## In the Matter of:

## Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

June 3, 2015 Open Public Business Meeting

**Condensed Transcript with Word Index** 



For The Record, Inc. (301) 870-8025 - www.ftrinc.net - (800) 921-5555

	1		3
1		1	PUBLIC MEETING
2		2	
3	DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD	3	(9:00 a.m.)
4		4	MS. ROBERSON: My name is Jessie Roberson.
5		5	Good morning. I thought my voice was music.
6		6	My name is Jessie Roberson, and I am the Vice
7		7	Chairman of the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board.
8		8	I will preside over this public business meeting. I'd
9		9	like to introduce my colleagues on the Safety Board.
10	OPEN PUBLIC BUSINESS MEETING	10	Seated directly to my right is Mr. Daniel Santos, and
11		11	seated directly across from me is Mr. Sean Sullivan. We
12		12	three constitute the Board.
13		13	Seated next to Mr. Sullivan is Mr. John
14	JUNE 3, 2015	14	Batherson, the Board's Acting General Counsel, who will
15	3:00 p.m.	15	serve as the Board's Executive Secretary for the meeting.
16		16	Having established a quorum of three Board
17	DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD	17	members, this public business meeting will now come to
18	625 INDIANA AVENUE, NW	18	order. This public business meeting was noticed in the
19	ROOM 352	19	Federal Register on May 21, 2015. The meeting is held
20	WASHINGTON, DC 20004	20	open to the public per the provisions of the Government
21		21	in the Sunshine Act, also known as the Sunshine Act, as
22		22	well as the Board's regulations implementing the Sunshine
23		23	Act and the Board's operating business procedures the
24		24	Board's operating procedures for conducting a meeting.
25		25	A request for Board action concerning
		_	
	2		1
	2		4
1	2 INDEX	1	$\begin{tabular}{ll} $4$ \\ additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was \\ \end{tabular}$
2	INDEX	2	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14,
		2 3	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.
2 3 4	INDEX Topic: Page:	2 3 4	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through
2	INDEX	2 3 4 5	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals
2 3 4 5 6	Topic: Page: Board's Opening Remarks 3	2 3 4 5 6	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit
2 3 4 5 6 7	INDEX  Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's	2 3 4 5 6 7	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at
2 3 4 5 6 7 8	Topic: Page: Board's Opening Remarks 3	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	INDEX  Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6	2 3 4 5 6 7 8	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	INDEX  Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	INDEX  Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	TODEX  Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	TODEX  Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50  General Manager on Organizational Assessments 88	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General Manager will present on the Board's performance metrics.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50  General Manager on Organizational Assessments 88  Public Comments 104	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General Manager will present on the Board's performance metrics. Next, the Acting General Counsel will present to the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50  General Manager on Organizational Assessments 88	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General Manager will present on the Board's performance metrics.  Next, the Acting General Counsel will present to the Board on the Board's policies and their underlying legal
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50  General Manager on Organizational Assessments 88  Public Comments 104  Board Consideration of Requests for Board Action 119	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General Manager will present on the Board's performance metrics.  Next, the Acting General Counsel will present to the Board on the Board's policies and their underlying legal basis. And, finally, the Technical Director will present
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50  General Manager on Organizational Assessments 88  Public Comments 104	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General Manager will present on the Board's performance metrics. Next, the Acting General Counsel will present to the Board on the Board's policies and their underlying legal basis. And, finally, the Technical Director will present on the technical staff organizational structure.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50  General Manager on Organizational Assessments 88  Public Comments 104  Board Consideration of Requests for Board Action 119	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General Manager will present on the Board's performance metrics. Next, the Acting General Counsel will present to the Board on the Board's policies and their underlying legal basis. And, finally, the Technical Director will present on the technical staff organizational structure.  The Board will then take a short recess, and
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	Topic: Page:  Board's Opening Remarks 3  General Manager Presentation on the Board's Performance Metrics 6  Acting General Counsel on the Board's Policies and Their Underlying Legal Basis 22  Technical Director on the Technical Staff Organizational Structure 50  General Manager on Organizational Assessments 88  Public Comments 104  Board Consideration of Requests for Board Action 119	2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	additional procedures for the conduct of this meeting was also approved by the Board by notational vote on May 14, 2015.  The Board is recording this proceeding through a verbatim transcript and video recording. Individuals viewing remotely by live video streaming may submit comments via email to the Board's email address at mailbox@DNFSB.gov. Comments received via email will be read to the Board during the public comment period.  The transcript, public notice, and video recording will be available for viewing on the Board's public website. In addition, an archive copy of the video recording will be available through our website for at least 60 days.  In accordance with the previously approved agenda, Board members will receive presentations from each of the Board's office directors. First, the General Manager will present on the Board's performance metrics. Next, the Acting General Counsel will present to the Board on the Board's policies and their underlying legal basis. And, finally, the Technical Director will present on the technical staff organizational structure.

assessments of the Board. The Board will then entertain
comments from the public. And after a lunch break, the
Board will consider four previously submitted requests
for Board action, engage in deliberations, and vote on
whether to approve or disapprove the request. A copy of
the meeting agenda is posted on the Board's public
website.

I'd also like to ask, if you have your phone, if you could put it on vibrate or silent or turn it off. I think it would be appreciated for everybody here.

So, this concludes my opening remarks. And now I turn to the Board members for their opening remarks.

Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: No comments.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.

Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Thank you, Madam Vice Chairman. I just briefly want to mention as a relatively new Board member I'm very encouraged by this opportunity to have a public business meeting where we're giving opportunity to the public and other interested parties to actually see the Board conduct its business in a transparent manner.

As you know, given the Sunshine Act, a lot of our Board activities are somewhat restricted and we have to do it every -- through notational votes that may be a produce a new strategic plan by February of the year after the President's term commences. The plan must cover a minimum of four years and contain general goals and objectives for the major functions and operations of the agency.

GPRA also requires agencies to submit an annual performance plan by the first Monday in February of each year. The annual performance plan establishes performance goals to be achieved during the year in which the plan is submitted, as well as the next year. The plan must also describe how the performance goals contribute to the general goals and objectives established in the strategic plan. Goals are to be expressed in an objective, quantifiable, and measurable form, unless such an expression is not feasible, hence the need for performance metrics.

Office of Management and Budget, or OMB, Circular A-11 encourages agencies to deliver the annual performance plan concurrent with the Congressional Budget Justification. Finally, GPRA requires agencies to submit an annual performance report no later than 150 days after the end of the fiscal year. The report must compare actual performance achieved with the performance goals established in the performance plan. OMB Circular A-11 also encourages agencies to deliver the annual

little bit cryptic to folks. So, having the opportunity to have public meetings is something that I fully support. And I encourage the Board to see this as a good tool in our toolkit to keep all our stakeholders informed.

That concludes my opening remarks. Thank you. MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Santos.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Santos. So, this concludes the Board members' opening

remarks, and at this time, I'd like to begin with the first order of business on the agenda. I'd like to recognize our first presenter, Mr. Mark Welch, the Board's General Manager.

Mr. Welch, please present your report on the existing Board performance metrics.

MR. WELCH: Thank you, Madam Vice Chairman, and good morning, Board members and staff.

Slide 2, please. I'm going to provide a brief overview of the strategic planning and performance planning and reporting requirements of the Government Performance and Results Modernization Act of 2010, or GPRA. I will then briefly discuss the purposes of GPRA, the strategic goals and objectives included in the

Board's strategic plan, and existing Board performance metrics in support of these goals and objectives.

Slide 3, please. GPRA requires that agencies

performance plan concurrent with the annual budget justification submitted to Congress.

Slide 4, please. Per OMB Circular A-11, purposes of the GPRA Modernization Act include improving public confidence in the capability of the Federal Government by holding federal agencies accountable for achieving program results; improving program performance by requiring agencies to set goals and measure performance against those goals and report publicly on progress; improving federal program effectiveness and public accountability by promoting a focus on results; helping federal managers improve service delivery by requiring that they plan for meeting program goals and providing them with information about program results; and improving congressional decision-making by providing more information on achieving statutory objectives and on the relative effectiveness and efficiency of federal programs and spending.

Slide 5, please. The Board's strategic plan for Fiscal Years 2014 through 2018, which was approved by the Board in February of 2014, replaced the previous strategic plan, which covered Fiscal Years 2011 through 2016. It established four strategic goals: improve safety of operations; strengthen safety standards; strengthen safety in design; and achieve excellence in

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

management and communication with stakeholders.

The first three strategic goals relate to the technical mission of the Board, while the fourth relates to agency support provided by all offices. The detailed strategic goals are shown on slide 5.

Slide 6, please. The plan further established strategic objectives for each of the four strategic goals. The first three strategic goals have two objectives each, and the fourth strategic goal has three strategic objectives. Slide 6 shows the strategic objectives for the first two strategic goals.

Slide 7, please. Slide 7 shows the strategic objectives for the third and fourth strategic goals.

Slide 8, please. The Board first began establishing performance goals and associated metrics in support of the current strategic goals and objectives for Fiscal Year 2014. The performance goals and metrics remained consistent in Fiscal Years 2015 and 2016, the latest year in which performance goals were established, with the exception of minor editorial changes or clarifications.

Under strategic goals one through three, 19 performance goals support the six strategic objectives, and the Board uses three cross-cutting metrics and three individual metrics to measure performance. The first

established under Strategic Objective 3.1

Finally, the percentage of significant Hazard Category 2 projects achieving a critical design milestone for which the Board issues a project letter within 60 days of DOE's critical decision milestone supports a performance goal established under Strategic Objective 3.1

Slide 10, please. Under strategic goal 4, eight performance goals support the three strategic objectives, and each goal has a unique metric to measure performance. Under Strategic Objective 4.1, improving internal management controls, each of the Board offices has a performance goal with a metric tied to development of new procedures.

Under Strategic Objective 4.2, improving the alignment of human capital strategies, the Board is measuring the number of employees operating under a results-based appraisal system, and the number of unfilled critical mission functions.

Slide 11, please. Under Strategic Objective 4.3, improving communication, the Board has three metrics. The first is the percentage of site representative weekly reports documenting direct oversight posted to the Board's public website within 35 days of the date of the report. The second is the number

cross-cutting metric, the number of completed reviews that comply with technical staff instructions, operating procedures, and internal controls, supports performance goals established under strategic -- Strategic Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.1, 2.2, and 3.2

The percentage of Board letters regarding potential safety deficiencies sent to DOE or NNSA that are responded to and result in positive response to assess safety issues supports performance goals established under Strategic Objectives 1.1, 1.2, 2.2 and 3.2.

Slide 9, please. The number of days per year a site representative or member of the technical staff conducts onsite safety oversight supports performance goals established under Strategic Objectives 1.1 and 1.2. The percentage of DOE directives entering the review comment period for which the Board provides comments on or before the review date deadline, supports a performance goal established under Strategic Objective 2.1.

The percentage of significant Hazard Category 2 projects achieving a critical design milestone for which the Board's technical staff completes and documents in the staff report, a review of the associated safety design basis document, supports a performance goal

of reports to Congress on the status of significant unresolved technical differences between the Board and the Department of Energy on issues concerning the design and construction of DOE's defense nuclear facilities submitted to Congress, which the Board most recently included as an appendix in its annual report to Congress. The third is the number of public hearings conducted.

This concludes my presentation summarizing existing Board performance metrics and their relationship to Board strategic goals and objectives. I'm happy to answer any questions.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Welch.
The floor is now open for questions from Board members.

Mr. Sullivan, do you have any questions at this time?

MR. SULLIVAN: I don't really have any questions for Mr. Welch, but, I mean, I think there's plenty to talk about on the topic.

MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm.

MR. SULLIVAN: So, if anybody else wants to ask Mr. Welch questions while he's standing up, otherwise I'll wait until he's allowed to take a seat.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Thank you, sir. Mr. Santos?

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

MR. SANTOS: Yeah, one quick question for the benefit of the public and other stakeholders. Where can the public, other than the Congressional Budget Justification, access how we're doing, the metrics, all these links as you described in detail? If you can explain that.

MR. WELCH: Right. So, the Congressional Budget Justification each year has both the performance plans for that year and the budget year, but it also has the results for the previous five years. So, that's the best place for the specific performance metrics, the best place to go is the Congressional Budget Justification. And then the Board does have its annual report, which discusses in more detail, in the more narrative format, its successes each calendar year.

MR. SANTOS: And those are available on our public website?

MR. WELCH: Those are available on our public website, yes.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Well, I have a couple questions while you're standing. So, we started using these metrics 2014 after we updated our strategic plan.

MR. WELCH: Right.

MS. ROBERSON: Do we have a mechanism for

other views that we've had, the climate of the organization? Have you had a chance to think about that, Mark?

MR. WELCH: I've thought about it a little bit. So, for the next couple of months, we'll be embarking on the project to develop the '17 Congressional Budget Justification. That will be the opportunity to look at our '17 goals and adjust our '16 goals, so I'm envisioning that that will be part of that process.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. SANTOS: A quick followup?

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Have we received any outside feedback, whether it's JO, IG, or any other, OMB, on -- on our goals, metrics, process, overall? Has anybody else looked at this?

MR. WELCH: Well, OMB looks at it since it's part of the Congressional Budget Justification. And obviously the congressional committees see it when we submit the budget. We haven't gotten any specific feedback on the metrics themselves.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Welch.

I'd like to now recognize our next presenter,

Mr. --

accumulating information so we know where we need to make adjustments in the metrics? I recognize we've had one run year. How does that work?

MR. WELCH: Well, we do have a mechanism in -in the sense that each year when we update the budget we
have to report on performance. We also have office
directors report to the Board quarterly on how we're
doing against both work plans and -- and the performance
metrics. And the technical staff has a specific
organizational structure to do that.

MS. ROBERSON: But we're not constrained by OMB or Congress if the Board determines there needs to be adjustment in the metrics, are we?

MR. WELCH: Not in the adjustment of the metrics, no.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. WELCH: We are constrained if we wanted to do an adjustment to the strategic plan mid-cycle.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. WELCH: If it's considered a significant adjustment, then it has to be reviewed by OMB and Congress has to be consulted.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. And in strategic goal 4, excellence in management, do you think there may be opportunities for improving those metrics based on some

1 MR. SULLIVAN: Excuse me --

MS. ROBERSON: Yes, Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: I had some comments or maybe some things I'd throw out --

MS. ROBERSON: Please. The floor is yours.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- that other Board members can -- can talk about. I just -- they're the sort of questions that I didn't expect Mr. Welch to be able to answer.

I just want to say I -- yeah, I've struggled with the whole concept of trying to find good metrics for this agency, because the purpose of the agency is to advise the Secretary to -- on the adequate protection of public health and safety. So, I suppose the real metric would be do we get good advice and is -- is the public protected.

So, it's kind of like when I was on a submarine -- a ballistic missile submarine. I mean, the purpose of the ship was to deter nuclear war. And, so, there was really only one metric that mattered in terms of the ship's mission. So, the -- it's like -- so, here, how do we actually figure that out? And we have a bunch of metrics which measure things that can be measured. The real question is the stuff that can't be measured or is difficult to measure. I mean, what is -- how is our

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

advice really received over in the Forestall Building? It's difficult for us to measure, and I think maybe we can pick up on some of those things anecdotally, but I'm not sure we'll ever have metrics.

I mean, we have a metric that talks about positive responses, but if you want a positive response to a letter, we could just start sending letters over there that say, gosh, Mr. Secretary, you're doing a great job; please tell us why you're doing such a great job. We'll get back a positive response.

