

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

Title: **ALL EMPLOYEES MEETING - PUBLIC MEETING**

Location: **Rockville, Maryland**

Date: **Tuesday, September 12, 1995**

Pages: **1 - 48**

SECRETARIAT RECORD COPY

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.

1250 I St., N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 842-0034

DISCLAIMER

This is an unofficial transcript of a meeting of the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission held on September 12, 1995 in the Commission's office at One White Flint North, Rockville, Maryland. The meeting was open to public attendance and observation. This transcript has not been reviewed, corrected or edited, and it may contain inaccuracies.

The transcript is intended solely for general informational purposes. As provided by 10 CFR 9.103, it is not part of the formal or informal record of decision of the matters discussed. Expressions of opinion in this transcript do not necessarily reflect final determination or beliefs. No pleading or other paper may be filed with the Commission in any proceeding as the result of, or addressed to, any statement or argument contained herein, except as the Commission may authorize.

1 UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
2 NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

3 ***

4 ALL EMPLOYEES MEETING

5 ***

6 PUBLIC MEETING

7 ***

8
9 Nuclear Regulatory Commission
10 11555 Rockville Pike
11 One White Flint North
12 Rockville, Maryland
13

14 Tuesday, September 12, 1995
15

16 The Commission met in open session, pursuant to
17 notice, at 10:35 a.m., Shirley A. Jackson, Chairman,
18 presiding.
19

20 COMMISSIONERS PRESENT:

21 SHIRLEY A. JACKSON, Chairman of the Commission
22 KENNETH C. ROGERS, Member of the Commission
23
24
25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1250 I Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 842-0034

1 PARTICIPANT:

2 MS. NORRY

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1250 I Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 842-0034

P R O C E E D I N G S

[10:35 a.m.]

MS. NORRY: Good morning. Welcome to the Fourth Annual All Employees Meeting with the Chairman, and today we have a new Chairman, Chairman Jackson, as well as Commissioner Rogers.

After the opening remarks, we will be asking questions and as you can see, as usual, the microphones are placed so that you can move to one of the microphones and ask your questions.

The regional and those from the residents will be relayed and asked from that position over there. They are all hooked in by telephone. So without further ado, Chairman Jackson.

CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Thank you very much, Ms. Norry. Good morning, everyone.

Commissioner Rogers and I are pleased to welcome you to this special meeting of the Commission with the Agency employees.

As the Commission's newest member, I have been looking forward to this meeting for some time as an opportunity for meeting you and to talk directly with the Agency Staff and particularly with those of you who I have not had the chance to meet before today, to hear what your questions and concerns are and to explain to you my

1 perception of what the future may hold for the NRC.

2 For those of you who are unfamiliar with the
3 purpose and format of this session, I should explain that it
4 has been the Commission practice in recent years to meet
5 with its employees about once annually, usually in the
6 summer or early fall, to enable employees to become better
7 acquainted with newly appointed Commissioners and to
8 facilitate the communication between the Commissioners and
9 individual members of the staff.

10 Given the interactive character of this meeting,
11 Commissioner Rogers and I, following my brief opening
12 remarks -- I hope you will think they are brief -- will
13 entertain questions from the NRC employees here on the
14 Green, on Mr. Taylor's grass, as well as from our employees
15 from our regional and field offices who are connected with
16 us by open telephone lines.

17 Since we cannot accommodate all NRC employees in
18 the plaza area at one time, we will be holding a second
19 session of this meeting this afternoon at 1:30 p.m.

20 If you haven't had enough, please feel free to
21 come again.

22 I also want to welcome any members of the public
23 and any representative of the news media who may be here
24 today.

25 Although the Commission recognizes that you may

1 also have questions that you would like to address to the
2 Commission, we would ask you not to do so at either of
3 today's sessions so that the Commission and its employees
4 can dialogue with each other as we intended when we
5 scheduled this special meeting. You can have access to me
6 otherwise afterwards.

7 Before I turn the microphone over to all of you
8 for questions, I would like to take a few minutes to give
9 you a perspective on some of perspectives in some of the
10 important issues that we face and the direction that I think
11 the Agency needs to take in the immediate future.

12 Although I have been Chairman of the NRC for a
13 little more than two months, it has become strikingly clear
14 to me that the external and the internal environment within
15 which the NRC conducts its activities is rapidly changing.

16 Interestingly, none of the changing circumstances
17 that I see are of major significance by themselves, but when
18 taken together pose, in my opinion, as great a challenge
19 that the NRC has had to face at any time since its inception
20 in 1975.

21 In light of the strong impact of these changing
22 circumstances on the Agency, it seems inevitable to me that
23 the NRC will have to change as well if we are to carry out
24 our regulatory responsibilities successfully.

25 In fact, if there is one message that I hope each

1 of you take away from this meeting is that you need to be
2 prepared for change and to welcome the challenges and
3 opportunities that change will almost invariably bring.

4 Some of the changes I am referring to are already
5 familiar to you.

6 For example, as you already know and is evident
7 here, the Commission at present has only two members,
8 Commissioner Rogers and myself.

9 We have been operating under a procedure in which
10 the authority of the Commission has been delegated to me as
11 Chairman.

12 In acting for the Commission, I have consulted
13 with Commissioner Rogers and sought and received his
14 concurrence on the major issues, and have had the benefit of
15 the advice of the agency's senior managers.

16 Next month we expect this unprecedented situation
17 to end, we hope, when Greta Dicus of Arkansas, if confirmed
18 by the Senate, may assume her position as Commissioner.

19 I, in fact, welcome the restoration of a quorum of
20 the Commissioners that her appointment will make possible.
21 In fact, we need all the minds we can get.

22 But I would remind you that although we will
23 therefore be returning to the traditional Commission format
24 that all of you are familiar with, Ms. Dicus' appointment
25 and others that will follow, in practice, mean that we will

1 soon have almost an entirely new Commission whose policy
2 direction and guidance are going to be difficult to predict.

3 You have not experienced such a sweeping turnover
4 of commissions since the first commission took office in
5 1975.

6 Another change with which you already have ample
7 experience has been the budget constraints that we are
8 learning to live with.

9 The budget targets and the schedule for achieving
10 them set by the President and the Congress have caused the
11 Commission to make difficult choices that have or will
12 impact nearly every NRC office.

