

NRC REGION I PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

ANALYSIS FORM

Meeting Date: **February 27, 2002** Meeting Location: **Public Meeting Room**

Meeting Purpose/Subject: **Regulatory Performance Meeting to review Entergy's performance improvement efforts in the areas of equipment reliability, design and configuration control, human performance, and problem identification and resolution for Indian Point 2, a multiple degraded cornerstone plant.**

Was the overall public perception of the meeting POSITIVE or NEGATIVE? **Positive**

Summarize feedback received (consider the factors described on the next page):

One feedback form was submitted with a generally positive tone and with no additional comments. Five members of the public attended the meeting. During the meeting, only one individual had a general comment about performance indicators which was addressed by the NRC. No additional followup was required.

Any useful suggestions / ideas: **None**

Constructive criticism (what can be improved): **None**

Actions recommended as a result of feedback received: **None**

Other actions planned: **None**

Meeting Sponsor 
P.W. Eselgroth

Date: 3/28/2002

Division Director: 
A. R. Blough

Date: 4/2/2002
3/1/2002

Package together with this form:

Meeting Summary

Feedback Forms

Within 3 weeks of meeting date, deliver completed package to Region I DNMS Division Secretary.

Factors to consider in your discussion:

1. Provide some perspective regarding the meeting "atmosphere". For example, was the public concerned because of some earlier event? What recent news had motivated people to come to the meeting?
2. Were people expecting to have an opportunity to express their views, when the meeting was not intended or designed to provide such an opportunity?
3. Has the public's perception of, or opposition to, the meeting subject already been strongly expressed in the area media?

Keep in mind that the purpose of this analysis is on the quality of NRC communications and how to improve them. The purpose does not include how to persuade stakeholders to like the message; they may not like the NRC, the licensee, or the message to be delivered. Our objective is to make our communications to the stakeholders more effective.



NRC PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK

Meeting

Date: February 27, 2002

Meeting

Title: Discuss Entergy's IP-2 Fundamentals Improvement Plan

The NRC recognizes the public's interest in the proper regulation of nuclear activities and is committed to understanding and including public input into our decisions. The NRC seeks to elicit public involvement early in the regulatory process so that safety concerns that may affect a community can be resolved in a timely and practical manner. This process is considered vital to assuring the public that the NRC is making sound, balanced decisions about nuclear safety. If you would like more information about NRC, please visit our web site at www.nrc.gov.

1. Why did you attend this meeting?
☐ a. I am a local resident
☒ b. I work for an interested organization
☐ c. I am concerned about environmental issues
☐ d. I am concerned about economic issues
☐ e. Other
2. Were you familiar with the meeting topic prior to coming today?
☐ a. Very ☒ b. Somewhat ☐ c. Not at all
3. How did you find out about this meeting?
☐ a. NRC mailing list ☐ d. Internet
☐ b. Newspaper ☒ e. Other *press release*
☐ c. Radio/TV
4. Have you attended an NRC meeting before?
☒ a. Never ☐ c. 3 to 5 times
☐ b. 1 or 2 times ☐ d. More than 5 times
5. Was sufficient notice given in advance of the meeting?
☒ a. Yes ☐ b. No
6. How well do you feel you understand the NRC's role with regard to the issues discussed today?
☐ a. Very well ☒ b. Somewhat ☐ c. Not at all
7. Were you able to find all of the supporting information you wanted prior to the meeting?
☐ a. Yes
☒ b. I did not try to find any information
☐ c. No
8. Was the purpose of the meeting made clear in the preliminary information you received?
☒ a. Yes ☐ b. No
9. In your opinion, were people's questions answered clearly, completely and candidly?
☒ a. Yes ☐ b. No
10. Was the written material useful in understanding the topic? *(NA)*
☐ a. Very ☐ b. Somewhat ☐ c. Not at all
11. Were NRC's presentations and material presented in clear, understandable language?
☒ a. Yes ☐ b. No
12. In your opinion, did the meeting achieve its stated purpose?
☒ a. Yes ☐ b. No
13. Has this meeting helped you with your understanding of the topic?
☐ a. Greatly ☒ b. Somewhat ☐ c. Not at all
14. How well did NRC staff respond to your concerns at this meeting?
☐ a. My concerns were directly addressed
☐ b. I was provided an alternate source of information to address my concerns
☒ c. I did not raise my concerns at this meeting
☐ d. I raised my concerns but am not satisfied with the response
15. Was adequate time allotted for discussion with NRC staff on the topic of today's meeting?
☒ a. Yes ☐ b. No
16. How satisfied are you overall with the NRC staff who participated in the meeting?
☒ a. Very ☐ b. Somewhat ☐ c. Not at all
17. Were the next steps in this process clearly explained, including how you can continue to be involved?
☒ a. Yes ☐ b. No

If you would like someone to contact you, please provide your name and phone number or email.

Name

Jessica Rutledge

Telephone

212-632-6645

E-Mail

jessica.rutledge@hazard.com

OMB NO. 3150-0187

Expires: 06/30/2003

Public Protection Notification: If a means used to impose an information collection does not display a currently valid OMB control number, the NRC may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, the information collection.

Please fold on the dotted lines with Business Reply side out, tape the bottom, and mail back to the NRC.