So, it's really hard to figure out, other than the anecdotal, which means you're trying to figure out based on what the water cooler talk is over in the Forestall Building or talking to the senior people over there. And I don't know how we put that in metrics. You know, the same goes true with how our advice is viewed on Capitol Hill. One metric is they keep funding our budget, and -- and keep giving us what the President's budget asks for, if not more. I mean, so, that's -- that's pretty positive.

On the other hand, for three years in a row there's been an attempt to change our enabling legislation, and at least one of those was successful and one's still in progress. So, Congress doesn't generally try to change the law unless they think there's a problem didn't have any. We now have a lot. And I think they're pretty cumbersome. I think they're viewed as pretty cumbersome, and maybe we need to try to pare them back.

So, I look through some of the -- some of the history of the Board by looking at the -- at what the Board did years ago and how they did it. And, so, just for a comparison, I looked at a staff issue report sent over to the Department of Energy and how long it took. So, back -- an early version in the early '90s, the staff did a review in -- let me see, I have that. I wrote the dates down here, so if you just bear with me for a second.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: It was 1992, they did a review in June, from June 22nd to 24th at a site. They wrote a report on June 29th, and assigned it out, sent it over to the Department of Energy on July 7th. So, even dealing with the July 4th holiday, that's less -- that's about two weeks. 2002, and I looked at another one. I just picked these out at random. This is not a scientific survey.

So, the review was done in November 5th to 7th; the report was signed by the staff on the 3rd of December and signed and sent over by the Board of 12th -- on the 27th of December. So, that was about seven weeks, start

that they're trying to fix. So, I'm not sure what message that sends.

So, we just have metrics to me, the real-world metrics that are confusing, and I'm trying to sort my way through it. I'm trying to figure out -- I understand we have to do this under the law. I'm just trying to figure out if there's a better way or other things we can be measuring. I haven't -- I haven't quite gotten there.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos, do you want to say anything?

MR. SANTOS: That's good feedback.

MS. ROBERSON: No, I think it is good feedback. I struggle with this, as well, too, even in organizations other than the Board, but it's especially challenging for the Board because the goal of the Board is to help the Department prevent something from happening, so it's kind of hard to measure. But I think we have the opportunity as we think through it to see if there -- if we can as a group develop better metrics. I don't know that -- I don't -- I certainly don't know that there's anything specific, so I appreciate your comment.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, I would -- thank you. And I would like to introduce something specific that may become somewhat of a theme of mine this morning, but I think our internal procedures, when I first got here, we

to finish, and it was -- even dealing with Thanksgiving and Christmas holidays.

And I looked at the last five staff issue reports that we've sent over, and we've sent them all over this calendar year. And the time between when the staff does the review and when we send something over is -- is measured in months, in some cases greater than six. Now, we've added -- due to one of those changes to our statute, we've added at least three, sometimes longer weeks of voting procedures that we do, and I fully understand that.

Nevertheless, in these five cases, the time between the date that the staff member completed the report and the date something even came to us with what was generally a two-paragraph or less cover letter, was eight weeks. And in one case, it was 16 weeks.

So, I'm not sure what our staff procedures are doing, but it's just taking a very long time between the time our staff goes out and sees something that they say is a problem or they believe is a problem and the time to when we -- we feel that we are ready to say something to the Department of Energy. We're just -- we appear to be a lot less nimble.

Those aren't -- you know, that's an unscientific survey. We want to speed things up. We

5 (Pages 17 to 20)

could -- we could have unintended consequences. I mean, something goes beyond, you know, some deadline that we set, well, then, they just won't do it, because then we'll have no metric, as opposed to a bad metric. I'm not sure what the fix is; I'm just trying to look at how do we be more effective as an agency, and I see this as one area -- one area where perhaps we need to put some thought in it and do some work. I think we'll have some other presenters who might be able to speak on that topic later this morning. Thank you.

Department.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.
Mr. Santos, did you want to add anything?
MR. SANTOS: I did not want at length like you did, but in some of the letters, I have similar observations in terms of the time I've seen that it takes to -- to get any product in front of the Board. Also, it's not clear to me all that is happening in the process before we get the work product in terms of the interactions between the staff or the staff at the

So, I'm fairly new, but that's something that is still kind of -- even six months after being with you is kind of a mystery to me, all that is happening to -- to come up with a -- with a work product. So, that's something I would like to continue to -- to get a better

of trip reports and other safety information to the Secretary of Energy.

Policy Statement 3 lays out Board oversight of Department of Energy decommissioning activities at defense nuclear facilities. And, finally, Policy Statement 5 establishes the approach the Board will take to assess risk when making recommendations to the Secretary of Energy.

And you may have noticed that I skipped Policy Statement 4. As you may recall, the Board repealed PS-4 in January of 2013 when the Board first stood up its new operating procedures for the Board members. I'd like to now address each of the four -- each of the four policy statements individually.

Slide 3, please. The first and likely most significant of the Board's policy statements was established near the end of the Board's first full year of operation. Issued on October 19, 1990, Policy Statement 1 was intended as a guide for the Board and its staff in evaluating the adequacy of Department of Energy initial responses to recommendations and subsequent implementation plans, as well as to assist the Board in structuring appropriate followup actions in the event a recommendation is not fully or adequately addressed.

Furthermore, the statement formally identifies

understanding as an individual Board member.

 $MS.\ ROBERSON:\ Thank\ you,\ Mr.\ Santos.$ 

I think it's a -- it's a fair issue. I probably won't comment further. I'll let the others do it, since I was actually on the Board during those times, I tend to also have views, as well, to -- as to what the difference is between then and now. But I think we can have that discussion as we proceed during the day.

So, unless there's more comments at this time, then I'd like to recognize our next presenter, Mr. John Batherson, the Board's Acting General Counsel.

MR. BATHERSON: Good morning and thank you, Vice Chairman Roberson and Board Members Mr. Sullivan and Mr. Santos, for the opportunity to provide this statement. My name is John Batherson. I'm the Acting General Counsel for the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board. As described in the meeting agenda, today I will speak to the Board's existing policy statements and their underlying legal basis.

Slide 2, please. The Board currently has four distinct policy statements. Policy Statement 1, or PS-1, establishes the criteria by which the Board judges the adequacy of Department of Energy responses to and implementation plans for Board recommendations. Policy Statement 2 describes the Board's policy on transmittal

for the benefit of the Department and the public the Board's expectations regarding the elements the Board believes are necessary for adequate responses and

implementation plans. By way of background, the Board's
 authorizing statute requires the Secretary of Energy to

6 respond to each Board recommendation by accepting or

7 rejecting in whole or in part the recommendation. The 8 Secretary must subsequently prepare an implementation

plan of accepted recommendations. The Board's statute contemplates that the Board members, as recognized experts in the field of nuclear safety, shall use their discretion and judgment in assessing the adequacy of the

Department's responses to recommendations and its implementation plans.

Policy Statement 1 does several things to assist the Board in accomplishing this function. First, it provides Board members detailed guidance in evaluating the various types of initial responses that may be encountered in a departmental reply to a recommendation. As described in the Board's first annual report to Congress in 1991, the Board learned early on from its first six recommendations that there existed a whole range of possible written responses that the Board must be prepared to deal with in future recommendations. For example, a response could look like an acceptance but

contain language or terms that could be construed as rejecting part of the recommendation. Conversely, the Secretary may transmit an unconditional acceptance of the entire recommendation consistent with the terms set by the Board, as has been the case in almost every response transmitted to the Board since the inception of the policy statement.

Policy Statement 1 also serves a second purpose. It establishes specific substantive criteria by which Board members can apply their discretion to assess the adequacy of a DOE implementation plan. These substantive criteria are set out in the policy in the form of questions with detailed answers, describing how individual criteria are satisfied.

Policy Statement 1 also provides guidance on compliance with procedural requirements. For example, has the Department submitted the implementation plan in accordance with statutory deadlines; does the plan establish a realistic and achievable schedule; does the plan provide for adequate reporting to assure the Board remains informed of the status of the progress in any new or related issues that may subsequently appear.

In a period of operations spanning almost 25 years, the Board has consistently employed Policy Statement 1 as a means to assess the Department's

the Department relatively quick and efficient as opposed to reliance on the Board's public reading room process.

3 At the time of its issuance 23 years ago, Policy

4 Statement 2 established that site visits to Department of

5 Energy defense nuclear facilities were a major fact-

gathering activity of the Board and its staff. The
 policy goes on to state that during such visits briefing
 materials were frequently provided by departmental and

contractor personnel; facilities were toured and facility operations observed.

The same is true of site visits today. The Board and staff observe and gather information and, in the Board's discretion, transmit information that contains safety information which might assist the Secretary of Energy, federal employees, and site contractor personnel in their pursuit of safer conditions and practices at defense nuclear facilities.

Site reviews today often result in transmission of Board letters with accompanying issue reports. This Board action is consistent with the intent of the original policy that while reports of the Board staff serve principally as internal working papers and a vehicle for facilitating Board staff communications, the Board recognizes that information gathered pursuant to Board interest could at times prove useful to the

responses and implementation plans for over 50 Board recommendations transmitted to the Secretary. The intent and guidance contained in Policy Statement 1 appear to have the same validity and applicability today as compared to 25 years ago and should continue to serve the Board as an invaluable guide in evaluating departmental responses to future Board recommendations.

Slide 4. I would now like to turn Policy Statement 2, issued on December 31, 1992, which establishes procedures for Board transmittal of trip reports and other safety information to the Secretary of Energy in cases where information will be of assistance to the Secretary and the information does not warrant issuance of a recommendation.

The Board's third annual report to Congress in 1993 describes the genesis of Policy Statement 2, "As a result of its ongoing activities, the Board, at times, develops information which warrants being brought to DOE's attention promptly while it is being assessed further by the Board. In such cases, the Board communicates to DOE through letters which are placed in the Board's public document room."

Parts of Policy Statement 2 appear to have become outdated. The advent of email and the Internet has made transmission of relevant safety information to 1 Department of Energy.

Moreover, the practice of transmitting technical information to the Secretary for further distribution is fully consistent with the congressional intention that the Board provide assistance to the Secretary and DOE's health and safety activities as described in the legislative history of the Board's enabling statute.

While the intent of Policy Statement 2 is still applicable today, certain nomenclature in the policy, coupled with advances in the technology of information sharing, may have rendered parts of the policy obsolete. I would recommend a further review of Policy Statement 2 to determine what parts remain applicable, what parts may need to be replaced, and what parts, if any, may need supplementation.

Slide 5. Now I'll spend just a few minutes on Policy Statement 3, entitled Board Oversight of Department of Energy Decommissioning Activities at Defense Nuclear Facilities. Issued in August of 1996, the policy more specifically describes the decommissioning phase of a DOE defense nuclear facility and identifies the Board's safety oversight responsibilities for decommissioning -- decommissioning activities.

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

This policy statement is designed to provide guidance pertaining to the Board's interpretation of its statutory role in decommissioning activities. The Board's oversight mission covers all phases in the life of a defense nuclear facility, including decommissioning. During the Board's more than two decades of work, some major sites have been successfully decommissioned and closed, such as the Rocky Flats site in Colorado.

As described in the Board's seventh annual report to Congress, the Board states that it has focused its attention with regard to deactivation and decommissioning primarily on Rocky Flats, the Hanford site, and the Savannah River site, three locations DOE has selected for early cleanup. This is in addition to the oversight of decommissioning activities at the Mound facility in Ohio.

Notably, the Board's oversight of DOE decommissioning activities today has decreased substantially since issuance of Policy Statement 3. Presently, the Board staff remains primarily focused on deactivation and decommissioning of the plutonium finishing plant at Hanford.

Nonetheless, Policy Statement 3 remains an important guide for the Board to accomplish its objective to facilitate a smooth transition of Board oversight to

Moreover, the Board will transmit its risk assessments to the Secretary pursuant to the procedure outlined in the Board's statute. This process has been formalized into Board internal operating procedures. For recommendations that address specific safety hazards and for which adequate quantitative data exist, the risk assessment will apply certain risk factors to specifically answer three categories of questions.

The Board has issued only one recommendation since issuing Policy Statement 5, and that's Recommendation 2014-1, entitled "Emergency Preparedness and Response." Pursuant to Policy Statement 5, a quantitative risk assessment on the effectiveness of the emergency preparedness and response programs outlined in Recommendation 2014-1 requires data on probability and consequences.

The Board determined that data did not exist on the probability of failure of elements of the emergency preparedness and response programs. Therefore, it was not possible to do a quantitative assessment of the risk of these elements to provide adequate protection of the workers and the public in this particular recommendation.

The Board anticipates, however, that Policy Statement 5 will play a significant role in the evaluation of risk assessment for future Board

state regulation as a defense nuclear facility passes through operational and decommissioning phases to state and EPA-regulated final complete, demolition, and environmental restoration activities.

Slide 6. I will now address the Board's final and most recent policy, Policy Statement 5, issued in August of 2013, which establishes the approach the Board will take to assess risk when making recommendations to the Secretary of Energy. The National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2013 made several modifications to the Board's enabling legislation.

One modification required the Board to specifically assess risk whenever sufficient data exists when making its recommendations. In response to this direction, the Board developed the necessary guidance to implement this new statutory mandate which is reflected in Policy Statement 5.

Simply put, the policy defines how the Board will assess risk. As a corollary effect, the Board staff developed supporting internal operating procedures that further define the methods to be used in implementing the policy statement. To comply with the revised statute, the Board will, in cases where sufficient data exists, explicitly document its assessment of risk when drafting recommendations.

recommendations. No further changes or updates are recommended for Policy Statement 5.

This concludes my presentation this morning. I would be happy to answer any questions the Board may have.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Batherson. Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. The Policy Statement 2, which says, in a nutshell, that if we have information that we think is useful to the Secretary we'll send it over there, and it doesn't really say much more, I don't think. And, so, I'm -- you know, under our statute, I would think we can do that. So, I don't know if this is a question you want to answer or maybe it's just a question for the Board members to think about, but do we really need it? Does it add anything? Anybody have a comment?

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. -- I have a comment, but I wanted to -- well, I think it doesn't say more than that. I think the operating parameters of that do require more discussion. I mean, I don't -- I think the statute envisions the Board operating a certain way, and I think it depends on if it's staff interaction or Board interaction, since we don't operate individually. So, I don't know that the policy needs to say any more, but how

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

we actually implement the policy, in my view, does require more.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so, again, looking back in history, there appears to have been quite a variation over time with -- with the whole process of sending information over to the Department of Energy which was somewhat short of a recommendation. So, for example, this policy statement was 1992, is that correct?

MR. BATHERSON: Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's in -- okay. So, and I look back, and in those early days, I saw numerous trip reports sent over, and then somewhere around the 1996-97 time frame, that just seemed to stop. And thereafter, everything that went over was generally in the form of an issue report. There were some issue reports before '96-97, but issue reports were longer papers that said -- that basically summarized. I mean, a trip report just said, well, we went out there and we saw this; whereas an issue report did some analysis of what was -- what was seen and reached some conclusions. And then, generally, based on those conclusions, sometimes the Board has asked the Department to report back, and sometimes it hasn't.