13 I fully expect that we will continue to be subject
14 to these as well as new budget constraints that are likely
15 to be imposed for the next several years.

16 I recognize that this introduces a continuing
17 level of uncertainty into our lives and perhaps anxiety for
18 some of you, and I would prefer to be able to give you some
19 definitive insights that will put your minds at ease in this
20 regard, but in fact all I can do at this time is to urge you
21 to be prepared to adjust to changed circumstances as
22 warranted by events.

23 Budget considerations are also responsible for the
24 current impasse between the President and the Congress over
25 pending appropriations bills including the NRC's.

1 Even if action on our appropriation, which has
2 passed both the House and the Senate but must be referred to
3 a conference committee as completed, the situation will
4 remain sufficiently complex that there are possible
5 scenarios under which the NRC may have to furlough employees
6 later this fall for an unknown period of time.

7 But having said that, I should tell you that we
8 really would not expect that to happen. If you will ask me
9 about it, I will explain it in a little more detail.

10 Fortunately, and somewhat more likely, in fact,
11 are scenarios under which the NRC could continue to operate
12 even if other agencies are required to shut down.

13 At this point in time I am simply unable to give
14 you any more definitive information in this regard, and
15 therefore I urge you to prepare for either eventuality.

16 The changes I have described within the Federal
17 Government are likely to have only a relatively short term
18 impact on the NRC. Still other changes, for the most part
19 in our external environment, are more long term in effect
20 and more significant in terms of their impact on the NRC.
21 The most important of these external changes is occurring in
22 the power industry we regulate.

23 The nuclear power industry, for example, at one
24 time not long ago one of the most vigorous and expanding
25 sectors of the economy, has rapidly changed and has rapidly

1 matured. The Watts Barr plant, if licensed, will certainly
2 be the last reactor operating license application that will
3 be pending Commission review and decision in this century.
4 We really mean in the next five years, but it sounds good.

5 [Laughter.]

6 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: No new reactor orders of any
7 kind are expected in the foreseeable future.

8 Moreover, although we have developed a sound and
9 sensible licensing process to handle plant life expansion in
10 10 CFR Part 54 and despite meetings with vendors and owner
11 groups in recent years to discuss generic license renewal
12 programs, no license renewal application has yet been filed.

13 As a result, our reactor licensing activities,
14 along with our Design Certification and Severe Accident
15 Programs are declining and our regulatory attention is
16 inexorably being drawn instead towards problems related to
17 the aging of our existing licensed reactors and to
18 decommissioning as reactors that were once leading
19 candidates for license renewal have instead been prematurely
20 shut down and there may be others.

21 Another area of potential concern in the nuclear
22 power industry are the competitive pressures, which continue
23 to build, and could lead to increased concerns about safety
24 at specific nuclear plants. Although at one time we worried
25 only about the direct competition of traditional electric

1 utilities with independent power producers and whether the
2 utilities would make decisions about their nuclear
3 operations from the perspective of competitive advantage
4 rather than safety, what we're now seeing is possible
5 consolidation of utilities themselves through several
6 proposed recent mergers -- well, recent proposed mergers I
7 should say.

8 If this approach becomes a general trend, as it
9 has in other industries, the NRC will need to pay very close
10 attention to ensure that licenses are transferred as
11 necessary to new owners of record and that any new
12 management teams assigned to existing licensed reactors have
13 the requisite safety consciousness and adequate resources to
14 operate nuclear facilities safely.

15 In the materials area, similar changes are
16 occurring that are likely to have significant impacts on the
17 NRC. Later this fall we expect to receive the results of
18 the National Academy of Sciences study about program of
19 regulation of the medical uses of radioisotopes. Although
20 the Academy study is just one source of input into our
21 deliberations about whether the NRC should continue to be
22 active in this area, the decision we might ultimately be
23 called upon to make in this area could have all the
24 characteristics of a sunset process, something that we have
25 not done before for an entire program area.

1 In high level waste management, the Congress, as
2 you know, is considering legislation that would for the
3 first time place greater emphasis on the development of a
4 centralized interim storage facility as opposed to the
5 permanent repository possibility under study at Yucca
6 Mountain, Nevada.

7 The Commission has prepared testimony on this
8 legislative proposal in which we take the view that we agree
9 with the fundamental approach of an integrated waste
10 management system embodied in the proposed legislation, but
11 continue to believe that deep geological disposal is a sound
12 and technically feasible problem to the problem of high
13 level radioactive waste and, in fact, is an appropriate in
14 gain, as it were.

15 As some of you know, I visited the Yucca Mountain
16 site not long ago and saw first hand the tunnel and alcoves
17 for the experimental studies facilities that DOE is
18 constructing within the tunnel. Of course, DOE still
19 confronts many technical and scientific challenges before
20 site characterization can be completed.

21 Two other bills before Congress are directed at
22 streamlining and defining future missions of the DOE
23 National Laboratories. Although the Commission has not
24 sought an expansion of our regulatory authority over the
25 National Laboratory, we have informed the Congress that we

1 will fulfill whatever missions the Congress decides to
2 assign to us. This, plus the added responsibility of
3 certifying the U.S. Enrichment Corporations operations, pose
4 significant new challenges to us that we simply must be
5 prepared to address.

6 These are only some of the changes and challenges
7 that are likely to affect us as I see them. As I indicated
8 earlier, these changes taken together could be seriously
9 disruptive to the NRC if we're unprepared in advance to deal
10 with them. But since I view challenges as opportunities
11 rather than problems, I would prefer to address them
12 comprehensively and in advance, rather than to react
13 piecemeal to their effects on the NRC as they occur. That
14 is the rationale for my Strategic Assessment and
15 Rebaselining Initiative that I recently announced and have
16 asked the Staff to complete the first phase of by the end of
17 the year.

18 In my mind, with the world changing so rapidly
19 around us, such a course is prudent to permit us to take a
20 systematic look at where we, as an agency, are now and where
21 we should be in the future. Unfortunately, I think there
22 has been some fairly widespread misunderstanding of the
23 purpose of this initiative and how it differs from other
24 actions and reports that have been prepared in response to
25 the national performance review and to the congressional

1 reduction in our budget, misunderstanding which I would like
2 to clarify if possible.

