regulators, the Japanese operators, and say, "We wouldn't have made those mistakes. So, therefore, we don't have to do anything."

The Near-Term Task Force looked beyond that. They looked at where there could be weaknesses in our own system. And they made a series of recommendations that the Commission has spent a great deal of time, a tremendous amount of time, analyzing very carefully.

And the decisions we have made thus far, I am very, very comfortable are based on sound principles, are based on the need to assure adequate protection for the public. And I don't think we have gone nearly as far as some people would like us to go. I think that we

5 6 7

have heard a lot of voices from the political world about things they would like us to do that we have not done, and I don't think we will do.

So, I think that the perception or the concern that we have succumbed to political pressure is simply wrong. It is just not true, although I appreciate Commissioner Svinicki said, if there is an appearance -- it is hard for us to deflect that appearance because there will always be political voices advocating one action or another. I think it's just left up to the American people to decide whether our decisions are being politically influenced.

I think if you look at our votes, if you look at our analyses, if you look at the work that the staff has done, everything we have done has a sound technical basis. And I think it is work that this Agency should be very, very proud of.

COMMISSIONER OSTENDORFF: I want to give an appendix to my previous answer because I think this is a really important question. And we have had three questions today that I have asterisked on my pages that have come out that I have said, wow, this is of concern.

I am concerned about there being a perception of political pressure, especially if you think that political pressure is being caved into by the Commission. And certainly, we get a lot of letters from Members of Congress. You could go back and look at the number of letters we received on San Onofre, on filtered vents, on the initial Near-Term Task Force on Fukushima, and lots of correspondence.

I believe this Commission sitting before you has not

caved into any political pressure. But, obviously, the questions would not come up unless there's a perception that it is a problem. So, I would ask Mark Satorius and his leadership team to think about how might this type of a concern, how can we, as a Commission, better communicate or what do we need to do to clear the air on this issue?

Because I am very concerned. I have heard three different speakers today address what I believed were very heartfelt questions, as Commission Svinicki mentioned. And we need to, as a Commission, be able to caucus on this issue and figure out how do we best communicate with the NRC staff.

So, Mark, I can't task you to do that, but I think it is a follow-on from this particular session that is important for us as a Commission to be able to better understand, so that we can do a better job of communicating to you. Because, for you, perception is reality, and that's just human nature.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I think it is an important issue, but not a surprising one. We are political appointees. Politics enters, you know, at the beginning.

I think there are probably views that we have been politically influenced on the left, politically influenced on the right. In my view, as long as we are sort of in the middle there, and there's enough voices on both ends, we are probably doing okay.

COMMISSIONER SVINICKI: Well, I just feel a need to be clear.

Is this on (referring to the microphone)? No, I've been shut off.

(Laughter.)

I feel a need to be clear that, you know, I've been here almost six years. I have not -- I talked about what it means to me when I sign that vote sheet -- I have not taken any actions in my role as a Commissioner that were motivated by some sort of political pressure put on me or some kind of political reward. And I can't be any clearer than that.

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Next question.

QUESTIONER: The Agency is eliminating GG-15 positions. Understanding the budget constraints, is it wise to eliminate these positions when we're trying to retain expertise in the Agency, especially in areas such as PRA, for which expertise is hard to find?

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: I might ask Mark to help me comment on this one.

You know, I think the senior management carefully considers the needs of the Agency and where we need to be going in the future. And so, they certainly don't make choices to eliminate certain positions without very careful consideration.

And I think that's probably all the time we have for questions.

I am going to now invite the NTEU up to make comments.

> There's Sheryl. You're sitting all the way at the back. So, we've got Sheryl Burrows of the NTEU.

COMMISSIONER MAGWOOD: Hailing frequencies

open.

23

24

25

26

(Laughter.)

CHAIRMAN MACFARLANE: Ah, a Star Trek officer.

Which one?

(Laughter.)

MS. BURROWS: Well, I have a little one, and I guess I'm surprised that not as many of you all dressed up.

(Laughter.)

I would like to explain that I thought I should dress as one of my heroes, and I couldn't find a Madam Curie costume on the internet.

(Laughter.)

Thank you, Chairman Macfarlane and Commissioners, for the opportunity to speak on behalf of NTEU.

And congratulations, Mr. Satorius, on your selection as EDO.

Although this is the second All Employees Meeting since I became Chapter President, it's the first one where I have been able to speak on behalf of the Union.

I have been President of NTEU Chapter 208 for exactly 16 months as of today. And I know I have said this before, but this is not what it looked like in the brochure. I did have some idea of what I was taking on, but doing the job really far exceeds anything that I had imagined.

Having said that, I'm tired at the end of every day, but I feel very engaged with what the Union is doing for our employees, and I am happy to be a part of our efforts.