In the -- in the years when Chairman Conway was here, it seemed like -- just, again, this is an unscientific review, but about 90 percent of the issue

well, what should be doing to be effective. Any thoughts I would welcome.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Mr. Sullivan, do you envision -- I'm just thinking out loud here -- creating some sort of formal criteria for -- that we can standardize how we classify which should go to information, which should go for action, and then maybe write that down and institutionalize in procedures so it's more clear to everybody and the staff and the Board?

MR. SULLIVAN: Not really.

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: And kind of think we have a lot of procedures.

MR. SANTOS: I'm just -- I'm just trying to see where we were going.

MR. SULLIVAN: I would prefer we move in the other direction.

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm really trying to stimulate a discussion here because I'm just not sure that -- I mean, since we don't have meetings, so now we've got us, we're having a meeting, what should we be doing? I mean, based on the numbers that I gave you earlier, just as very small data sample, because it was only five from this

reports that went over were for information only. There were some that said please give us a report back, but not many. And then we had the next Chairman, Mr. Eggenberger, and during the years where he was chairman, it seemed to be about fifty/fifty for information only or please give us a report.

And then since about 10, Chairman Winokur and in times since Chairman Winokur has retired, it seems like almost every time we sent something over we were asking for a report, and we -- we do not often send things over, ask -- you know, just for the information. So, there seems to have been this -- you know, we have a policy statement. It's been there since 1992. It doesn't say a whole lot. Yet, the historical way the agency has operated has seemed to go through many different changes.

So, I guess I'm wondering what really we think the policy should be. Should we try to send stuff over quickly and without a whole lot of analysis, and then later provide analysis? Should we make sure that we do analysis before we say anything? Should we say things frequently, not frequently? You know, we don't want to overload them, I would assume. Maybe that's why they stopped back in the mid '90s, sending trip reports.

So, I guess it really goes to the thought of,

calendar year, but based on the issue reports that I recall during my almost three years now that I've been here, it seems to me to be the case. It takes a while. As an agency, we're not very nimble, including us as a board. I'm not pointing fingers at the staff.

And, so, it -- so, it is not unusual for us to have observations that I know the staff talks to staff at a site when they leave. Nevertheless, it may be months before the leadership of the Department of Energy gets a piece of paper, which may be attached to a eight-page report that sort of says, hey, this -- this is a real issue and you ought to be taking a look at it. The alternative would be to try to speed thing up, you know, but speeding things up has its other -- other faults.

So, I'm just -- the real question is are we effective in what we're doing now? If not, can we do it better?

MR. SANTOS: Go first, Madam.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Well, I think it's -- it's a good question. Obviously, we've had -- we've been each individually giving a lot of thought to this, and hopefully we'll have good discussion about it later in the day. You know, my personal opinion, having been on the receiving end of much of what the Board did and then in the Board and then back on the receiving end and in

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

the Board, my personal knowledge is that the Board, in its early decades, provided -- formally provided the Department a view of much of what its staff saw. In some cases, the staff, the Board, wanted the staff to provide that directly; in other cases, the Board put its own letter on top of it.

And my recollection is at some point it was hard to distinguish what the Board -- it's kind of like the Board used a tier of thinking. It's like information you can use, information the Board may be considering further action on, information the Board really thinks you need to act on, and then recommendation. So, I think we need to think about how we want to communicate with the Department based upon all the information our staff gathers. I think it's open to -- this is a different board than that board, than the previous board, and I think it's a fair question.

Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Thank you. I like structure and being clear to everybody, but I also recognize your point on the timeliness, especially if it could be useful information. So, I think we can -- we can have more discussions on work, but I'd just look for a structure that is very clear to everybody, even if we decide as a Board to provide early FYI-type information then follow

can -- we can ask Mr. Stokes when he comes up, but that's my recollection.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. And, I mean, that stimulates in my mind a question for the General Counsel, which I actually don't want to ask here because it's a legal type question, and we don't want to ask the General Counsel to be giving us legal advice, but it gets into FOIA and what's an agency action and, you know, what can we do, what can't we do. And I'm not sure that that's clear in my mind.

You know, I mean, I could see -- I could see clearly we could try to do everything through staff communications, that the Board never officially does anything, and that clearly defeats a lot of purpose of some of the laws that do apply to us so that we -- you know, there is some transparency for the taxpayer. So, perhaps that's something that we could ask the General Counsel to opine on and provide us in some reasonable time, within the next few weeks.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you.

Mr. Batherson, did you want to comment? I mean, not on the specifics now, but that would be a tasking from the Board.

MR. BATHERSON: Thank you for the Board member comments, and I think that Policy Statement 2 is one

on with our request for action. I think -- I think clarifying that and writing it down so it's very clear to all stakeholders and the public, is -- it's important to me. That's all I say. But I understand your concern and I have witnessed some of the -- some of the items you do describe. So, I think it's a worthwhile endeavor to try to see if we can come up with something that may work, and then, you know, make a decision as a Board.

So, I do not know whether it's something we'll probably revisit this afternoon or how you want to proceed with that, Madam. So, I'm open to suggestions.

MS. ROBERSON: Well, this is a Board public meeting.

MR. SANTOS: Right.

MS. ROBERSON: So, I'm only moderating. It's up to the Board members to decide how they want to spend their time, as long as it's within the agenda.

Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Question for you, Ms. Roberson. You said in the -- in days of old, the --

MS. ROBERSON: Not that old, Sean.

MR. SULLIVAN: So, the Board -- Board staff, at one point, sent stuff over to the Department -- written stuff, written communications?

MS. ROBERSON: That's my recollection, and we

which we need to take a closer look at. That's all I have.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Sullivan, do you want to add something else?

MR. SULLIVAN: Sure. I think we also probably ought to think about other policy statements that we may need or should have. So, we have other major areas of our enabling statute where we do things and we have no policy statement on them. So, for example, the Policy Statement 3 on decommissioning just sort of strikes me as something that came about in a period of time where there was a lot of decommissioning.

And if we didn't have such a policy statement, I would not be thinking about writing it now. But now we have an awful lot of new construction or -- or at least construction that the Department hopes to do. And -- and we do an awful lot of work in that area. As I recall our discussion on our work plan, it's like a 35 percent chunk of our manpower. It's pretty big.

But we have no policy statement on how we're supposed to do that. There were some things in the 2007 time frame that I recall that Congress got involved or members of Congress -- congressional committees got involved with both the Board and the Secretary of Energy because there were some issues on some projects, and it

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

didn't appear that the executive branch of the Federal Government, which is both us and the Department of Energy, were on the same page, if I -- if I characterized that correctly from history. I wasn't here. But that has led to us to do some things, but we've never written a policy statement on it.

And we have recently asked the Secretary to establish a line of communication, maybe a working group -- I'm not sure what will come out of it -- on this topic, because he is revising over in his building how they do project management. So, there may be an opportunity here for us to take something and -- and create something to guide us and this agency in the future on -- on how to do things with new construction.

Similarly, we don't have anything on directives, review of directives, which we -- which we do and our statute covers and they -- they may be the source of a recommendation, and, in fact, they have been a source of recommendations. But, again, over 20, 25 years now with this agency, what has happened over in the Forrestal Building with respect to their directives and standards has changed significantly, to the point where without being unkind to the Department of Energy, I think there was a time where they really did not have much or that what they had wasn't all that good.

for your opinions or anything else.

MS. ROBERSON: No, I think it's a -- it's a good idea. I particularly like the two examples Mr. Sullivan cited on new construction and directives review. I think there are other functions where we have regulations, but I think it's fair to go through the statute and see where we have coverage and how we define it. I think it's a good exercise. That would be my opinion.

MR. SANTO: Any thoughts, Sean?
MS. ROBERSON: Anything else, Mr. Sullivan?
MR. SULLIVAN: Of course I have other things.
So, turning to Policy Statement 5, we've only

So, turning to Policy Statement 5, we've only tried to use it once, and we basically found we couldn't, and that was on the emergency preparedness recommendation, 2014-1. So, something I've characterized before, and I hope I won't confuse the world on it, but I think we have first-order issues, which we've written recommendations on, and second-order issues. So, to me, a first-order issue is there's a facility somewhere with a problem, and if the -- if there's -- you know, if the problem develops either due to natural disaster or human error, you can -- human error at that facility, you can say that's a problem, go fix it, go engineer some controls, advise the Secretary to go fix it, et cetera.

It's much better now. But it's gone through several -- it's gone through several attempts and reviews within their building. And, so, really, kind of the question is what -- what do we need to do now as an agency and does it make sense, should we have a policy statement on it, where there's some Board-level guidance on how we're doing business there. And I don't know if any of the other Board members have comments on any of that.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: I've been reflecting on this, and to me, I think -- and I've used this in the past -- a worthwhile exercise, and I don't know if it had been done in the past, is to simply walk down through our statute, you know, line by line, and see do we as a Board -- as a corresponding policy that we'll use to meet the statute. I think we obviously meet our statute, but we do it sometimes implicitly. So, having a more explicit statement, and this is how this Board intends to meet the statute on the various items, I think gets us a long way. And I think what Sean described is just one self-example or two of just that.

So, to me, I think it would be a worthwhile exercise to go through that creation of policies based -- directly based on our statutory statement. And I open

And second-order issues are those issues which generally relate to ways where you get -- you can -- you should almost expect human error, but you can't really predict when or how the human error will occur. Those are things like training, qualification, work planning and control, conduct of regular operations, safety culture. I mean, all of those things, if they are not good, will likely result in human error. But exactly where the human error will occur, exactly how that will cause or may cause special nuclear material to -- to go where it's not supposed to be and threaten the -- the adequate protection of the public safety, you can't really say.

Emergency preparedness, in my view, fell into that category because almost by definition, you don't need emergency preparedness if you have adequate controls otherwise. By definition, emergency preparedness assumes something has happened that wasn't supposed to happen. And -- but exactly where, when, how, you can't predict.

So, nevertheless, in a lot of those areas, training, qualification, conduct of operations, there's plenty of data that might be available, especially if you went to a specific site, that we might be able to use to provide some sort of assessment risk. So, I guess my thought is perhaps we ought to take another look at

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

Policy Statement 5 and think about it in those terms as we're dealing with these sort of issues where, by definition, we know if we have this problem. It's a -- it's a problem that can threaten the public. We have plenty of examples of recommendations where this agency has written that go towards those type of issues, yet you would not be able to apply Policy Statement 5 as it's written today and do any sort of an assessment of risk.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: And, again, I just need to get a better understanding as I mature in the organization, but, I mean, I guess my question is for the Technical Director. Maybe he can answer it now or maybe we'll wait, but are we ready today as an agency to actually perform a quantitative review and assessment, whether it's PRA or even a review of assessment provided to us by -- by DOE. Do we have the tools, training, staff, competence, such that if in the future we were to get -- or work on such a recommendation we can actually execute?

MR. STOKES: A review of a PRA, could we perform a PRA, we certainly have a core group of people. About two years ago, two and a half years ago, we formed a team. It was led by one of our senior staff, where with NRC experience, with PRA experience, we took the team; we put them through an aggressive one-year training

good one and we should look at it. But I also think we have to, in some degree, move in lock-step with the Department so the Department is still trying to fathom how it's going to approach PRAs. And in the end, they will generate the majority of the data.

Now, what Mr. Sullivan, if I understand correctly, if I look at a tier one recommendation, to me, you know, and I think back to at least the legislative history I've read is very much as you described. It's a barrier, is it going to fail, and the exposure is pretty straightforward. To me, a tier two recommendation is one in which because of the way this complex is designed, the safety approach at most of DOE's operation relies on what I call soft things. So, soft things being the competency of the people doing the activities; the maintenance of the equipment relied upon; procedures, like emergency response. And I consider those to be just as relevant. They're just the supporting elements to tier one.

That's just the way that I see it. I don't know if -- and, actually, Mr. Stokes, if you did have a comment, you're welcome to make it, but it's open to the Board members to react.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well -- well, if the Technical Director wants to make a comment, he can, while I'm -- walk up there while I'm talking. But, I mean, I agree

program. They went to training at the NRC, other -- other kinds of training, and so we have a cadre of people that can perform that work.

We have, also, on separate occasions with other individuals that have the technical skills, they have looked at quantitative risk assessment, not a probabilistic risk assessment, that employs many of those kinds of techniques. So, we've done it in the past, but it was on a draft document that the Department never forwarded and implemented in their safety basis.

So, we are prepared. We have -- we have the skill set. We can do it. We -- could we do it on the order of 100 PRAs a year? No. We don't have that kind of bandwidth to be able to address that capability.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: So, I guess -- I'm not asking you a question, Mr. Stokes, not yet. I'm just reacting to what I've heard. You know, I have mixed views. One, you know, Congress mandates the size of our organization, and, I mean, I guess we could have as many consultants as we have employees, but I don't think that's the intent, so I think we have to prioritize what we do.

Number two, I think notwithstanding that I think we can always improve our policies and the tier one, tier two discussion you just presented I think is a

with you. Tier two, whatever we want to call it, but maintenance is a good example. It would be easy to look at some maintenance statistics somewhere and say you're not doing very good in maintenance and that's a problem and here's why. So, we would have sufficient data on maintenance, but, nevertheless, even if you concluded at a particular site that maintenance practices were poor, that doesn't tell you what piece of equipment will fail --

MS. ROBERSON: That's right.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- or when. So, that's the sort of -- sort of thing where I'm not sure that applying Policy Statement 5, as it exists today, would lead us to an answer. Nevertheless, as you said, Congress has mandated the size of our agency. They've also mandated that we assess risk, whatever sufficient data exists. And, so, I'm thinking about these second-order or secondtier issues and thinking, well, in many cases, there is data that could be assessed. We don't have a policy statement that would allow us to do it.

MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm.

MR. SULLIVAN: Go ahead.

MR. STOKES: I don't have any comments.

MS. ROBERSON: Oh, sorry.

Mr. Santos, do you want to further comment?