3 First, I want to emphasis that unlike the NPR
4 Phase I and Phase II Reviews, the Strategic Assessment and
5 Rebaselining Initiative does not have as its primary
6 objective the achievement of a preferred outcome. In other
7 words, I've not asked the Staff to conduct this assessment
8 and rebaselining effort in order to reduce FTE levels or to
9 eliminate programs or activity, although it is possible that
10 later in the process the rebaselining phases may have this
11 effect. Rather, I have asked the Staff to look at what we
12 are doing from a wider perspective than we have used in
13 recent years in order to provide better input into the NRC's
14 planning process.

15 The first stage of the initiative, the strategic
16 assessment, involves identifying and examining the sources
17 of the mandates that make up our regulatory mission,
18 statutes, executive branch directives and Commission
19 decisions so that we can establish a mutual understanding of
20 what our mission is, what is required of us. Also included
21 in this phase is a process of looking at Agency activities
22 to determine whether they are being conducted in response to
23 a specific mandate or whether these activities have some
24 other rationale for their existence and whether there may be
25 areas where we should have ongoing programs to implement a

1 specific mission but do not.

2 This phase, as the title implies, is essentially a
3 review, categorization and assessment, but will not address
4 whether programs should continue or what resource levels
5 should be assigned to them, which are traditionally and more
6 appropriately addressed in the next phase, rebaselining and
7 strategic planning.

8 The first phase provides input to the following
9 phases and ultimately to budget and human resource planning,
10 which is the fourth and final phase of this initiative.
11 With respect to the latter two phases, I have suggested the
12 incorporation into a single strategic plan of the human
13 resources plan and the information technology strategic
14 plan, which will provide the foundation for the Agency Five-
15 Year Plan in the yearly budget process. I believe this
16 approach is necessary to meet the challenges we face and to
17 guide our activities and decision making in the future. It
18 will help us, in other words, to have a strategic vision.

19 I will acknowledge partnering efforts among all
20 NRC employees and to express my support for the concepts and
21 ideals that are embodied in such activity. But now I'd like
22 to turn this meeting over to our employees. I would ask
23 each of you who wishes to ask a question to use one of the
24 microphones available so that everyone can hear your
25 question. Please feel free to direct your question to me or

1 to Commissioner Rogers or to both of us.

2 May we have the first question please.

3 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: I'd like to direct this
4 question to both of you. What is your view of the proper
5 role of the NRC in the regulation of low level waste?

6 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, I'll speak to that issue.
7 As you know, most of the low level waste activities occur
8 through the states, through various regional compacts, and
9 the siting of those possible sites for low level waste
10 disposal, in fact, resides within those compacts. Most
11 sites that are under consideration happen to be in agreement
12 states, where then we've essentially delegated that
13 responsibility to those states. We've relinquished the
14 responsibility. We do continue to provide technical
15 support and guidance.

16 Other than that, I don't really have an opinion,
17 at this point, as to the proper role of the Commission, but
18 Commissioner Rogers, who's been here for a number of years
19 may, in fact, have a more definitive point of view.

20 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Well, of course. The low
21 level waste is generated by our licensees and we have a
22 direct responsibility to see that that is safely dealt with
23 when it is on site, when it is at the site of its
24 generation. In fact, that's a rather large problem today
25 because of the absence of final disposal facilities for low

1 level waste.

2 So we have a very direct responsibility to see
3 that at the generators low level waste is handled safely and
4 paid attention to. We have had some incidents in the past
5 in which low level waste was stored on site and then
6 forgotten. We've been very careful to see that that doesn't
7 happen again.

8 But as the Chairman has said, the ultimate
9 disposal facilities for low level waste are, by law, the
10 responsibility of the states. What we can do is offer some
11 guidance and expertise to states to assist them in making
12 decisions with respect to the means for disposing of low
13 level waste, but the ultimate responsibility is basically
14 that of the states.

15 I think there is a question as to the degree of
16 expertise and ongoing activity NRC should maintain when we
17 have this limited ultimate responsibility. My own opinion
18 that we have to keep our hand in to some degree. But in
19 these days of contracting budgets, trying to decide exactly
20 what that level of activity is, is a complex question, not
21 an easy one, and it's one that is being grappled with by the
22 EDO, the Staff and is a matter of considerable interest to
23 the commissioners.

24 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: As one of the missions that, in
25 fact, will be looked at and reviewed, both as part of the

1 strategic assessment and rebaselining, but also will be
2 reviewed at the Commission level as things evolve generally
3 and as we have to end up making specific decisions.

4 Is there another question?

5 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Yes, Chairman Jackson
6 and Commissioner Rogers, I may be accused of being biased
7 toward age discrimination for asking this question. But I
8 still think it's a worthwhile to ask.

9 When I came to NRC some 20 years ago, one of the
10 prerequisites was to have years and years of experience in
11 either research and development of nuclear power structures
12 or anything else or actual work in the construction and
13 design of nuclear power plants. These days with the
14 industry being so-called mature it seems that the people
15 that are attracted to NRC are all very young people with
16 very little experience.

17 Now that may be said that the experience that we
18 have is no longer required, but I beg to differ with that
19 because I think that now, especially with the budget cuts,
20 that the aging plants have problems that are structurally
21 and conceptually just as difficult as the design of the
22 plants were. For that purpose, we need people with years
23 and years of experience in those fields.

24 Now that I come to close to retirement and with
25 other determinants I see that we're losing this kind of

1 expertise. What are your comments on that?

2 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, I think, as I tried to
3 lay out in my introductory remarks, the heart of the
4 challenge that the NRC faces is, in fact, to maintain the
5 right balance -- and "balance" is a key word here -- which
6 involves the right mix of skills, the right programmatic mix
7 for us to carry out our continuing responsibilities, even as
8 we take on new responsibilities and as the apparent
9 directions of some of our missions change.

10 But I agree that it is important that we have the
11 right people in the right places for the right jobs and I'm
12 sure that the senior managers of the Agency and the
13 Commission are going to be looking very carefully to be sure
14 that we do, in fact, have the right balance of skills that
15 we need to carry out all phases of the work of the Agency,
16 including that having to do with reactors and the aging of
17 those reactors.

18 So I thank you for your comments and I'll just say
19 that we're keeping our eyes very carefully on that.

20 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: I would just like to add
21 that I think that the maintenance of a high degree of
22 technical expertise and professionalism is going to be one
23 of the major challenges of the future, not only because some
24 of the areas that we'll be paying attention to will be
25 somewhat different, as the Chairman has pointed out, but

1 also because of the facts that you've just alluded to, that
2 many of the more experienced people are going to be reaching
3 retirement age.