One of the best things about my new job is that I have had the opportunity to assemble and work with an amazing team of incredibly-talented individuals. Our Chapter's Executive Board and Stewards work very hard every day to serve the bargaining unit, and I would like to thank them for the important work they do, not only for the bargaining unit, but for the entire Agency.

Our new Administration has experienced a lot of change in the last year. Our first Executive Vice President, Walter Lang, took a position outside of the bargaining unit and had to resign. I am happy to say that we were able to convince Maria Schwartz to step up and fill the Executive Vice President position.

Maria is now our Executive Vice President and Chief Steward. Maria is an attorney with over 22 years at the NRC. She has worked in OGC. We has worked for the Commission, and she has worked in OE.

Then, our beloved Chapter Treasurer Mike Canova retired. His gain was truly our loss. Again, I am delighted to report that we were able to convince an accountant, Darrin Butler, to step up and fill the position as Chapter Treasurer.

With a lawyer for our Vice President and an accountant for our Treasurer, I would have to say this is a coup.

Completing our Executive Committee is our incredibly-capable Chapter Secretary and my favorite Steward, Robert Heard, super Steward Robert Heard. We were lucky to have Rob in the Union office for six months this year, but, unfortunately, his rotation was over at the end of September.

Having said that, one of my biggest challenges as a new Chapter President has been how to represent almost 2,700 bargaining unit employees with myself being the only designated full-time Union employee. Just providing office coverage, especially during this time of the year, my favorite season -- and by that, I mean the performance appraisal season -- it isn't easy. My secret weapon thus far has been to somehow convince high-performing, motivated individuals to step up and help out.

And I would like to address this to the Chairman, the Commissioners, and the EDO. Meeting the needs of such a large bargaining unit with only one dedicated FTE will continue to be a challenge, especially with the possibility of another government shutdown in early 2014.

So, what have we done since this time last year? Well, about this time last year, we were involved in mid-term bargaining, renegotiating five of the 57 Articles in the Collective Bargaining Agreement, the agreement between the Agency and NTEU which covers all of our bargaining unit's working conditions.

The Union was able to reach agreement, and, in fact, make some gains on three of the Articles. These Articles were equal employment opportunity, mid-term bargaining, and grievance procedures.

The other two Articles, performance appraisals and performance awards, reached an impasse, and we spent four days with an independent mediator. The mediator decided in favor of the Agency on both Articles.

However, there were some wins even in these losses, such as the Agency has agreed to provide additional information on the way performance awards are made.

But, honestly, the problems that I have seen in my 16 months as Union President have not been with the contract, but, rather, with lack of fairness and equity, unequal treatment of similarly-situated employees, lack of civility, and misuse of power.

Last year at this time, the Agency was starting the implementation of TABS, which was delayed partly in response to Union questions. This year we are moving forward with TABS, and one of our new Stewards, Carl Konzman, is the new NTEU point of contact. Carl has done an impressive job coming up-to-speed on NTEU's behalf, and he continues to monitor the progress for our Chapter.

As a result of declining OIG safety culture scores as well as a downward trend in the FEVS scores, the EDO last year introduced the Behavior Matters Cafes. Yet, in spite of this, I hear daily about managers who are not responsive to their employees, managers who fail to provide clear expectations to their employees, and in some cases managers who abuse their employees, overlooking the importance of treating them with dignity or respect.

But, also, I have to say that there are some employees treating other employees in, at a minimum, a less-than-professional manner. Employees feel disheartened that, from their vantage point, nothing seems to change, in spite of numerous new initiatives. I have been asked more than once what the point of Behavior Matters was,

because, first of all, as adults, we all know that our behavior matters. Even my fourth-grader knows that his behavior matters. Yet, bad behavior continues. NTEU believes that change is always possible, but everyone at every level needs to be held accountable.

One of our Administration's main goals was to increase our Chapter's strength, as there is strength in numbers. To that end, we have appointed two Co-Chairs of our Membership Committee, Ms. Serita Sanders and Stephen Monarque. I'm pleased to report that we have recruited well over 100 members in just our first year. And because of this large increase in membership, we received a 2013 NTEU National Membership Recognition Award at the National Convention this August. Stephen and Serita continue to work on this effort, and our strength continues to increase.

In the interest of time, I will eliminate my comments on the sequestration, building lease issues, the recent government shutdown, although we do have additional information and insights, and I invite anyone who has concerns to contact us directly or through their partnership.

I know I have covered a lot here in a limited time. In closing, I would like to thank the bargaining unit, all of the Union members, and then, many non-bargaining unit Union supporters, and NRC management for the warm reception and all of the help in getting our new Administration up-to-speed.

I was so flattered on behalf of our new team when at a recent Office All Hands Meeting a manager, commenting on my appraisal advice, encouraged employees to seek advice from the Union

Sheryl.