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

Dete	nse Nuclear Facilities Satety Board		6/3/2013
	49		51
1	MR. SANTOS: Yeah, again, structure guy here.	1	appropriate technical skills are applied to each work
2	I understand for the purpose of this discussion we're	2	plan activity.
3	talking about tiers one, two or second order, but I just	3	Next slide, please. Slide 2 depicts the
4	wanted to clarify that we haven't adopted that sort of	4	overall organization of the Office of the Technical
5	scheme, and I don't want to confuse people at this point	5	Director. It includes the following organizational
6	that we actually have such a such a scheme today. If	6	elements: the Deputy Technical Director; Nuclear Weapons
7	that's something we should be looking at to do, I I	7	Programs; Nuclear Materials Processing and Stabilization;
8	welcome the proposal to actually go go do that. I	8	Nuclear Facilities Design and Infrastructure; and Nuclear
9	just didn't want to confuse people that we we	9	Programs and Analysis; and Performance Assurance.
10	currently are filtering items one, two, and by some sort	10	This arrangement uses a flat organizational
11	of criteria because I haven't I haven't seen that.	11	structure to focus the maximum amount of available
12	And that's all.	12	technical resources on nuclear safety oversight,
13	MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, there probably isn't,	13	establishes the appropriate management span of control,
14	although there is a history on it, there probably	14	responsibilities, accountabilities, and alignment with
15	you're right, we don't have a policy statement, but I	15	the Board's strategic plan, and minimizes management
16	would say my experience is that is a thought process	16	overhead. For example, the only administrative staff
17	MR. SANTOS: Sure.	17	assigned to each technical group is a single shared
18	MS. ROBERSON: a historical thought process.	18	resource responsible for supporting the administrative
19	MR. SANTOS: I was just suggesting, I mean,	19	needs of an entire group.
20	back to the structure, if that's something we think is	20	Slide 3, please. Individual staff assignments
21	valuable, I'm I'm for actually let's write it down and	21	within the simple structure are designed to parallel
22	let's set up the criteria and implement that. That's	22	DOE's organizational structure to ensure that we maintain
23	all.	23	the necessary corporate knowledge within each group to
24	MS. ROBERSON: So, are you proposing something?	24	work effectively with DOE's Department of Energy's
25	MR. SANTOS: I would like to have further	25	points of contact at each site and applicable Department
	50		52
1	discussion whether we should create such a structure.	1	of Energy headquarters elements. For example, cognizant
2	MS. ROBERSON: Fair enough.	2	site engineers are assigned to the Nuclear Weapons
3	More on that topic? Mr. Sullivan?	3	Program and Nuclear Materials Processing and
4	MR. SULLIVAN: No, ma'am.	4	Stabilization groups, which parallel the National Nuclear
5	MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos?	5	Security Administration, NNSA, and DOE's Office of
6	MR. SANTOS: No.	6	Environmental Management, EM, their organizational roles
7	MS. ROBERSON: Very well. Again, thank you,	7	and responsibilities.
8	Mr. Batherson, for igniting that.	8	If unique resource requirements exist, those
9	Now I'd like to recognize our next presenter,	9	resources are typically assigned within that group, for
10	Mr. Steve Stokes, the Board's Technical Director. And	10	example, personnel with nuclear weapons expertise are
11	Mr. Stokes will report on the Technical Office's	11	assigned to the Nuclear Weapons Program group. This is
12	organizational structure and underlying basis.	12	portrayed on slide 3, and it depicts the allocation of
13	MR. STOKES: Good morning, Madam Vice Chairman	13	cognizant site and project engineers and programmatic
14	and Board members. My name is Steven Stokes, and I am	14	expertise.
15	the Board's Technical Director. I'm here to discuss the	15	Next slide, please. Slide 4 depicts the
16	technical staff's organizational structure and basis.	16	Technical the Deputy Technical Director's group, as
17	The Office of the Technical Director is organized and	17	well as our newest group, Performance Assurance. All of
18	staffed for a singular purpose: to perform nuclear	18	the Board's site representatives report to the Deputy
19	safety oversight of the Department of Energy's defense	19	Technical Director to ensure they receive consistent
20	nuclear facilities, consistent with the Board's enabling	20	direction and focused attention from headquarters. The
21	legislation and work plan.	21	Performance Assurance Group was created to address both
/ 1/3			

new scope, the technical staff internal controls, and to

consolidate existing work scope, like training, under a

The Performance Assurance Group's mission is to

22

23

24

25

single supervisor.

22

23

24

25

The basis for our organizational structure was

that manages the Board's approved work plan efficiently

essentially twofold: first, to establish an organization

and effectively; and, second, to ensure that the

provide the necessary information and staff support to drive improvements within the technical staff and, to the extent practicable, perform the support functions necessary to meet management-related requirements, for example, our own internal oversight. This approach enables the other groups to focus on delivering the best technical products to the Board that we can.

Next slide. Slide 5 depicts how the technical staff's organization performs work in support of the Board's nuclear safety oversight mission. The technical staff uses a matrix approach for all of our technical reviews. This is necessary for one fundamental reason: our technical resources are very small compared to the scope of the Board's mission. To use them effectively, we maintain a flexible approach to the assignment of staff to the work scope identified in the Board's annual work plan. This approach dedicates staff with the appropriate expertise to the Board's highest priority projects.

Let me attempt to walk -- to walk through how the matrix approach works in a generic way. For each task in the Board's work plan, there is a cognizant group lead accountable for conduct of the review and a responsible review lead and review team who actually perform the work. The review team members are drawn from even occur anywhere in the DOE complex, not just the site where they have their primary responsibility, and where the Nuclear Weapons Programs and Nuclear Materials Processing and Stabilization Group lead is not the cognizant group lead for a review performed at their respective sites.

This flexible approach is embedded in the way we plan and execute the technical work performed by the Office of the Technical Director. Moreover, the approach provides the necessary flexibility to meet the diverse nature of Board oversight activities with such a small and highly talented technical staff.

In preparing these remarks, I asked the group leads to evaluate the current work plan to assess the extent to which we matrix our work. A simple statistic from that, 76 of our headquarters review teams include at least one member from another group other than the cognizant group lead who is assigned the task. And if you count involvement of site reps into that statistic, 100 percent of our work is matrixed across the entire organization.

This concludes my remarks, and I'd be happy to address any questions you might have.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Sullivan? I'm always going to look to you.

the entire pool of the technical staff, irrespective of group assignment.

As illustrated in the slide, interfaces exist between the site cognizant engineer, site representative, review lead and review team to ensure that each review is properly coordinated with the Department of Energy and within the technical staff. This model takes advantage of the strong relationships between and among cognizant group leads and cognizant site engineers, a supervisory relationship; cognizant engineers and site representatives, they maintain a frequent, commonly daily, contact, and their DOE counterparts; and, three, the review team lead, review team and cognizant site engineer and site representative. We use a similar matrix approach to review new design and construction projects, although I haven't listed that here.

Before ending my remarks, I'd like to emphasize that the matrix approach is central to the technical staff's ability to accomplish the extensive and diverse oversight activities defined in the Board's work plan with the limited resources we have available. There are, of course, instances where individual staff members perform a review without the involvement of a review team, where cognizant site and project engineers are also review team leads and/or team members for reviews that

MR. SULLIVAN: You always want to start with me?

MS. ROBERSON: Yes, you're the furthest away from me.

MR. SULLIVAN: I'll let somebody else start, if they -- you want to start? Don't have any questions? Okay.

MR. SANTOS: I do.

MR. SULLIVAN: All right. Well, so, Mr. Stokes, you've been here a long time, so when I started talking about this history, you've lived it; I haven't. So, can you just generally walk us through? You gave us this. How's that compare to 20 years ago, 10 years ago? Can you go into that a bit?

MR. STOKES: Actually, it's quite -- it's virtually the same. It has -- there have been in some instances -- go back to slide 2, please. There have been different groupings. There's always been a -- there was a technical director, no deputy technical director. That was created in the late 1990s. Below that, there was essentially the same kind of organizational structure. You had different titles in the boxes, but when you moved to the work, the work was the same.

For example, we had, when I arrived, an engineering group. It was the largest group. And it

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

was, by design, the individuals in that group were matrixed out to the other groups. We had one group that was Nuclear Weapons; we had one group that was -- essentially the same, Nuclear Materials Processing and Stabilization. And, at the time, there were very few design and construction projects, so there wasn't a standalone group for that. And then we had a -- and a group that's analogous to Nuclear Programs and Analysis.

In the engineering group, I worked at every DOE site on review teams in review leads in the same manner that we do today. So, from -- from the bottom part of our organization, that has not changed in the 23 years that I've been here.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so, the structure is pretty much the same. So, before when I was revealing the results of my unscientific review, I concluded that it just takes us longer today to get something throughout own agency system to the point where we're ready to send it over to the Department of Energy. And, so, feel free to tell me whether my review is wrong or whatever, but structure -- if it's true then structure doesn't appear to be the issue, so -- or the reason. And reason is a better word than issue because perhaps it's a reasonable conclusion that says we were too quick back in those days and maybe some stuff went over that shouldn't.

could be addressed at the Department. There has been
 significant improvements over the past two decades in the
 way that the Department does its nuclear safety business.
 Many of the things that we do today are much more
 sophisticated than they were 20 years ago, particularly
 because we are, for example, doing design and
 construction and doing new -- you know, looking at new

mission of the Board, there was a lot of things that

s construction and doing new -- you know, looking at technologies that are -- that are groundbreaking, for example, the study of those kinds of things is much different than the things that we were doing 20-plus years ago.

If you look at the topics of the reports, generally 20 years ago, we were doing things more associated with conduct of operations, a lot more operational kinds of things. You can do an operational review and report on it because it's simply observations much quick -- much more quickly than you can a detailed evaluation of a technology, particularly an emerging technology for safety basis kinds of things.

So, I hesitate to draw any general conclusions from your observations, but I also know that we have -- and there is an urgency, there's a desire to improve the amount of the -- the -- our ability to move things from the beginning of a review to the Board in a -- you know,

So, I'd just like you to first say whether or not my conclusion -- whether or not you agree with it, that it takes us longer, and then if you could tell us why.

MR. STOKES: In my experience, I don't think it
-- I don't know that it takes any longer. There were
some things that I know I did that never went over, so
that would be an infinite period of time. But there's
also -- there is -- there is today versus yesteryear,
there are some -- there are some significant differences
that could be contributors to additional duration to be
able to release reports. I would actually say that some
of them were -- are improvements, you know, because
there's a singular goal here, too, factual accuracy and,
you know, technical adequacy. In many cases, we had a
third of the staff, so you had one or two people working
on a document instead of sometime now we bring much more
expertise to bear.

We're also tackling different problems today the we were 20 years ago. So, to make a -- to make a comparison that would be essentially apples to apples, I'd have to defer and go look at some specifics. I know in my own personal experience many of the issues that we were dealing with 20 years ago, it was -- we used to call it low-hanging fruit, and when you first began the

in the right speed, because we don't want to sacrifice quality.

So, in fact, we've got initiatives. We're looking at those things right now, to be able to improve that, and we've studied it, too, and about the similar kind of scientific nature that you've described today.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. So, I appreciate your response. I know I'm asking you to dance, and you're dancing pretty good up there. So, and I don't want you to get defensive, because I'm not trying to be accusatory at all. I'm just trying to understand it, you know, because a lot of what the staff does is -- is just -- it's not visible to me based, you know, on your process.

So, again, I'm going to take my five examples and -- to -- to lead to a specific question. But in all five of these cases, there was a period of time that measured from somewhere between seven to 16 weeks between the date on the issue report, you know, the author, whoever the author was, says, you know, it's dated November 3rd -- or I'm sorry, I had one example here, it's November 13th, okay, and then the date that it comes to us in orange folder, and now you can go to the public website and you can see the date that we signed out the letter, so I'm using an interim date, which isn't

15 (Pages 57 to 60)

available to the public. That's the date that it came to us for us to use our notational voting process.

And, so, one case I said November 13th, and the date it came to us was January 9th, it was about eight weeks there. There was one example, which must be some anomaly because the date on the report was November 18th and it didn't come to us until March 6th. So, that one was about 16 weeks, but -- so, my specific question is what's happening in that time? The only addition, besides the report that I see generally is the cover letter, and the cover letter is always very brief. So, would you just walk us through what's -- what's happening during that time?

MR. STOKES: I can't speak to individual specifics on those, so I'll speak generically.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah.

MR. STOKES: When -- following the -- that -- when the author signs it out and the group lead signs it out, the document then proceeds up to the Technical Director and Deputy Technical Director. There is a technical review and a quality review performed by the Technical Director, myself, and the Deputy Technical Director. So, if there are questions or there are rewrites as a function of any number of things, it is cycled back.

issues, then that can -- that can drive time up. Once those reviews are all -- all completed, and then we have parallel security reviews also going on at that period -- and during that period of time, then once all those signoffs are in place, then it enters into the process you called the orange folder process, which means that we forward it to the Board for review and -- and further staff work.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, thank you. Yeah, it seems like there's a lot of steps in there. And we have five site rep offices, so I can see, and they don't -- they only have one or two people in them, so I can see why that might take some time.

And do you have any statistics on, like, the percentage of these staff issue reports where site reps do raise an issue that requires the report to be modified?

MR. STOKES: No, I don't.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, because, I mean, again, the examples I'm citing, the date on the report -- perhaps the report was modified after it was first written and dated, but I'm just using the date on the report, so my assumption that the report was not modified after the date that's on it. That may not -- may not be a good assumption.

Depending upon availability, I mean, again, one deep kinds of things, there can be delays associated with that. In fact, we studied that and the report that I can recall from last summer, they were -- there was an average of about two days in that cycle, unless there were a lot of technical questions, and then it really jumped up into the kinds of time frames that you're -- you're describing.

After those reviews are completed, the report is signed off by the Technical Director. It then goes for a factual accuracy check with all -- with all the site reps, because we are -- we've learned over time that an issue that may be at one site may have implications at another. And, so, there's some sensitivities that we want to reflect on in that factual accuracy check, so we -- so we work with all of the site reps. Normally, those state reviews take on the number of days; in some cases, they can take a considerable period of time to be able to work through issues that had not been -- the sensitivity wasn't there, but when it got that broader review, that sensitivity needed to be addressed. So, it take -- that takes time.

In parallel with that, there is a review that is performed by the Office of General Counsel. Those -- those reviews typically are quite short, but if there are

1 And then I guess the other question is can any of this be done in parallel, which would -- I mean, it

could even be as simple as it comes to us and we start our process. And if the site reps sometimes, but not frequently, have an issue, it could go to them at the same time, and, you know, then there might be some rare occasions where the -- we're in the middle of our process and somebody has to raise a red flag, but that might speed things up.

I'm just suggesting that we -- we take a look at it. I know you say you're taking a look at it, so I'll be interested in seeing what you come up with. I think I've talked enough on this and I've made the Technical Director dance enough. I will yield the floor. Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan. Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: I'll change the tune, but I'll look for more dancing here. I know we don't make widgets, but how do you get a sense of how much -- I just want to follow up, Sean, how much rework has been happening with the products? Are the products you're getting from this team is pretty solid? Or do you feel that you have to constantly have to modify?

MR. STOKES: They're -- from a -- you've got

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

about -- there's about four or five questions there. Let me -- let me break them down. The confidence that I have in our technical staff to be able to provide an adequate technical review and describe the results of that review in a product are extremely high. So, I have great confidence in their ability to do the technical work.

We have a -- we also have parts of our process that occur before that date's applied, where we send the report to a technical editor, which we have on staff that resides in the building. And they provide feedback to the team, in parallel with other reviewers. The typical way of staffing something from the initial draft through to a final draft, which is what the Deputy Technical Director and I see, is done in parallel.

A review team will attempt to do things in parallel, and it's a very dynamic process at that -- at that point in time, where group members are contributing pieces and parts to a total or sometimes one author will draft an initial and then there will be comments provided by the team members. And then the way our process works is that -- that document then is concurred on by all of the -- the participants, and that means concurrence can be a concurrence or a nonconcurrence, and we've got processes to accommodate how that is reflected in the report.

rework. The -- you know, the staff works very, very hard to try and be able to provide a document up through the Technical Director and to the Board that -- that is as accurate as possible.

In some cases, and it's usually -- it is the exception and not the rule, I will raise technical questions simply because I have a different perspective than some of the teams have. I have much more experience, on average; I can bring to bear other information that the team may not have had, simply because I've been here a long time, and we may have done something one way, you know, and we need to do it a different way.

All of those kind of things, and I realize now I'm not dancing very well, but at -- you know, the bottom line is the staff works very hard to be able to get the best products to the Board that they can. And I have great confidence in their ability to do that. In many cases, we stumble along the way, and we work very hard to be able to recover those things as quickly as we can.

MR. SANTOS: I have a few followup questions, ma'am.

See, if I were to lay out your process on a wall, when was the last time you kind of took a hard look for, you know, process improvement initiatives?