4 They will not be easily replaced from the field
5 because the field, the people in the nuclear plants and the
6 nuclear vendors, they're experiencing exactly the same
7 phenomena. Their people are retiring and sources of new
8 expertise are shrinking. So that that makes even more of a
9 challenge, I think, for NRC to consider very carefully how
10 best it can maintain its very high level of professional
11 expertise, which I think clearly does distinguish this
12 Agency.

13 That has to be I think by using every technique
14 that we have available to us -- in house training,
15 educational programs, as well as the bringing in of new
16 people from the outside as best we can. I must say,
17 however, that while experience is very important, I think if
18 we're talking about the aging phenomena of nuclear power
19 plants, in a certain sense, having been around a long time
20 and aging with the plants does not equip one to deal with
21 the aging phenomena necessarily.

22 I think that that's a new challenge that can be
23 dealt with by a younger group of people who are well-
24 trained, well-educated and are alerted to the things to look
25 out for by some of the more experienced people. So I think

1 that that's a new challenge in its own right that I believe
2 is an interesting one for the future, for young people, as
3 well as people with more experience.

4 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Another question?

5 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Chairman Jackson, I have
6 a question from Region III, and you mentioned this earlier
7 in your opening remarks. But what are the chances of us
8 being furloughed?

9 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, I would not make an
10 absolute prediction. I think that in the end when the
11 various parties see the trains on a collision course, I
12 don't think the trains are going to collide in the sense
13 that one might be concerned about it at this stage of the
14 game.

15 We, in fact, as an Agency have carryover funds
16 that would allow us to continue for some number of weeks
17 with some cutbacks in some of the things that we would do.
18 So at this stage of the game, I would say it's unlikely that
19 we would have to deal with that. But it really depends on
20 the outcome of the budget wars. But as things stand, in
21 terms of what the historical situation has been, coupled
22 with our own financial situation here, I do not see that on
23 the horizon. It's not likely at this point.

24 Another question?

25 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Chairman Jackson, I have

1 a question from Region IV. In a recent issue of "Nuclear
2 News," Tom Murley proposed a new safety contract between NRC
3 and the industry which would result in a risk-based approach
4 to safety regulation of nuclear power plants. What is your
5 view of this proposal?

6 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, rather than comment
7 specifically on Dr. Murley's specific proposal, what I'd
8 like to do is to give you a few comments of my own, relative
9 to this subject of "risk-based regulation." Let me just say
10 the following. It falls into two categories.

11 I think that the term I prefer is "risk informed
12 performance-based regulation." I think many times in
13 discussions, even among ourselves and with licensees and
14 certainly in the press, the words get used interchangeably.
15 There is a difference between performance-based regulation
16 and risk informed approaches to regulation.

17 I think that if one has an industry and that
18 industry wants to use various risk methodologies to help it
19 focus in its operating facilities, focus its resources in
20 its operating facilities on areas that allow in a more
21 efficient way to meet our existing regulations, then I think
22 that's a business and operational decision.

23 If, on the other hand, we as an agency, as a
24 regulator, a public health and safety agency, want to use
25 risk methodologies to make regulatory decisions or to make

1 regulatory changes, then there's a different standard.

2 Nonetheless, I think the industry and the NRC are
3 moving along parallel tracks, hopefully going in the same
4 direction. I personally feel that the methodologies and the
5 technology of risk assessment, as it were, have to evolve
6 more. I think the Agency has taken a number of steps to
7 begin to introduce risk insights and risk assessments into
8 how it does its business. I think one sees that embodied in
9 the maintenance rule. One also sees it in certain aspects
10 of changes to the inspection program.

11 What I'm trying to say is that I think there still
12 is somewhat of a gap between some of the uses of risk
13 assessments on the industry side that are different and some
14 distance from where they need to be or coming to closure
15 with respect to the methodology in terms of basing
16 regulatory changes on them.

17 Nonetheless, I think it's an area that's ripe for
18 reaping and it's personally an area that I'd like to see the
19 Agency move more strongly toward, both in developing our
20 capabilities and applying them in appropriate areas and
21 changing our focus that way. But at the end what we do has
22 to be performance-based. One still is developing standards
23 to be met. The standards are not variable once they are set
24 and we regulate to those on a performance-based approach.

25 So that's my thought about it.

1 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: I'd just like to say that I
2 totally agree with the Chairman's characterization of the
3 need for distinguishing between risk analysis and
4 performance-based regulation. I think that they're
5 complimentary, but they're not exactly the same thing.

6 I'd just like to enlarge a little bit upon the
7 question of risk analyses and deterministic analyses. I
8 think it's becoming clearer and clearer that deterministic
9 analyses, which have been very important in the past, are
10 going to continue to be important in the future. However,
11 they have implicit in them assumptions that have not always
12 been clearly recognized. I think that risk analysis has
13 revealed, as a matter of fact, some of these hitherto
14 unidentified assumptions that, in fact, were probabilistic
15 in nature. It's just that one simply ignored those features
16 of the models that were being used for a deterministic
17 calculations.

18 So I think that it is not that PRA is going to
19 totally replace deterministic analyses. I think the both of
20 them are important and compliment each other. But I think,
21 in my opinion, that one of the virtues of risk analysis has
22 been to reveal, as a matter of fact, some of the assumptions
23 that had not been previously identified in deterministic
24 calculations and gave us pause I think to recognize that
25 however exact the number was that came out of deterministic

1 calculation, there still were implicit in the construction
2 of the model and in the input data itself the possibility of
3 a range of values or a range of possibilities and that the
4 final result itself is just as well characterized by a
5 probabilistic or a statistical way of describing it than the
6 single number result of a deterministic calculation that
7 always seemed to be so nicely precise and exact.

8 So I think that the two compliment each other. I
9 think we're seeing that.

10 I returned from a conference a few weeks ago in
11 which they're a number of different regulators talking about
12 the use of risk analysis in regulation and I was really very
13 pleased to see how far it is being carried in some other
14 countries, particularly Germany, for example, which was a
15 little bit I think a few years ago not very happy about
16 doing probabilistic calculations and using them much more so
17 today.

18 So I think this is an evolving field, one that is
19 not yet entirely mature, but one that has great potential.

20 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Is there another question? Why
21 don't you go ahead with your question?