And then they go -- it goes to the cognizant group lead. So, what -- one of the things that -- that tends to add -- add things at the tail end of the process, for example, I spend a tremendous amount of time with the Board. Group leads spend less time with the Board. Staff spends even less time with the Board.

We -- we communicate on a weekly basis, for example, my observations about what happened with a particular paper as it went through the orange folder process, those observations are fed back through -- to the staff via the group leads, so there will be -- if the Board is concerned about a particular style of communication, which we have had the opportunity to have to address, those stylistic desires are then fed back to the staff. So, we have mechanisms that we had.

So, for example, when I get something, I may have comments like, okay, one of the things that we're constantly making sure that we do is be very mindful of the Secretary of Energy's time, so you don't want to, quote, "bury the lead," unquote. Don't start off a letter with a bunch of boilerplate and then get to the actual technical issue on page 7. Make sure that that's up front.

So -- and there will be times when the writing style needs to be adjusted like that, which then causes

1 MR. STOKES: A year ago.
2 MR. SANTOS: A year ago.

MR. STOKES: When we formulated the process for -- and we finalized it. So, we went through our existing process that we had that had a very simple structure, and we went through that and we attempted to describe what we do and provide guidance consistent with what we were doing. And we took a very hard look at how we move things through the -- through the staff. By and large, what we found is is that the steps in the process, and I did my own -- very recently, when we had the last site rep weekly gathering here in DC, I asked every site rep, tell me what you think is the matter with our concurrence process. I asked every one of them that.

Not a single one of the site reps told me we had a problem with the process -- an organic problem with the process. Where we spend a tremendous amount of time is -- is trying to make sure that as we communicate issues, that those -- that the way we communicate the issue is something that people agree on. The nature of the technical issue is usually not of debate, but what's important, what's not important. Those are things that the staff in general feel very -- they believe are very important. So, there's a lot of work that goes into doing that, and that takes time when there are later

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

individuals involved in the review, the group lead, myself, the Deputy Technical Director, and the Board, we all do rework.

There's a tremendous amount of churn in our process to reflect individual kinds of influences on our particular products. There's -- and I can tick them off. There's the review team and the review lead; the site rep; the cognizant site engineer; the group lead; the Technical Director; the Deputy Technical Director; and every Board member. So, every one of the folks that's involved in producing a product has the -- has the ability to affect that product. And those -- each of those views, in many cases unique views, because of their unique technical expertise, it's really important to be able to provide, for lack of a better term, a 360-degree product.

MR. SANTOS: Okay, for other questions. So, if I look at slide 5, which -- which shows the execution of work, is it correct that you're the ultimate decision-maker before the work goes to the -- product goes to the Board?

MR. STOKES: Am I ultimate decision-maker? Yeah, my -- my signature releases it from the technical staff to the -- to the Board --

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

went from me to the -- to the group lead. They were then staffed by the review team lead. The review team lead and I had a 45-minute discussion. He had filled in the facts, advised me, I made some observations. Those observations, then, were taken back to the team, ensured that there was -- that any of the concerns that I had did not create factual accuracy issues. The changes were made, and then it came back up to me, and they were brought to me by the review team lead, and they were checked off by the group lead. So, I used, in that scenario, I used the Deputy Technical Director, the group lead, and the review team lead, all as advisors to be able to ensure that any concerns that I had were properly reflected in that report.

MR. SANTOS: Okay. And my last question has to do with the different view process. Can you explain how that works and maybe how independence is provided, because, you know, you're describing normal set of works, everything is kind of through the line, but if there's a different opinion, is there any different process or independence that is brought up to bear?

MR. STOKES: There are two mechanisms that we have that will allow any staff member to be able to offer an opinion, if you will. Number one, during the review and concurrence process, all of the people that were on

MR. STOKES: -- and to the OGC, just like every office director is the ultimate -- I mean, we have a concurrence process, concurrence sheet, and my name is at the top for every technical document.

MR. SANTOS: Do you use any sort of independent input of the staff work product in coming up with your decision, or you're basically relying on your own assessment? Meaning do you have a -- when they produce a product, do you have like a senior advisor who kinds of challenges the work or looks at it and provides an independent input --

MR. STOKES: I have -- I have the entire staff at my disposal, if I so choose. The primary senior technical advisor is the Deputy Technical Director. I rely on Rich's technical expertise, and he's -- he's been here, I think two weeks less at this organization than I am, so he's -- has, you know, decades of experience, as well. And I also rely on the group lead and the review lead. There isn't a decision that I make regarding one of these documents that I do not -- that I make unilaterally without any input from relevant people. I -- I just don't operate that way.

So, for example, I just completed a review where I had several questions on a -- on an issue paper at Savannah River. I wrote my questions; the questions

the review have the ability to be able to provide their independent opinions about the final product. We don't suffer from people that are shy about expressing their views, which I think is a wonderful part of our culture.

The -- you know, there just isn't typically at that stage people get their reviews reflected and they -- they team to try and resolve the reviews, their -- any differing views. There's also an independent process.

For example, if something were to go up to the Board and somebody had a differing professional opinion, that process also exists. In fact, we've -- we put -- and that's proceduralized, and that process has been exercised one time since its inception. And the -- we form an independent team and we evaluate things independently and address any concerns that the individuals that raised the concern have, and all of that is formally documented and then provided to the Board. So -- and we've got two parallel and distinct processes for anyone in the organization to be able to voice any differing professional opinions they may have.

MR. SANTOS: So, what's your role, if that process happens? Or does your role change at all, or what's your role if -- if we have -- if you are faced with a differing view?

MR. STOKES: The role that -- the role that I

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

personally maintain is one of -- I sit back, and I'm going to just kind of describe it in a high level. The -- what we did, we were very concerned when we constructed this, that there would not be conflict of interest within a very small staff. So, what we did is we -- we made the performance assurance group lead the --responsible for managing that process. They, by and large, on a day-to-day basis, are not involved in the technical work. Some of them are. Again, we matrix staff from the performance assurance group to do technical reviews as well, so that's -- you know, but we manage -- the Performance Assurance group lead is in charge of running that process because he's the most independent person we have. 

It follows there is a very deliberate protocol for doing that, of notifications, as well as forming an independent team, doing independent evaluation, and then -- and then taking it up through the Deputy Technical Director and myself, and we sit and listen to all of the individuals that have played a role in the differing professional opinion. For example, the independent review team has to provide a report. The individuals that had the differing professional opinion, they have access to the Technical Director. And there is -- so -- and we attempt to resolve the issues as early as

I mean, I could imagine if I'm a staffperson, I might just hesitate to start down this road of differing professional opinion for the sole reason that I am now making more work for my already busy fellow workers, who now have to go through all this process of review of whatever it is that I want to -- I want to say in a differing professional opinion process. So, you know, perhaps we could look at something that is simpler and easier, streamline it a little bit. I think that -- that might be helpful.

The other point I want to make is -- is I understand that, you know, as you explained the process, there's probably many times where staff members get in a room and they go hash something out, and then they come out with something that they think is the right answer that everybody thinks that they can -- they can live with. But if there's a question in any staff member's mind that leads that staff member to believe that there is an issue of adequate protection to the public, there's a threat to the adequate protection of the public, then -- then that needs to come to the Board, because we're the ones who -- who decide that.

So, I would hope in this process we don't stifle that. In other words, if there's a staff member who feels very strongly that there's an issue out there

practicable.

And then at the end, the Technical Director has the final responsibility for being able to make some kind of a judgment. And then there are -- there's ways to appeal that. And then there's also involvement with the Board. So, you know, we tried to manage it so everyone on the staff, if they have a concern, there is -- there is an independent and fair approach to resolving that concern.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you for explaining that to the public and the Board. Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Santos.
Any additional questions from Board members for Mr. Stokes?

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, a comment. I think -- again, this is just my perception, that our differing professional opinion process is proceduralized and it's got a lot of steps, and I think it maybe has too many. I mean, at the end of the day we don't have much more than 100 people in the organization, and I know them all by name, and why we don't have a simpler procedure for people to voice their opinions, you know, is -- and it's just something that I think we -- we should be trying to look at and not make it so -- so many steps in the procedure.

in the complex that does threaten the adequate protection of the public health and safety that in this process where they try to hash things out, you know, we don't end up with a majority staff rule and majority rule by the staff which then says, no, no, it's not -- it doesn't rise to the level of issue of adequate protection. So, then, it never gets to the Board, if that's -- if that's the case.

So, again, I would hope that that would always get to the Board if we have a single staff member anywhere who believes that there's an issue. We need to have a process, if we don't have one now, where quickly we can raise that issue to the Board level and have the Board decide this question, because all of those -- you know, all of those questions -- the answers to those questions all belong with the Board.

MS. ROBERSON: Are you done, Mr. Sullivan? MR. SULLIVAN: Yes, I am.

MS. ROBERSON: Yeah. Well, I just want to tag onto that because I think you didn't talk about this enough, even though we're a little over. Sorry. You didn't really talk much about the concurrent process. I know I've seen at least four instances where whether it was a nonconcurrence or not, or an employee wanted the Board to have additional information in its decision-

19 (Pages 73 to 76)

making, is that process proceduralized and understood by our staff?

MR. STOKES: Yes, it is. MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. STOKES: And I -- and kind of extending my response a bit, the staff generally is not shy about saying whether they have an adequate protection issue or not. There is a -- every group lead, myself, the Deputy Technical Director, is trained to ensure that if we do have an adequate protection issue that it be raised to the Board as soon as we have a basis to be able to support that. I mean, certainly, we -- we have to be responsible about making sure that if, you know, we're not going to cry wolf, in essence, so we have to have a technical basis consistent with what the legislation requires, if we're going to do a recommendation, you have to have a basis.

So, built into our procedures is also, for every staff concern that's raised, we categorize them. And they're categorized one, two, three, and four. And all category four things have to go to the Board. And those are the ones that the staff believes have inadequate protection. So, if there is any staff member that believes that they have an issue, it's classified that way -- categorized that way, and it goes to the

MR. STOKES: Of course. If I do not believe that what we've provided with the Board -- or to the Board is factually accurate or technically correct or any action that the Board takes, I believe to be, you know, suffer from factual inaccuracies or it lacks technical adequacy or justification, I'd have no hesitancy to inform Board members of those concerns and to act upon them. I -- you know, I just don't. It's -- the public protection is just too important.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Good question for fellow Board members. Have the Board ever been presented or waited on this one through four items? Because the staff might feel an item is two; the Board might feel it's three or four. I mean, there's all these items being tracked. Has the Board ever been presented with a summary or as to make an opinion on are those the right categorizations? I just don't know -- I haven't seen that in my time here.

MS. ROBERSON: So -- so for public consumption, you're referring to the staff's categorization of, I don't know, significance relative to the statute.

MR. STOKES: When we, relative to the statute and relative to being able to prepare information for the Board, to manage, well, what things -- what things need

Board.

So, there is a -- there actually is a process to be able to accommodate that. The -- and then for those things that are of lesser degree, they're tracked and with the exception of ones which are dismissed, which says there really is no issue here. But that's documented, and then -- and so that the basis for that is also documented.

And those things are all tracked. So, we have the ability to be able to watch that over time. I would be very surprised that any staff member would be unable to believe that they have the ability, because we have open-door policies with all Board members; we have an open-door policy with all group leads, with myself and the Technical Director, that anyone who has that kind of an issue doesn't have an avenue to be able to make sure that those concerns are known.

MS. ROBERSON: So, can I ask you a quick question? And then Mr. Santos has a quick question.

You, as the Technical Director, I mean, at the end of the day the Board decides what decision it makes through the statutory process. Are you comfortable if they're nonconcurring --

MR. STOKES: Of course.

MS. ROBERSON: -- with the Board action?

further study, for example, do we have all the information necessary for being able to provide the Board with an adequate volume of information to be able to make any kind of decision, so that then drives further study and then there's a plan that goes into doing that.

So, those things are available internally. The Board has access to them. Have we made a presentation on every one of them, by and large, no, because, by and large, anything that rises to any level goes to the Board in an issue paper. So, you see them as we develop them, in essence.

MS. ROBERSON: So, your question primarily is to the Board, so I'll let Mr. Sullivan respond, and then I can respond, as well.

MR. SULLIVAN: Refresh my memory, Steve. Is it -- which is worse, one or four?

MR. STOKES: Four.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay, that's your answer.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. Okay, so, four means we should be writing a recommendation. Is that what that means?

MR. STOKES: Basically, yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Because I'm aware of times where based on just discussions I've had with staff members where the staff member thought that something was

20 (Pages 77 to 80)

an issue that rose to the level of a threat to the adequate protection of the public health and safety and might -- and probably should be writing a recommendation, yet we are not because staff member thinks DOE is moving in the right direction without the recommendation. And some concerns that if the Board weighed in, you know, with the heavy hammer, maybe that would actually upset the applecart. And, you know, I guess the bottom line there is, well, you know, staff's entitled to that opinion, and it's a good opinion. Nevertheless, the resolution of the question still belongs to the Board.

So, typically, in those scenarios, those questions have not come to us, at least not in a format. You know, we're going to have a closed meeting this afternoon. We just haven't had those, so we haven't been able to have the discussion without those closed meetings. I mean, they just haven't come to us in a format where -- where actually we get to weigh in. And I guess it's my observation, whether it's fair or otherwise, that there's been sort of a screening process or a filtering process where the staff itself is saying, okay, this should -- this is an issue of adequate protection, but we're not going to write a recommendation because we think the right path is the path that we're already on. And -- and, so, then the question itself

MR. SULLIVAN: I'd just like to address a comment that you made. In the time -- in the time that I've been here working with you, I'm not aware of a circumstance where you worked with the staff to produce a recommendation. We've only had the --

MS. ROBERSON: But you know I'm telling the truth, right, because --

8 MR. SULLIVAN: No, no. I'm not questioning 9 your --

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- your veracity, no, no. So, my point is this. Based on two things that happened, one was changes in our statute, which occurred early in 2013, and another has been the Board getting assigned an IG, which led us to looking internally at internal controls or the lack thereof, so we started internal controls.

One of the things we started was creating this work plan, which -- which we didn't have before. The work plan led to, well, now we have a Board-approved plan, so Board members should not be individually upsetting that plan by just, you know, grabbing staff members and saying, okay, let's -- you know, I want you to go off in a corner and -- and start doing things.

So, it's -- it's become -- you know, other -- I guess my point is I think you're -- what you're talking

never comes to the Board, and I think we need to take a look at that in terms of how we do our own process.

MS. ROBERSON: Well, my answer is yes and no. I mean, there have been cases where I have worked alongside the staff to produce a recommendation, so as far as their categorization of issues, the answer is still yes and no. I would say there is no systemic way that I'm aware of that the Board does that, but as an individual Board member, I take that as, you know, a responsibility I have.

MR. SANTOS: Is the criteria at least clear to you?

MS. ROBERSON: So, the criteria for me is a distinction between is it good information or is there a potential gap as it relates to adequate protection, whether the Board should be taking more meaningful action, not uniquely the criteria that the staff used to categorize, but as a Board member, do I agree that it is good information for the Department to act on or not information because -- that they need because it will just confuse the matter or if we should be issuing a recommendation. So, it's fairly simplistic for me.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Other comments from Mr. Stokes or Board members?

about occurred in a -- in a different era on the Board and perhaps some of the other procedural things that we have now, which were all instituted for a good cause, may actually get in the way of a -- of a Board member trying to do the same thing. I mean, I think we could try to do the same thing, but it's -- it's just not easy, right.

If I thought something was worthy of a recommendation, you know, we do have procedures where I could request the staff assistance, but, you know, it gets back to the Board, you know, convincing the Board in the first place that the other Board members in the first place, well, then, you know, gosh, if Sullivan wants to go off and write a recommendation on something, why would -- why would other Board members want to dedicate precious staff time to that effort unless they already agreed that it was something that was worthy of a recommendation.

So, I'm just saying we need to look at the format and the process. This isn't a -- you know, I think, and the point is that the -- when you have done this in the past, you did it in the era where we didn't have nearly as many procedures and processes as we do now. And, so, we need to figure out how we fit that in.

MS. ROBERSON: I don't know that I fully agree with that, Mr. Sullivan, I think even today. The time

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

I'm referring to is 2010, 2011, even 2012. I think the Board -- the Board may not have had the formality we have today, and I'll give an example. The Board conducted a series of hearings at Hanford. And following that hearing, when the Board did its hotwash, it was clear that the Board was not satisfied with the responses that it had. And, so, I jumped in to work with the staff. So, I didn't go to the staff with my own idea. I went to apply my individual expertise to help them produce a product that the Board, as a whole, would have to vote

on. And I think we can do that today.

So, I'm not saying that I tasked the staff outside of the work plan. I think we've all agreed we're not going to do that. But I think ideally we have expertise in certain areas, and our job is to apply our expertise to the products of the Board. So, I -- I see no reason why you couldn't work with the staff on something that the Board had clearly decided it wanted to pursue. That's my view. That's all.

Yes, sir.

MR. SANTOS: I just didn't perceive the disagreement because in both cases the -- there was a Board agreement that it was worthwhile.

MS. ROBERSON: No, there's no disagreement. I just want to clarify what I was saying.

looked at -- stepped back and we're looking at the entire plan and looking for ways to streamline that because there have been a number of things that, upon reflection, don't necessarily add the kind of value that we originally had thought they might.

And to give context to that statement, when we developed the plan for our technical staff internal controls, we were at a point in time where we were -- we desired we were going to put procedures into place. So, we developed an architecture and we did it, and we did it in three phases. In the ensuing time period, we learned by implementing the ones that we created and we're looking at the other -- all of the architecture that we had originally envisioned that was necessary to meet our needs and we're questioning that. We're doing feedback and improvement. So, it's in a several-step process.

What we're doing right now is we've got a commitment to the Board to produce the second phase of the internal controls, so we're doing that. For the most part, those are written and we're going to continuing staffing. In parallel with that, we're looking at our existing internal controls, looking to streamline them, reflect on staff feedback to improve them, and then we're assessing everything we're doing in phase three to see if they're really even necessary or if there is a better way

MR. SANTOS: Oh, okay.

MS. ROBERSON: I think that's what Mr. Sullivan was asking.

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

MS. ROBERSON: So, other comments while we have Mr. Stokes standing here? Or should we wrap up this part of the agenda?

Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to reiterate, nice job dancing, and you probably should have made Rich get up and do some dancing.

MR. SANTOS: And my last question is you did an assessment a year ago; do you plan for another one?

MR. STOKES: Which assessment are you referring to?

MR. SANTOS: Process improvement, you know, looking at the whole.

MR. STOKES: We're looking at it right now. In fact, one of the -- the tasks that I have for the group -- for the Performance Assurance group lead is to look at all of the directives that we currently have, look for ways to streamline them, we have been compiling for over a year staff comments on these documents. Those

for over a year staff comments on these documents. Those comments are going to be reflected in the -- as improvements to our current set of directives, and we've

to be able to address what we believed our needs were when we envisioned the architecture three years ago.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you. No more questions.

MS. ROBERSON: Last call.

Thank you, Mr. Stokes.

At this point in our agenda, we have scheduled a 15-minute recess, so I would ask everyone to return no later than 11:15. We are in recess.

(Brief recess.)

MS. ROBERSON: Welcome back, everyone. I'd like now to call Mr. Mark Welch back to provide an overview of planned resources to matters raised in recent organizational assessments of the Board from outside entities.

MR. WELCH: Thank you, Madam Vice Chairman. Slide 2, please. I'm going to provide a brief overview of the organizational assessment tools used to provide feedback to the Board over the last 12 months. I will then briefly discuss the organizational trends identified by these tools. Finally, I will provide an outline of the planned current, short-term, and long-term actions in response to the organizational assessments.

Slide 3. In June of 2014, the Board participated in the annual federal employee viewpoint survey, or FEVS, conducted by the Office of Personnel

22 (Pages 85 to 88)

Management. As in previous years, the response rate was an impressive 73 percent of the employees eligible to receive the survey responded.

As a result of the feedback from the Fiscal Year 14 FEVS, the Board contracted with Logistics Management Institute, or LMI, to conduct an assessment of the Board's workforce and culture. LMI is a company with a proven track record of helping organizations solve the organizational issues raised in the FEVS. The assessment was conducted in October of 2014, and 60 percent of the agencies attended a focus group or interview session.

The final organization assessment was initiated by the Board's Office of the Inspector General. It was conducted by Towers Watson in April of this year. Again, the response to this survey was an impressive 74 percent. Although all three assessments were conducted by separate entities and each provided a unique insight into the organizational culture at the Board, there were certain trends that emerged.

Slide 4, please. The three organizational assessments revealed certain strengths that we continue to build upon. First is the staff's commitment to the mission of the Board, as evident by their continual willingness to participate in activities like these assessments, aimed at improving our agency. Our

that there's a lack of trust and respect for the Board's senior leadership.

In the remaining three slides, I will discuss the planned current, short-term, and long-term actions to address the trends identified by the three organizational assessments.

Slide 5, please. The planned approach to building on successes and addressing areas in need of improvement can be divided into three stages. The first stage includes those activities that could be implemented immediately in support of improving the organizational culture. These activities, outlined on this slide, are aimed at strengthening the Board's foundation to address its areas of need.

The development of agency core values is an agency-wide initiative aimed at getting employees at all levels of the Board engaged in determining the values that will guide our future communications, behaviors, and decision-making throughout the agency. Increased communication, employee engagement activities, and use of individual development plans, or IDPs, are all aimed at improving the working environment of the Board's employees.

By increasing communication at all levels, the goal is to ensure that employees are receiving accurate,

employees believe in the Board's pivotal safety mission and want to contribute to its success.

Second, each assessment showed that responses to questions about performance management were positive when compared to recent historical agency responses. The issue of performance management was one area that Board leaders committed to improve upon in Fiscal Year 2013, and the assessments indicate that the agency is moving towards achieving this goal.

The third area of strength identified by the assessments was that of professional relationships between employees and immediate supervisors. The assessments revealed that, generally speaking, there's a mutual trust and respect between employees and their supervisors.

Again, the Board is looking to build on these strengths to help improve the agency's organizational culture and other areas, and these include recognition, communication, and senior leadership. In this context, drawing from these three assessments, recognition includes the areas of monetary and nonmonetary awards and the acknowledgment of high-quality work; communication, in terms of its regularity, tone, and timeliness was identified as an area in need of improvement in all three assessments; finally, it was apparent from the feedback

appropriate, and timely information that allows them to do their jobs better. By increasing employee engagement activities like the special emphasis programs, core values initiative, and public service recognition activities, we are encouraging employees to come together to celebrate their accomplishments, their differences, and, most importantly, the fundamental role they play in the success of our agency.

The coaching and training activities listed here, along with the Internet resource and the accountability for providing timely employee feedback, including the midyear performance review sessions, are aimed at strengthening competencies at all levels of leadership. By investing in these activities, the agency is showing its readiness to improve the organization from the top down.

Slide 6, please. The short-term actions listed here indicate activities that will occur over the summer and into early fall. Some, like the adoption of the core values for the agency and the availability of the Internet resource for managers, executives, and Board members, build on current activities.

Others, like the trainings on performance plans and recognition tools and expanded use of professional development opportunities, are aimed at improving the use

23 (Pages 89 to 92)

of already available resources.

The final activity listed, expanded award categories, is a new initiative based on the feedback from the organizational assessments. The goal of expanding the award categories at the annual ceremony is to show the agency's commitment to expanding, including, and recognizing the contributions of employees at all levels of the Board.

The initiative strives to acknowledge that although professional achievements may come in different forms, the success of one Board employee is a success for all Board employees.

Slide 7. Positive change will not occur overnight, nor will it come without a concerted effort from all organizational levels to make it happen. To that end, there are additional long-term actions that can be implemented to ensure all the areas of need identified by the three organizational assessments are addressed. The activities listed here are aimed at building on our strengths, putting resources into the areas that need improvement, and allowing for an organizational culture that supports our employees and their professional growth.

This long-term strategy is a dynamic approach, and additional initiatives may be added as supplementary

to go ahead and participate, bring up their own ideas, their set of experience and contribute to what I think will be an important agency initiative.

Thank you.

 $MS.\ ROBERSON:\ Thank\ you,\ Mr.\ Santos.$ 

Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. One of the things the Towers Watson folks told us was that the staff members did not feel free to talk to Board members, despite the fact that we've told them many times that there's -- I think each of us has told them we all have an open door, that the staff thinks there's a virtual door there that is closed and they can't walk through it. For whatever is the cause of that, do we have anything in these actions that is trying to attack that?

MR. WELCH: Well, we are going to have the action to plan workshops that Towers Watson will assist us with, so, I mean, that certainly could be one of the areas that we focus on.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: You done, Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm done with questions.

MS. ROBERSON: For now?

24 MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.

MS. ROBERSON: I guess I'd like to pick up on

data becomes available. For example, once the Board receives the final report from Towers Watson and goes through the action plan process, other items might be added. Likewise, the results of the 2015 FEVS may also serve as a catalyst for future improvement efforts.

This concludes my presentation. I'm happy to answer any questions.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Welch. And this time I'll start with you, Mr. Santos, if you have any questions at this time.

MR. SANTOS: Well, just a comment. I'm very encouraged by the initiative that the staff is working on to develop their own set of core values and they're tied to their mission. To me, that's fundamental if we want to get to a very open and collaborative work environment. I think it's paramount that we have a good framework that can be very clear to everybody and have everybody accountable that that's the type of environment we want.

I just wanted to tell the staff they have a champion in me for this initiative. I do plan to bring it in front of the Board once I get a product for them, and not only in the initial step, but throughout, through my actions and as we institutionalize our own set of core values. So, public service announcement, I really would like to encourage the staff that has not got involved yet

that, because we didn't really talk much about it. Is the -- and I know Mr. Santos has experience with this, the -- there's an added benefit to the Towers Watson evaluation in that they work with us as a group to help identify, because, you know, we could do a million things, but they help us identify what are the key things to do. That's what those workshops are designed to do, so I'm really looking forward to having their expertise help us target our attention.

The other thing I'd like to say is, one, I'd like to thank you, Mr. Santos, for taking the lead among the Board to work with the staff on development of core values. I think it's important for a Board member to pitch in on these things so the staff knows the seriousness with which we take them. And, so, I just want to thank you personally for doing that.

MR. SANTOS: Any questions?

MS. ROBERSON: I don't have any. I'll come back around, unless Board members have other comments, we'll move on. Any other comments, Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I don't have any questions. MS. ROBERSON: Do you have comments?

23 MR. SULLIVAN: I might have some comments.

MS. ROBERSON: It's your floor.

MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, okay. Then I don't need Mr.

24 (Pages 93 to 96)

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

99

100

97

Welch standing at the podium. MS. ROBERSON: Well, he may. MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, you do, okay, well, keep going -- keep going with questions. MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. SULLIVAN: And I will -- I will jabber when he --MR. SANTOS: A question on the 2015 FEVS survey. What's our current numbers and deadlines and

where we are with that?

MR. WELCH: It closes June 12th. I think the last figure we had, I thought we were up to 50 percent or so -- 64 percent, I'm being told.

MR. SANTOS: Okay. Again, public service announcement --

MR. WELCH: Right.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MR. SANTOS: -- I want to encourage all staff to -- to participate in the surveys, and you want to get a sense -- I haven't talked to many of staff on this, but I want to make sure they get a sense that we take this seriously and that we actually derive implementation actions straight based on the result of this assessment. So, it's very important to me, at least, that I get a statistically representative solid sample so our actions can be, you know, commensurate with it, with the items.

So, going forward, that's -- I mean, that's one of our -- one of our goals is to engage the employees more in coming up with some of these solutions. So, we've already started that with the core values workshop. I think the action to plan workshops will help in that regard, too, because that -- that is -- that is going to involve employees. So, that will be a good step forward.

MR. SANTOS: Okay. And my last question, what's the time line to work with, like, Towers Watson on some of these initiatives? So, the time line to where we -- you feel you're going to get to at least a list of things that just needs to be executed.

MR. WELCH: Right. So, notionally, we're planning on the workshops roughly early July.

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

MR. WELCH: So, I believe they'll take -- and don't quote me exactly on this -- I believe they'll take four to six weeks. So, we're probably looking towards the end of the fiscal year when we actually have something to move out.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Santos.

The floor is open for comments, Mr. Sullivan.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's your signal that you may cease standing up, if you so choose.

25

98

So, I just wanted to communicate that to the staff, that at least from my stand, I really would like for everybody to participate. And then I want to make sure we are effectively communicating for this topic that was identified. This is what you expect; this is how your actions -- and they'll be given a chance to express their own views on how they think some of those items are -- could be improved.

I just want to make sure we're not just driving this from what we, the senior leadership, think is going to be the solution. I think it's very important that as far as this process we organically provide an opportunity for staff to be part of the solution. That's not clear to me how that process is going to work out today, but I look forward to your initiatives as you come up with the plans.

Anything you want to say regarding how to better integrate staff in the whole process?

MR. WELCH: Well, I mean, first of all, I agree. I'll chime in on the public service initiative, that if everybody could respond by June 12th, that would be great, because, as you said, the better -- the higher percentage response we get the more -- the more feedback and -- and the higher statistically valuable that feedback is.

Yeah, well, so, on the issue of feedback to Board members, I just wanted to comment that I find it --I find it difficult for us as individual Board members to try to attack some of these issues. Unless we were to be able to have a meeting pursuant to our own regulations under the Sunshine Act and we close it in order to discuss strictly internal or personnel matters, and I think we would need to probably have our General Counsel again take a look at the parameters for which that's -that's applicable or that's appropriate, because I imagine other agencies, boards, commissions have done the same thing and been challenged on it. So, I imagine there's some -- some court rulings or whatever that set some parameters. So, there's probably some work there for us to do, because we've never done that.

So, as a Board member, the staff doesn't work for me. So, now, the question becomes what do I do with information if I do get it where a staff member says here's a problem with the agency? We're such a small agency, it's very difficult to talk about the specifics of that issue without revealing who the staff member is. So, if the staff member comes forward to me but doesn't really want to let it be known to his or her supervisor that they're basically complaining about something, they want to be able to have that be kept in confidence, well,

25 (Pages 97 to 100)

I go turn around and I -- since staff doesn't work for me

If the staff did work for me, I could just tell senior leaders of the staff, okay, well, change A and B and C and I don't really have to tell them exactly where I got information that said A and B and C are a problem, but since they don't work for me, I have to -- you know, I'd say change A, B, and C or I suggest we change A, B, and C, and they come back and say A, B, and C is not a problem. Well, in order to explain it's a problem, you kind of got to give specifics, but then you can't give specifics without revealing who gave you the specifics because we're such a small, specialized agency. Any description of any particular specifics quickly leads back to, okay, who was the source of that information.