22 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Chairman Jackson, this
23 is from Region II. What are your views regarding long term
24 resident staffing of nuclear power plants at the N+1 level?

25 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: That's an evolving issue. I

1 think that that's something better handled through the
2 normal personnel processes and I think it's one that the
3 Commission is going to be looking at, but it has to be
4 evaluated, you know, within a broader context of what it
5 accomplishes for us and what our needs are and what the
6 issues are with respect to particular operating facilities.
7 Because of that, you know, it's not an area that I think is
8 appropriately commented on in detail here.

9 Yes?

10 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: I have a question about
11 what you called rebaselining. I'm a member of the Labor
12 Management Partnership Committee for NRR. So far what we
13 have been involved in is reorganization by attrition. So
14 what that involves is we try to reorganize the different
15 branches and parts of NRR as we see managers retire.

16 The reorganization so far has had nothing in it
17 that would indicate to me that we are going to go on a
18 different tack. The assumption so far has been that the mix
19 of expertise in NRR is about right and that only in
20 diminution of FTE and managers is important, not any
21 reorganization as far as doing things differently.

22 But you talk about rebaselining. Could you
23 explain to me what that means in this context?

24 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, I'm not going to comment
25 on any specific labor management or organizational issues.

1 So I'll say that at the outset.

2 Having said that, I ask you to keep in mind that
3 there's a conjunction. It's strategic assessment and
4 rebaselining. Before one can talk about rebaselining -- and
5 that has many meanings to many people and I'll talk a little
6 bit about that in a second -- one has to make some
7 assessment of where we are as an agency, what's the
8 statutory bases and other bases of what we do, whether it's
9 embodied in the law, in major Commission decisions or in
10 presidential directives.

11 Until that base and those bases have been examined
12 and looked at in terms of their implications for the Agency,
13 in terms of what our missions are, then we can't really have
14 a good sense of what rebaselining may be required. So I
15 mentioned that the strategic assessment is a first but
16 critical phase of what we do.

17 Having said that then, that kind of assessment
18 flows into a rebaselining process which has many aspects to
19 it, but not all of which are necessarily personnel related
20 ones. Rebaselining means many things. It means -- it could
21 mean business process. You know how do we go about doing
22 what we do on a daily basis, even if those activities don't
23 change? How do we respond to requests or directives that
24 come in from the Executive Branch? Do we have some
25 appropriate methodology for considering taking on new

1 missions or new aspects of missions?

2 What specific changes may go on in a particular
3 area, such as NRR, is something that would be dealt with
4 down the line, but ultimately rationalized on the bases that
5 come before. So it's precisely because I know that they're
6 lingering questions out there, such as the one you posed,
7 that one has to go through the total process and do a bottom
8 up, zero-based approach at looking at what it is we do, what
9 must we do, what should we be doing, how are we doing it, et
10 cetera?

11 You know what are the drivers? How is the
12 external environment affecting us and what are our own
13 internal initiatives that we've carried out that have impact
14 in all of these areas and how are we interconnected or not
15 interconnected as an agency in terms of the various pieces?
16 It's only out of looking and doing that kind of real hard
17 core assessment can one get at in a rationale way the
18 answers to questions.

19 It may sound to you as if this is put off of
20 answering your question, and it's not meant to be at all.
21 But all I'm trying to say to you is that when the various
22 things that we do do have a changing base, when we're being
23 asked to do many other things, as well as being faced with
24 budget constraints, then until and unless one takes a
25 careful and a prolonged look at all of these and understand

1 how everything is rationalized with everything else, then we
2 can't talk about specifically what happens here.

3 I mean there have been some offices of the
4 Commission that have wanted to do strategic planning. Well,
5 a unit of the NRC does strategic planning as part of the
6 whole because it's one agency in the end and what a given
7 unit does can affect what happens in another unit. So
8 that's why there has to be this comprehensive overall look
9 at what we do.

10 But I stress to you that what will come out of
11 this is not strictly or only something that has
12 organizational implications, but it really just has to do as
13 much with how we do what we do. When we come to a point and
14 if we come to a point where rebaselining has job
15 implications for people, then we certainly are going to be
16 working those issues through the appropriate partnerships
17 here at the NRC and not without them. So that's what I can
18 tell you.

19 Yes?

20 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Chairman Jackson, I have
21 a question that was sent in anonymously. It's a four-part
22 question.

23 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Maybe you better give me two at
24 a time. My short term memory is getting worst.

25 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Okay. I'll repeat them.

1 Can you tell us your view of the ongoing impasse between
2 NTEU and management regarding the family friendly proposal?
3 The issues in the proposal are, number one --

4 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I can answer that before you
5 tell me the issues. It's something that I know is going to
6 a Federal impasse panel. It's undergoing arbitration and
7 mediation and, as such, I'm not going to comment on it
8 because it has to go through that process.

9 You have further questions?

10 [Laughter.]

11 [Applause.]

12 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Here is another
13 anonymous question. What is the Chairman's position on
14 nuclear weapons? As I'm sure you're aware, France has
15 conducted the first nuclear test since 1991 in the South
16 Pacific and intends to conduct more. Despite opposition
17 from countries of the region, do you agree that France
18 should continue?

19 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I'm not going to answer that
20 because our mission doesn't have to do with nuclear weapons
21 testing, and I'm here to talk about our mission, which has
22 to do with civilian uses of nuclear energy.

23 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: I won't be anonymous. I
24 am Jay Perensky from the Office of Research. In any event,
25 the question I have has to do with the strategic planning

1 initiatives that you're talking about.

2 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Strategic assessment.

3 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Assessment. I'm sorry.
4 But it relates to planning in the long run.

5 A lot of the agencies that I've worked with in the
6 past, other regulatory agencies, have what I would consider
7 a non-adversarial relationship with their industry, whereas
8 it seems that we have a much more adversarial situation
9 here. As a researcher, we've had problems, for instance, in
10 trying to do cooperate research because of the conflict of
11 interest issues. Yet at the FAA there's a lot of
12 cooperative research that goes on.

13 Will this strategic assessment include aspects --
14 those kind of aspects in terms of the relationship with the
15 industry that we do regulate and how we might better
16 cooperate with them to perhaps even save some money?

17 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, it certainly is going to
18 deal with and relate to all of our various constituencies.
19 What it would have to say in terms of what you would call
20 cooperate research I can't predict at this time. But we are
21 a regulatory agency in a way that is unique and, as such, it
22 is important that we do maintain, I think, for a public
23 credibility the appropriate arm's length relationship with
24 those that we regulate.

25 I think because of the recognition of that, it was

1 also embodied not only in the Atomic Energy Act of '54, but
2 in the act that created the NRC as a civilian regulatory
3 agency, whereby we have certain research relationships with
4 the National Laboratory. But it also why in the research
5 area we have a number of cooperative or research agreements
6 worldwide with a number of other entities.

7 But I do think there are areas on technical issues
8 that the Staff has been working with and continues to work
9 with those whom we regulate on the resolution of issues.
10 But I think that we have to be careful because we are a
11 regulatory agency and as such we want to have a
12 professional, cooperative in areas where it's appropriate,
13 but appropriately arm's length but cordial, professional
14 relationship with those we regulate.

15 Are there other questions? I get no questions
16 from the left, except from my friend over here. Please.

17 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Chairman Jackson, this
18 came in anonymously. What do you think of the idea of you
19 or Mr. Taylor presenting Length of Service Awards to those
20 who have reached 30 years or more of service?

21 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Since I just gave out some
22 Length of Service Awards, I mean I don't understand the
23 nature of the question. But I don't have a problem with it.
24 I think people should be recognized for years of long and
25 loyal service to the Agency and it's something that has been

1 done and, as far as I know, continues to be done.

2 You want to clarify this?

3 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: I think they were
4 mentioning personal presentation in each case.

5 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Oh, I see. Well, if you mean
6 personal presentation, then one could think about whether
7 some kind of a graduation like ceremony -- and I don't mean
8 that to be totally facetious -- whether kind of ceremony is
9 possible, possibly in groupings. But we do have a fair
10 number of employees here in terms of doing it on a one-by-
11 one day-by-day basis. But let me take that under
12 consideration. Thank you.

13 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: I'm Jennifer Tally and
14 I'm from the Office of Research. I don't mean to just to go
15 back to the anonymous question about what is being
16 arbitrated about Family Friendly. My question is more
17 general and it concerns a family friendly work place.

18 I am sort of beyond the need for a family friendly
19 work place. But many young people -- and I mean both the
20 men and women in this Agency and also some of the middle-
21 aged people who are now coping with families -- need a
22 family friendly work place. It requires a commitment from
23 the top down so that our first level managers recognize that
24 they will be supported in this.

25 I guess what I'd like to ask you is how you feel

1 about family friendly work places without any details about
2 what you support or what you don't support, just so your
3 managers might hear it? Thank you.

4 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Okay. I think that one wants
5 to create a work place where everybody feels comfortable,
6 feels appreciated, feels their particular circumstances are
7 accommodated as much as possible. What the specific forum
8 or specific forums that may take is a function of the
9 particular issue. However, as I said, I think it's
10 important that we have a work environment at NRC where
11 everyone can work to his or her maximum potential and feels
12 comfortable doing that.

13 Obviously from the managerial perspective, what
14 form a particular aspect of family friendliness may take is
15 one that's going to be balanced against what the work
16 requirements are relative to the mission of the Agency. But
17 again, I affirm my previous statement.

18 Any other questions?

19 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: I think I, like most
20 people here, don't have a good appreciation of the actual
21 mechanics of the strategic assessment and rebaselining
22 effort that's going on. Recognizing that the NRC's most
23 valuable is it's human resources --

24 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Absolutely.

25 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: That there are probably

1 about as many opinions on what we should be doing and how we
2 should be doing it as there are people in this room, do you
3 have any thoughts or ideas of how the progress of this
4 effort is going to be communicated to the Staff at large and
5 how any Staff ideas, thoughts or comments might be
6 incorporated in that process?

7 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, thank you for the
8 question.

9 As I mentioned earlier, the first phase is almost
10 a research and environmental survey phase of the bases for
11 our work. As we move into the later phase, there is a need
12 and the Steering Committee has been challenged with the
13 responsibility to, in fact, engage the employees
14 appropriately to get that input as much as possible. I will
15 say that what specific forms that will take are still under
16 development.

17 But you're right. NRC is its people and,
18 therefore, what our people think is an important part, a
19 critical part of what goes on. So, in fact, those to whom
20 I've delegated this responsibility have a responsibility to
21 engage the people of the NRC in the process.

22 Yes?

23 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: I have a question from
24 Region III.

25 In Chairman Jackson's opinion, what issue provides

1 the Agency's single biggest challenge and what raises this
2 issue above all others?

3 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, the biggest challenge is
4 to be the NRC and to be a regulatory body in a changing
5 time, when there are changes to what it means to regulate
6 when there are budget constraints, but to stay focused on
7 our missions. There are various specific technical issues
8 that we are dealing with at this point in time. There are
9 various new regulatory approaches that we're taking in
10 response to external changes in response to our own desire
11 to do things in a more effective way.

12 But if we remember the legacy of the Agency and
13 try to stay focused on that, then I think we're in good
14 shape. But as I said, in terms of specific issues, it's a
15 question of really a coalescence of a number of things that
16 taken together have big and dramatic impact. But I've
17 already given a listing of what I think some of the specific
18 challenges that we face happen to be.

19 Another question?

20 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Question from Region
21 III. Considering all the debate in Congress, what is your
22 position on affirmative action at NRC?

23 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, I've said and I think
24 when I was interviewed for the internal company publication,
25 NRC is its people and we're an agency whose work requires a

1 high level of expertise, of technical and analytical
2 expertise. The quality of the people is the first
3 consideration.

4 At the same time, given who I am and my own
5 experience, I'm obviously sensitive to the necessity for --
6 and I'm committed to this -- that all people have the
7 opportunity to contribute to their maximum potential to the
8 work of the NRC and that all people are treated with the
9 respect and dignity that they deserve and that they're given
10 opportunity consistent with what their abilities are and
11 what our mission needs are.

12 Yes?

13 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Chairman Jackson, I'm
14 Fran Goldberg from the Office of Information Resources
15 Management.

16 I'd like to ask you a question about your views
17 and Commissioner Rogers' views on information technology.
18 Specifically, I'd like to mention the fact that we have some
19 major business process re-engineering going on in the Agency
20 in the Office of NMSS and they are applying technology and
21 some other radical changes to their processes as a result of
22 that effort.