So, I just find it to be problematic for me as a Board member unless we were to sit as a board and do this sort of thing, but then we would have to do it in public, unless we close it. So, I guess that's my thought. I would like to see us give some serious thought to what we can and cannot talk about on these issues in a closed meeting so that we can talk with a lot more specificity in terms of what we -- what -- what particular members of the staff have said their experiences were and we can try to work through those.

MR. SANTOS: I just want to make sure this topic we can bring it up this afternoon, so we can actually formalize any sort of action, because I just heard the discussion.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. SANTOS: Are we actually going to act on it as a board now or later? Should we revisit it later this afternoon?

MS. ROBERSON: Well, I guess my understanding of the exchange that just happened was a Board member identified a desire to have insights from legal as to what parameters may exist for such a discussion, and so I want to hear that feedback. I don't -- I don't think we need to talk about tasking anymore, I mean, we're all here.

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

MR. BATHERSON: Right, it would be -- we would need to look at it first to give you the preliminary advice to proceed.

MR. SANTOS: Okay. I just wanted to say -MS. ROBERSON: That's the normal way it works.
MR. SANTOS: -- okay, I just wanted to say I
think it's a good effort and I support it. That's all.
Just in case you needed more -- more than one.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Okay.

MS. ROBERSON: So, Mr. Sullivan, are you asking legal to provide some feedback to the Board on the potential for having such a discussion?

MR. SULLIVAN: Again, legal doesn't work for me, so I think it would be good if we had that.

MS. ROBERSON: Well, all of the employees in this agency work for the Board.

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, understand, but, again, it's the tasking thing. So, I think -- I think we should have some guidance from our General Counsel that would allow -- would give us the parameters, what could we talk about and keep from the public if we're going to get into the -- you know, have a meeting where the Board members acting as a board, could make decisions and be free to talk about specifics that really shouldn't be in the public because they identify specific employees and specific circumstances.

MS. ROBERSON: I'm not really asking for a comment. I just want to make sure you understood the --

MR. BATHERSON: I certainly understand the

issue, and if the Board so desires, we can look at it.

MS. ROBERSON: Let me make sure Mr. Sullivan is

done now. He had a list. Is that your last comment?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Thank you. MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Mr. Santos?

1 MR. SANTOS: That's all.

MS. ROBERSON: Any other comments, Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: No.

MS. ROBERSON: Any other comments?

Okay, so, at this time, as stated on the agenda and in the Federal Register notice, we will welcome comments from the public and other interested parties. I will call speakers who have signed up in advance and ask the speakers to state their name and title at the beginning of their statement.

Those who have added their names on the sign-up sheet that was posted outside will follow those who have already registered with us in the order in which they have signed up. This will be followed by reading the comments submitted by e-mail by remote viewers.

To give everyone wishing to make a statement an equal opportunity, we will ask speakers to be brief. The Vice Chair may interject if a speaker exceeds five minutes, but will then give consideration for additional time should the agenda permit. Statements should be limited to the subject of this public meeting as stated on the agenda. The Board members may question anyone making a statement to the extent deemed appropriate.

And, so, it is my understanding we have -- can we close this off for this, unless somebody needs it, is

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4 5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

105

making a presentation? But my understanding is we have no speakers signed up. Is that -- where is Mr. Tibideau (phonetic)? No speakers signed up.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, I think, Board members, we're going to have to draft people in the audience. Is there anyone in the audience who would like to make a statement? Yes, Mr.

MR. PASKO: My name is John Pasko, and I am an employee of the Board. I currently serve as the Nuclear Materials Processing and Stabilization Group. And I'd like to just offer some thoughts on the -- on the last topic, when we were talking about staff engagement. And I would tell you that one of the things that the staff needs to feel engaged is to feel that they're valued and appreciated. And that kind of -- if you differentiate that out, it comes down to trust.

In the last session, prior to the break, several of the Board members were discussing the mystery by which the staff works and what's the staff working on, and I would just tell you from the staff's perspective that says -- that can convey that the Board doesn't trust what the staff is doing. And they work at counter to each other. So, I just wanted to make sure you're aware of that.

And then the second thing I had was a question.

we as a Board have, where the staff is, and how they may align, or if not, why. So, I do look forward to this process, but I need to make sure adequate time is given for the people to -- to embrace it and deal with it, but I think the process is going to get us there. That's just my expectation.

MR. PASKO: I'm not sure whether it will line up like this or like this.

MR. SANTOS: And that's okay.

MR. PASKO: The process has got great

MR. SANTOS: Exactly. I just -- let's just wait and see, but I think we're going to get there.

MR. PASKO: Okay. 14

> MR. SANTOS: And I also believe it's a -either a evolutionary process, as we grow and as we establish, you know, new relationships as we move forward. So, I'm an optimist.

> > MR. PASKO: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Thanks, John, for standing up and saying something. So, give me an opportunity to point out, you know, comments that I make might be perceived by the staff as I don't trust the staff, so let me just reiterate that's not the case at all. I mean,

106

I know the staff is working on values. I think one of the -- one of the other problems that the staff deals with sometimes we see conflicting which direction are we going to go, and I was curious if the Board in their closed deliberations intends to do the same thing, to try and plot a course that the staff could look at and have some confidence that we know what your priorities are going forward.

So, there are my comments.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you. I think it's a good question. Let's give the Board members an opportunity to see if they want to comment on -- no, you don't get to go. Stay right there.

MR. PASKO: I'll stay here and dance.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos or Mr. Sullivan, would you like to comment on that?

MR. SANTOS: I just want to express what my expectation is regarding the core values. I think it's important that, you know, they get developed by the staff, and the next step is to bring it to the Board and then through that exchange the Board needs to be very clear and communicate back to the staff exactly what you're saying.

So, I think the process will allow us to do that, to communicate very clearly what is the direction the statute provides that the staff -- that supervision of the employees is done by the Chairman, and currently that's the Vice Chairman who's the Acting Chair. So, I don't supervise the staff on a day-to-day basis, and while there's plenty of information available to me, you know, some of these things about the procedure, it's just -- it's just hard for me to figure out, well, exactly who's doing what. And I don't know if I actually go asking the questions who's doing what and then maybe that's perceived as I don't trust them. I'm just trying to figure it out.

I mean, just -- just this morning, I had a conversation with the Technical Director about another -it's just a product that's in the chain and I look at it and I was like, okay, I see that it's in the chain, but it hasn't come to us yet and it's been in the chain in the staff level for a while. And if the issue is important, you know, what -- what's taking so long, why can't -- why can't it get to us faster? I mean, it's just that sort of thing, you know, because I think the issue is important. And, so, I'm just trying to figure out if there are ways to be more efficient or more effective on that.

Happy to talk to the staff on any of the points that I was -- I was making earlier today. I know I made

27 (Pages 105 to 108)

107

108

one where I thought, you know, staff members themselves might, you know, self-filter, if you will, a potential issue of adequate protection because a staff member already thinks he or she has an adequate path to resolution. And my point is, well, okay, this is not an issue of trust; you know, my guess is that if the Board were then to consider the issue, the vast majority of times we would probably endorse what the staff is doing. That's not the point; the point is I have a statutory duty to -- to do certain things, which is to decide these questions. So, if the question never comes to me, I can't decide it. And that's -- that's the only point I was making there. So, yeah, I understand what you're saying, these can be perceived as, you know, I don't trust the staff, and I just ask the staff to say, okay, there's always two sides to every issue, this is why we need the communications piece. I appreciate your making

MR. PASKO: Thank you.

the communication. Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: And I want to thank you, as well, for being brave and standing up, because that's kind of what we need to happen. I appreciate the feedback. I think it is fair. I also am committed to once I say I'm going to operate according to a certain set of values, I think the staff can count on me to do

deliberates later this afternoon about potential changes to procedures and activities, particularly related to the staff, I'd just suggest that you consider the possibility of making those temporary changes or interim changes to give a chance to see how things work out, you know, before making permanent changes.

We've gone through a lot of change here over the last couple of years, and my fear is just here's another change that we're going to look at and then are we going to have to come back and look at it again. So, if you just kind of go into with the idea we'll try these things out for, you know, six months or a year or whatever and see and then reevaluate, it just might make things a lot easier in the future. And perhaps even make it like a sunset provision whereas we'll try it for a year, and if we don't, the Board doesn't act on it again, it will just go back to the way it was.

Just a thought.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, sir.

Any Board comments on that? Go ahead, Mr.

Santos.

MR. SANTOS: Yeah, I appreciate the comment. I just -- I'm kind of on a continuous improvement mentality, so to me, nothing is always permanent. If clearly something doesn't work or needs to be improved,

that. I won't say I'm going to do it if I'm not going to do it.

I think on the flip side, even though history always looks better, we are a Board of diverse individuals. We have different backgrounds, different careers, different experience, and different areas of expertise. And I know sometimes the staff would like for us to all see things the same. That will never happen because we are not built that way. That's why there's a Board. And, so, I think if we can provide greater comfort in the value side of our operation, the Board can better appreciate when we disagree on operational or technical matters.

MR. PASKO: Yes, ma'am. I think as the survey that we just completed bears out, over 90 percent of the folks who work here think what we do is very, very important. So, you know, and I tend to like to use, you know, my sayings, but that dog hunts, if safety is one of your values. So, thank you for the time. I appreciate it.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Pasko.
Does anyone -- yes, sir. Mr. March, come up.
MR. MARCH: Hi, I'm Charles March. I'm on the
Board staff. I just want to make one -- just one comment
or one suggestion. You know, as the Board, you know,

1 we shall act on it.

MR. MARCH: Okay.

MR. SANTOS: So, that would be my comment on

that.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Santos.

Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, with that said, we could, you know, if we're going to direct a procedural change, we could equally direct a sunset provision in it. And, so, you know, that's -- it's an idea worth considering. Thank you.

MR. MARCH: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: I echo Mr. Sullivan's comment. I think when we do that, it's something we can discuss, as well. Thank you very much.

MR. MARCH: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Anyone else in the audience that would like to make a statement or comment? Anybody from DOE? I mean, we're spending a lot of time talking about how we do our job and how it affects DOE. Anyone from DOE like to give their individual feedback? I recognize you don't come with a statement from the Secretary. Sean wants to draft somebody.

MR. SULLIVAN: You're going to have to bribe them.

28 (Pages 109 to 112)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

115

116

113

MS. ROBERSON: I'm going to bribe them with another recommendation. How about that? MR. SULLIVAN: How about -- how about a getout-of-recommendation-free card?

MS. ROBERSON: Please do. Please feel comfortable to share anything. Drew? Mr. Walter, would you like to say anything? Yeah.

MR. WALTER: I'm Drew Walter. I'm a professional staffer with the House Armed Services Committee, and I just want to pile on and say, you know, I think Congress at large really appreciates the mission of the Board and recognizes the deep technical expertise that's resident at the Board, and keeping our nuclear deterrent and the nuclear enterprise itself safe is of the highest priority. We really appreciate everything you guys do. Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, sir. Thank you for being here.

MR. WALTER: Sure.

MS. ROBERSON: Anyone else? Otherwise I guess I can bribe you with lunchtime. I want to thank you all. I'll give -- since we have the time, I'll offer to the Board members any statements they want to make before we

break for lunch on what's happened earlier.

24 25

Mr. Sullivan?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

have a more explicit discussion about what particular employees believe that they are faced with.

And I talked with the General Manager standing at the podium about looking at the -- specifically looking at the Towers Watson comment that said the employees did not feel that they were free to be able to -- to come and speak to Board members.

And, finally, I think I spoke specifically to the Technical Director about a desire to take a look at how the staff does its business, simply to see if we can't shorten some of that time line, perhaps putting things in parallel with them and currently being series. And I think that's it.

MS. ROBERSON: Do you have any notes written down of things that Mr. Sullivan missed that you believe you asked?

MR. SANTOS: I'm glad we have a transcript, so that could help.

MS. ROBERSON: I just didn't know if you kept

MR. SANTOS: But I just -- it's an expansion. He gave some examples, but, you know, I talked about maybe it will be worthwhile to have an exercise where we go through the statute and have an equivalent set of policies that matches it. Just an expansion of Mr.

114

MR. SULLIVAN: Thank you. I'm just going to review some things that we talked about here, but in terms of explicit direction, I don't -- I'm not sure that any has necessarily been provided, so I'll just review them for -- as a kind of a summary, but I think I've mentioned a possible new policy statement on how we do design review of new construction projects at the Department of Energy, potential new policy statement on how we do -- how we review the Department of Energy's orders, directives, standards.

We talked about looking at Policy Statement 2 and trying to decide if it's even needed any longer. We talked about looking at Policy Statement 5 to see if perhaps we should be adding something so we could do some sort of risk assessment on those things which are not tier one specific facility issues.

The -- we talked about having legal take a look at some of the issues of -- that involve restrictions on us in terms of agency action and/or making things available through FOIA if we are sending things over to the Department of Energy as staff products.

We talked about looking at -- having legal take a look at doing -- you know, how would we do -- or what are the parameters under which we can close a meeting for internal or personnel matters so that we could perhaps

1 Sullivan's examples.

> And, also, I would like to probably see some structure if we're going to start entertaining employment at tiered one, two, three approach to -- to issues and come up with the necessary criteria to support that.

> > MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm.

So, Mr. Batherson, you have all these? No, I'm saying, you've got the list.

MR. BATHERSON: Yes.

MS. ROBERSON: Step with me. I'm not saying give us an answer now.

MR. BATHERSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. ROBERSON: You have the list. So, I guess what I'd ask is maybe at the -- somewhere during the afternoon session we just see if we can get some feedback on those that the office directors can give us feedback on, schedule, scope. Some of them overlap. Give us some feedback on when you think some of these could be done. And we can move on from there. And, you know, the Board can always vote to direct on any of them. And maybe that's what we need to do this afternoon, but I'd like to get some feedback from the office directors on them.

MR. BATHERSON: Got it.

MS. ROBERSON: Any other comments?