23 I'd like to ask you what you think the potential
24 for further use of these techniques and the application of
25 information technology to other Agency business areas might

1 be and how this might be intertwined with the rebaselining
2 process?

3 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Okay. I'm going to let
4 Commissioner Rogers talk in a minute because he's had a
5 longstanding interest and I'm sure he's going to have an
6 even longer answer than mine. But before that happens, let
7 me just kind of give you my sense.

8 I come from ultimately -- and most of you may not
9 know this -- from an information technology background. I
10 spent most of my career at AT&T, in fact, at AT&T Bell
11 Laboratories, and a lot of the work I did was work that
12 undergirded and help to develop the enabling technologies
13 for the use and flow and understanding of information.

14 So having said that, obviously for an agency like
15 ours, with the kinds of technical and analytical bases for
16 our work, information technology and the technology of
17 information use is critical. It's important that we stay at
18 the leading edge of that. There are any enormous
19 opportunities for improving the way we do our business as
20 the initiative that you mentioned in NMSS in the materials
21 licensing area suggests.

22 But the one thing I've learned from my years of
23 experience in any company that's an information technology
24 company has to keep in mind and that is that the technology,
25 in and of itself, doesn't mean anything. What has meaning

1 is how the technology is used and it has to be part of an
2 overall plan and process for improving how we do our
3 business. That's true whether we're talking about
4 administrative functions or technical calculations, use of
5 codes for thermal hydraulics, et cetera.

6 So what does that mean? That means it has to be
7 user need driven, but at the same time we have to ensure
8 that our people are as up-to-date and on the leading edge as
9 possible in the various uses and types of technologies.
10 But, again, one doesn't want to start down a path for
11 acquiring technology for technology sake. Therefore, for
12 instance, if there is an area, such as an area like IRM,
13 where one is thinking about some kind of a planning exercise
14 or strategic plan, that it has to be part of a larger look
15 at how we do our business and how the technology enables us
16 to do that in an effective way.

17 There have been some initiatives that have been
18 undertaken to address some of these issues of being on the
19 leading edge and I know there have been a number of
20 initiatives undertaken in the IRM area. But, again, it has
21 to be tied to what use we want to make of it, whether it's
22 in the very technical and scientific and engineering aspects
23 of what we do or whether it's in the administrative aspects
24 of what we do.

25 So having said that, I'd like to give Commissioner

1 Rogers his turn.

2 COMMISSIONER ROGERS: Well, I actually have
3 absolutely no disagreement there at all because I think what
4 the Chairman said is absolutely right. The goal is not to
5 automate an antiquated process and thereby memorialize into
6 the future even more than it should be. So that it is
7 terribly important that the use of information technology be
8 a real assist in accomplishing what the Agency wants to
9 bring about.

10 Now again having said that, it is important that
11 the people who are trying to reach the goals of the Agency
12 are made aware of what the tools are that can assist them.
13 So that there has to be somehow a way of testing and
14 evaluating possible tools for their introduction, with the
15 full knowledge that many of these may be rejected because
16 they simply are a new kind of technology that may be
17 interesting in its own right, but not necessarily very
18 helpful at all.

19 So there has to be the balance that the Chairman
20 has mentioned here brought to this kind of activity.
21 However, I don't think that one can expect the day-by-day
22 online managers to become experts in what new technology
23 might be helpful to them. That's why we need a part of our
24 organization that is looking out to see what these new tools
25 are, what assists might be useful, then communicating that

1 to the users and providing some way in which they can be
2 tested for the utility.

3 So it is a process in its own right that I believe
4 has to be followed here, namely driven by, one, the
5 objectives of the Agency. Firstly, that's the important
6 thing. Then what are the assists that can be turned to,
7 technological assists, that can help us to do that better,
8 faster, in a less costly way or, in fact, to do some things
9 that we had thought were not possible before but we had
10 hoped to achieve.

11 So it is the symbiosis between the information
12 technology and the users of the technology that is most
13 important here and that they cannot just operate
14 independently of each other and achieve the most desirable
15 effect. So that there has to be a way of testing possible
16 aids, as well as being made aware of what they are, and then
17 bringing this in some way to the users so that they can
18 decide whether they will be helpful in their work. So it's
19 a complicated process.

20 Again, the human factor is very important here
21 because we all know that in some instances people have been
22 reluctant to turn to new technology because it was
23 unfamiliar to them and, you know, that old slide rule seemed
24 to work pretty darn well for a long time. Yet, think of
25 what we can do with the advances in electronic calculations.

1 So all I'm saying is that I think that it is very
2 important that the information technology not be simply
3 explored in a way that's disconnected from the mainline
4 activities of the institution, but that those two are very
5 tightly coupled all the time and there's a constant feedback
6 and mechanism for information exchange, testing, dialogue,
7 discussions so that the information technology is really a
8 supportive activity and a very important supportive activity
9 in bringing about the objectives of the overall Agency.

10 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Let me reiterate, I agree with
11 Commissioner Rogers, but again I'm not an advocate of work
12 station on every desk, like a chicken in every pot kind of
13 thing. But rather if a work station on every desk is what
14 allows us to keep the skills we need at a level and a
15 knowledge base that we need to do our work, then I'm
16 supportive of that.

17 I think though that again it has to be tied into
18 what it is we want to do, what information needs do we have
19 as an agency. It is true that without our people being
20 sufficiently knowledgeable about what exists in the way of
21 information technology, it's hard to make those decisions.
22 But information technology development and planning is not
23 something that can go on in isolation because it is a
24 supportive activity for our main work.

25 Are there other questions? Yes?

1 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Chairman Jackson, this
2 is a question concerning Watts Bar. It's a subject that you
3 touched during your introductory remarks.

4 In light of the fact that Watts Bar will most
5 likely be licensed to operate in the near future, there will
6 be no nuclear plants in the construction pipeline, what are
7 your views on retaining construction expertise within the
8 NRC staff?

9 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, as I have said earlier,
10 that our mix of skills has to match what our mix of
11 activities is. In certain key areas, we have to maintain
12 certain skills, even if certain activities are vamped down.
13 But what those skills are relative to what the activities
14 are, are what I hope to emerge from the Strategic Assessment
15 and Rebaselining Initiative to give us a bases for making
16 decisions in area such as the one you mentioned.

17 I know everyone, depending upon where, in fact,
18 that individual works at the NRC has a specific question
19 about maintaining that activity or that particular skill
20 that his or her work relates to. But I will tell you that
21 I'm not going to sit here and tell you whether Activity A
22 ought to remain or not, whether Skill B ought to remain or
23 not. In the end, it is going to be driven by what our best
24 understanding is, of what our continuing missions are, and
25 what forums those missions take even if the missions don't

1 change, and, therefore, what we need to get the job done.
2 That's as honest as I can be with you about that.

3 Questions? Yes.

4 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: The Agency is responding
5 to a ten percent budget cut and that type of scenario may go
6 on for several years. So it's not too hard for some of us
7 to envision that if it does, the Agency could be reduced by
8 a third of what it is today and it wouldn't take too long to
9 get there -- a few years.

10 Do you have in your mind, Chairman, some level by
11 budget or staff at which this agency would no longer be able
12 to do its job and that some other type of approach to
13 regulation of reactor safety through self-regulation or
14 something else would have to be done? Is there a level at
15 which you would say this Commission cannot function properly
16 at this level and therefore it's best for us not to function
17 at all? We can't do it.

18 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, let me leave aside the
19 self-regulation issue, except in the following sense. It
20 has always been and continues to be the responsibility of
21 our licensees to operate their facilities safely. Now we
22 don't operate the facilities for them. So in that sense,
23 they have a health and safety responsibility as part of what
24 they do operationally in running their businesses.

25 We are an oversight agency and one could say a

1 minimal standard setting agency vis-á-vis public health and
2 safety. Then we regulate and effectively audit to that
3 effect.

4 Now having said that, then there is a health and
5 safety line in the sand somewhere. Now what that is
6 something that's part of what I've challenged, what the
7 senior managers of the Agency to bring to the Commission to
8 help us decide and, secondly, what has to come out of the
9 Strategic Assessment and Rebaselining to understand what are
10 being asked to do and what are the resources that are
11 required?

12 How do we need to be organized? How can we gain
13 efficiencies, both in process, as well as people
14 productivity? But in the end, are there certain activities
15 that we can't do even today or should not do? Or are there
16 ones that going down the line we may be forced to say we can
17 no longer do them at a level to give adequate assurance of
18 public health and safety?

19 So the answer to your question is that I'm looking
20 to have that come out of this initiative. But at the same
21 time, at any given time, we don't have control over what the
22 Congress is going to do to our budget. But what we have to
23 be able to do is to say to the Congress and those who are
24 responsible for our existence as a regulatory body that this
25 is what we can do with the resources that we have available.

1 If you feel that these other missions have to be done, then
2 those other missions have to resource loaded somehow.

3 But in the end, it's not going to be our decision
4 to make. But it will be our responsibility to lay the
5 choices out starkly and to fight for what we think is an
6 appropriate level of resources to do the jobs we're being
7 asked to do.

8 Are there other questions?

9 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: This is a question from
10 Region IV.

11 The nature of operator licensing and examination
12 is being reviewed and a pilot program is underway. Other
13 countries rely on the operating organization to certify its
14 own operators. What is your view concerning the appropriate
15 role of safety regulators of the operator licensing process?

16 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I think there's some
17 opportunities are represented by this pilot program for us
18 to try certain things in this examination area. I think out
19 of that pilot program will come some answers relative to how
20 well and how effectively that kind of thing in certain areas
21 and selected areas can be implemented and how much is
22 something that is reasonably transferred to licensees to do
23 versus what core aspects may be appropriate for the NRC to
24 continue doing.

25 So I think the pilot program is designed to give

1 us answers along that line and that, coupled with our
2 knowledge of experience in other places -- but our companies
3 are different too and the businesses are organized
4 differently -- we'll be able to make a better judgment at
5 the end of that trial period.

6 Are there other questions?

7 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: This is a question from
8 headquarters.

9 Is there a time frame when training and additional
10 duties should enable lower grade employees to be considered
11 for higher graded career positions?

12 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, my understanding -- I
13 mean I think there is an overall career development process
14 or processes at the Agency and obviously training and
15 education, as well as experience, is part of that. But I
16 think that kind of question is probably more appropriately
17 referred to your supervisor, senior managers and the
18 Personnel Office.

19 Other questions?

20 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: One more.

21 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I'm getting to like you.

22 [Laughter.]

23 QUESTION FROM THE FLOOR: Great.

24 [Laughter.]

25 This is from Region III.

1 Could you elaborate on your projection regarding
2 the future of NRC's involvement in regulating the medical
3 use of byproducts material?

4 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I'm not going to make a
5 projection because we're awaiting the National Academy of
6 Sciences study, which we expect to be out later this fall
7 and we will be then having a Commission meeting, a public
8 meeting, from the Academy on the results of that. It'll be
9 on the bases of that that recommendations will be developed
10 that the Commission will consider relative to the degree of
11 our involvement in that area.

12 I know that there have been statements previously
13 with respect to the appropriateness or not of the NRC's
14 involvement. I think there are a number of questions. But
15 since we've asked the Academy to do the study, then my
16 perspective is let's let them do their work and we'll see
17 how that changes any of our existing biases.

18 Other questions?

19 [No audible response.]

20 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Well, I guess things have been
21 made crystally clear. I thank all of you for coming and
22 look forward to interacting with you over the years. I
23 meant what I said when I said that our people are the NRC.
24 I just ask you to keep the faith. The world is changing but
25 we're going to come through it because we serve a more than

1 useful purpose.

2 Thank you very much.

3 [Applause.]

4 [Whereupon, at 11:52 a.m., the meeting in the
5 above-entitled matter was adjourned.]

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

ANN RILEY & ASSOCIATES, LTD.
Court Reporters
1250 I Street, N.W., Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005
(202) 842-0034

CERTIFICATE

This is to certify that the attached description of a meeting of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission entitled:

TITLE OF MEETING: ALL EMPLOYEES MEETING - PUBLIC MEETING

PLACE OF MEETING: Rockville, Maryland

DATE OF MEETING: Tuesday, September 12, 1995

was held as herein appears, is a true and accurate record of the meeting, and that this is the original transcript thereof taken stenographically by me, thereafter reduced to typewriting by me or under the direction of the court reporting company

Transcriber: Tracy McQueen

Reporter: Marilynn Estep