25 Mr. Santos?

29 (Pages 113 to 116)

	117		119
1	MR. SANTOS: No, ma'am.	1	AFTERNOON SESSION
2	MS. ROBERSON: We are recessed for lunch, and	2	(1:01 p.m.)
3	we will be back in this room at 1:00 p.m.	3	MS. ROBERSON: Okay, welcome back. I'd like to
4	MR. SANTOS: You're changing the	4	now turn to consideration of the four requests for Board
5	MS. ROBERSON: What does it say?	5	action that were previously submitted in anticipation of
6	MR. SANTOS: 1:30. You're changing the	6	this public meeting.
7	MR. BATHERSON: We're 1:30, ma'am, or 1:00?	7	These requests are, number one, 2015-098,
8	MS. ROBERSON: Well, we're done we're done	8	request for Board action by Board Member Daniel J.
9	early. I guess I'd ask for unanimous consent to	9	Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff
10	reconvene at 1:00. It gives us a little more time in the	10	procedures pertaining to site representative reports.
11	afternoon if we need it. If we have visitors here for	11	The second request is 2015-102, request for
12	lunch, at least it maximizes their time, so I'm going to	12	Board action by Board Member Sean Sullivan, revise
13	ask the Board members for unanimous consent.	13	applicable staff procedures governing staff issue papers.
14	MR. SANTOS: I consent.	14	The third request is 2015-099, request for
15	MR. SULLIVAN: Just a point of order, do we	15	Board action by Board Member Daniel J. Santos,
16	think we might have confused out there who may have not	16	incorporate the legal opinion of DOJ Office of Legal
17	been here this morning who might be planning on coming	17	Counsel into a Board policy.
18	this afternoon and may not show up until 1:30 because of	18	And the fourth action is 2015-101, request for
19	our Federal Register notice?	19	Board action by Board Member Sean Sullivan, revise Board
20	MS. ROBERSON: There is that possibility, and	20	policies and staff procedures regarding the drafting of
21	if you want to not consent for that reason, I'm happy to	21	recommendations.
22	reconvene at 1:30.	22	The requests will be considered and voted on in
23	MR. SULLIVAN: I mean, I guess I just wanted to	23	the order I just presented them. And, so, the first
24	raise the point. I'm happy to start early, leave early,	24	request is proposed revision of Board policies and staff
25	be done early, so I'll go ahead and give my consent, if	25	procedures pertaining to site representative reports, and
	110		120
	118		120
1	that's what the majority of the Board wants to do.	1	I'll loove open the floor to you Mr. Sentes to open
	MS DOBEDSON: Is there some remodul action		I'll leave open the floor to you, Mr. Santos, to open
2	MS. ROBERSON: Is there some remedial action	2	up the discussion.
3	you think we should take to inform any you know, put	3	up the discussion. I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to
3 4	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?	3 4	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?
3 4 5	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we	3 4 5	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson
3 4 5 6	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the	3 4 5 6	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?
3 4 5 6 7	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of	3 4 5 6 7	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then
3 4 5 6 7 8	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.	3 4 5 6 7 8	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson  MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?	3 4 5 6 7 8 9	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson  MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos,
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson  MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures.
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures.  The action: request to create or revise applicable Board
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures.  The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request? MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures. The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:00.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request?  MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures.  The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:00.  Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request? MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures. The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not to waive the deliberative process privilege associated
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:00.  Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request? MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures. The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not to waive the deliberative process privilege associated with site representative report (weekly and monthly
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:00.  Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request? MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures. The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not to waive the deliberative process privilege associated with site representative report (weekly and monthly reports) or a portion of such reports; request to direct
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:00.  Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request? MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures. The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not to waive the deliberative process privilege associated with site representative report (weekly and monthly reports) or a portion of such reports; request to direct the DNFSB staff to revise applicable staff procedures
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:00.  Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request? MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures. The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not to waive the deliberative process privilege associated with site representative report (weekly and monthly reports) or a portion of such reports; request to direct the DNFSB staff to revise applicable staff procedures governing all site representative reports to explicitly solicit timely and formal feedback from DOE (coordinated through the office of the departmental representative to
3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	you think we should take to inform any you know, put it on our website, maybe?  MR. BATHERSON: We can do that. I mean, we could have, I guess, something posted on the on the direct feed that we'd be reconvening at 1:00 instead of 1:30.  MS. ROBERSON: Would that satisfy your concern at this time?  MR. SULLIVAN: Certainly.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay.  MR. SANTOS: Yes.  MS. ROBERSON: Okay, we'll reconvene at 1:00.  Thank you.	3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	up the discussion.  I'm sorry, would you like for Mr. Batherson to actually read it, or would you like to speak first?  MR. SANTOS: I would like Mr. Batherson MS. ROBERSON: Batherson to read the request? MR. SANTOS: and then MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Right, Document 2015-098, request for Board action by Board Member Daniel Santos, proposed revision of Board policies and staff procedures. The action: request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not to waive the deliberative process privilege associated with site representative report (weekly and monthly reports) or a portion of such reports; request to direct the DNFSB staff to revise applicable staff procedures governing all site representative reports to explicitly solicit timely and formal feedback from DOE (coordinated

25

distribution and publication.

The office of the departmental representative

24

25

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

24

25

123

124

121

to the DNFSB should be provided with a draft report at the same time the report is provided to the site management (typically the week following the creation of the report) and be given a window of five business days to review the draft report and provide feedback to the Board if they so desire.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The staff would forward the DOE feedback to the Board. If no Board member initiates a Board action within five days after receipt of the feedback from DOE, the DNFSB staff should continue with the disposition and publication of the site representative reports. If any Board member initiates a Board action, disposition of the site representative report should be stayed until the Board completes any and all actions, including a determination regarding the waiving of the deliberative process privilege.

The intent of this request is to formalize mechanisms for the Board members to be made aware of any DOE concerns about a site representative report and to decide whether or not to redact any part of a site representative report before it is made publicly available. It is not intended to be used by the Board members to make wording changes to the reports.

DNFSB staff has requested to affirm to the Board by July 13, 2015, that the necessary changes to MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. SANTOS: So, the first amendment I would like to propose to the Board members is to split the two requests for actions into two separate votes, so treat number one as it is; and if we could move to that one right now, that would -- that would be good. So, it will be one request for Board vote on just the first paragraph that reads -- we'll read it again. Is that okay? Or do I have to read it again?

MR. BATHERSON: Yeah, go ahead and read it. MR. SANTOS: I mean, request to create or revise applicable Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or not to waive the deliberative process privilege associated with the site representative reports (weekly and monthly reports) or a portion of such reports.

And I will ask for a Board vote on that specific one, if the amendment passes. So, the first thing we got to do is vote on my amendment to split into two actions. So, I will kindly request for a Board vote on the amendment.

22 23 MR. BATHERSON: Are you moving to --24 MR. SANTOS: Yes.

MR. BATHERSON: -- for an amendment.

122

applicable staff procedures governing site representative reports (weekly and monthly reports) have been incorporated. That's the end of the request.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you. At the very heart, I'm basically interested in formalizing actions that it's my understanding can be taken today. With the first one it's basically the Board -- any Board member can initiate the same type of actions where -- whether we want to waive or not the deliberative process privilege making a site report public or not. I just want to make sure we can explicitly write it down so the staff and other stakeholders know that it's in the Board's purview to take such action. So, it's a matter of formalizing that.

With the second request, at the core of it, basically as an individual Board member, I value various sources of information. And to me, I will value to get feedback from -- from DOE on our site reports. Today, that's something, again, that I could pursue on an individual basis, but it's not really formalized or written down, you know, anywhere.

So, I'm just looking for a more formal mechanism to obtain feedback. After giving some thoughts and -- and discussions on this, I would like to make some amendments -- propose some amendments to simplify my intentions behind this.

MR. SANTOS: For an amendment, correct, to split the vote.

MR. BATHERSON: Are there any objections? MR. SULLIVAN: So, just a -- I just want to clarify.

MR. SANTOS: Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: All right, if -- so, if we move on this and then we vote, what we're voting on is we're agreeing to vote twice more. Is that -- do I get that right?

MR. BATHERSON: If you vote on -- if you vote on the amendment, then there's going to be another vote for the final vote on number one.

MR. SANTOS: Correct.

MR. SULLIVAN: And -- and then a number two, whatever -- whatever that may be.

MR. SANTOS: I will have a different amendment, will require a different vote, and then a subsequent

MR. BATHERSON: Correct.

21 MR. SANTOS: So, that way, we're --

22 MR. SULLIVAN: These votes are --23

MR. SANTOS: That's right.

MR. SULLIVAN: That's okay. I just wanted to understand.

31 (Pages 121 to 124)

	125		127
1	MR. SANTOS: So, it looks like we're going to	1	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos?
2	have four votes.	2	MR. SANTOS: Yes.
3	MS. ROBERSON: All right.	3	MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?
4	MR. SULLIVAN: Wow, okay. Great.	4	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.
5	MS. ROBERSON: So, the first thing we're voting	5	MR. BATHERSON: All right, the vote to amend to
6	on is	6	split the original request into two parts is approved.
7	MR. SANTOS: The amendment.	7	And now we're going to the first the vote on the first
8	MS. ROBERSON: the amendment.	8	part of the request, to approve that. Correct?
9	MR. BATHERSON: What is the amendment?	9	MR. SANTOS: Correct.
10	MR. SANTOS: The amendment is to split the	10	MR. BATHERSON: All right, Mr. Sullivan?
11	current proposed	11	MR. SULLIVAN: So, just point of order, so now
12	MR. BATHERSON: Oh, got you.	12	we're voting on number one already?
13	MR. SANTOS: so we can treat number one	13	MR. BATHERSON: Correct, so I'll read it back
14	separate from number two.	14	so that we don't have any confusion. So, the first part
15	MR. SULLIVAN: So, if I understand correctly,	15	of 2015-098, Mr. Santos' request for Board action is as
16	Mr. Santos moved the question to vote on his amendment	16	follows: one, request to create or revise applicable
17	one, which is just to	17	Board policies to allow any Board member to initiate
18	MR. SANTOS: Split the current request for	18	Board action on a case-by-case basis regarding whether or
19	Board action into two independent requests for action,	19	not to waive the deliberative process privilege
20	each requiring a separate Board vote.	20	associated with the site representative report (weekly
21	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, well, so I second moving	21	and monthly reports) or a portion of such reports;.
22	the question, which I understand correctly actually	22	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so I just want to be
23	requires us to vote on vote on moving the question	23	clear, because I don't think we've actually moved this
24	MR. SANTOS: Yes.	24	question yet. I just had something I wanted to say about
25	MR. SULLIVAN: before we vote on the	25	it.
1	amendment. We get plenty of votes. It's great.	1	MR. SANTOS: Mm-hmm.
2	MR. SANTOS: You want to vote? We got to get	2	MR. SULLIVAN: And, also, I'm a little bit
3	votes.	3	rusty on the procedures, so correct me if I'm wrong, but
4	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, I'm going to take the	4	we don't necessarily have to move every question. I
5	roll of the Board members for the motion to move the	5	think the Chair can just say, all right, hearing no
6	question. We'll go with Mr. Sullivan.	6	further discussion, I will call for a vote. And if
7	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.	7	nobody speaks up, then we just go. Okay.
8	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos?	8	MR. BATHERSON: You can just move to the vote.
9	MR. SANTOS: Yes.	9	MR. SULLIVAN: All right.
10	MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?	10	MS. ROBERSON: But we're in discussion on this
11	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.	11	first one.
	MS. RODERSON. 168.		
12		12	MR. BATHERSON: Correct.
12 13	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.	12 13	MR. BATHERSON: Correct. MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I
	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to		MR. BATHERSON: Correct. MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other
13	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.	13	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I
13 14	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the	13 14	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other
13 14 15	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?	13 14 15	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise
13 14 15 16	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.	13 14 15 16	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure
13 14 15 16 17	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.  MR. BATHERSON: Correct. Before we vote, are	13 14 15 16 17	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure what we will create out of this. Nevertheless, we can
13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.  MR. BATHERSON: Correct. Before we vote, are there any objections to the amendment?	13 14 15 16 17 18	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure
13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.  MR. BATHERSON: Correct. Before we vote, are there any objections to the amendment?  MS. ROBERSON: No.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure what we will create out of this. Nevertheless, we can
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.  MR. BATHERSON: Correct. Before we vote, are there any objections to the amendment?  MS. ROBERSON: No.  MR. BATHERSON: Okay, I'll take I'll call	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure what we will create out of this. Nevertheless, we can we can move forward on it.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.  MR. BATHERSON: Correct. Before we vote, are there any objections to the amendment?  MS. ROBERSON: No.  MR. BATHERSON: Okay, I'll take I'll call the roll for the amendment to split the vote split the	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure what we will create out of this. Nevertheless, we can we can move forward on it.  MR. SANTOS: You're correct in that we have procedures that allow members to initiate action. The part that I want to make explicit is this concept of
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.  MR. BATHERSON: Correct. Before we vote, are there any objections to the amendment?  MS. ROBERSON: No.  MR. BATHERSON: Okay, I'll take I'll call the roll for the amendment to split the vote split the questions proposed in the original request for Board	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure what we will create out of this. Nevertheless, we can we can move forward on it.  MR. SANTOS: You're correct in that we have procedures that allow members to initiate action. The part that I want to make explicit is this concept of deliberative process privilege associated with the weekly
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have three votes to move the question and approved.  MR. SULLIVAN: So, now we're voting on the amendment?  MR. SANTOS: Correct.  MR. BATHERSON: Correct. Before we vote, are there any objections to the amendment?  MS. ROBERSON: No.  MR. BATHERSON: Okay, I'll take I'll call the roll for the amendment to split the vote split the questions proposed in the original request for Board actions and we'll take a vote on that amendment.	13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	MR. SULLIVAN: I just want to say, I mean, I have no objection to approving this thing but other than to point out that it says to create or revise applicable procedures allowing a Board member to initiate action on a case-by-case basis, et cetera, et cetera, and I think we already have that procedure. So, I'm not sure what we will create out of this. Nevertheless, we can we can move forward on it.  MR. SANTOS: You're correct in that we have procedures that allow members to initiate action. The part that I want to make explicit is this concept of

	129		131
1	MR. SULLIVAN: Very well.	1	MR. SANTOS: Yes.
2	MR. SANTOS: Yes.	2	MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?
3	MS. ROBERSON: So	3	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.
4	MR. SANTOS: It's not it's not complex.	4	MR. BATHERSON: So, 2015-098, part one, is
5	MS. ROBERSON: did you get your	5	approved by a vote of three approves and no disapproves.
6	MR. SULLIVAN: I have no more discussion.	6	Let's move on to part two.
7	Whenever	7	MR. SANTOS: Yes, I have a second proposed
8	MS. ROBERSON: Well, one, I just kind of want	8	amendment, that is to change the second item of the
9	to take a minute to make sure I explain to people who	9	current request for proposal. So, it's the second
10	don't really understand what we're doing. So and you	10	paragraph there.
11	correct me if I'm wrong. This item in 1998, the then	11	MR. BATHERSON: Correct.
12	Board members actually formally approved releasing site	12	MR. SANTOS: And I have provided the words to
13	rep weekly reports to the public. And the Board has done	13	the fellow Board members, but I will read it for the
14	so since that time.	14	for the record, and then I'll probably give you this copy
15	No board since that time has actually	15	in case you need to read it again. So, let me read it
16	reevaluated whether because the Board members, it is a	16	real quick.
17	Board product and the Board has to waive its privilege to	17	Change the entire paragraph and the last
18	release them. And, so, as I understand it, Mr. Santos,	18	paragraph to read: request the Board to approve a
19	what you're doing is saying create procedures and this	19	revision to Board procedures to create a new Board
20	is what I understand this to say we will continue to	20	product that will solicit timely and formal feedback from
21	do that, but we recognize that Board members have the	21	DOE headquarters on the content of the site
22	right to recall their consent to waive their privilege.	22	representative reports (weekly and monthly reports). The
23	Is that right?	23	DOE office of the departmental representative to the
24	MR. SANTOS: That is correct.	24	DNFSB will be provided with each draft report at the same
25	MS. ROBERSON: Is that your understanding, Mr.	25	time DOE site personnel are provided the draft reports
	130		132
1	Sullivan?	1	for sensitivity and awareness review. DOE headquarters
2	MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah. I'm happy. I'm a happy	2	will be requested to provide written feedback to the
3	guy.	3	Board if they so desire.
4	MS. ROBERSON: Okay, okay. I just want to make	4	I will now pass it
5	sure people understand. Did I say something wrong, Mr.	5	MR. BATHERSON: Yep.
6	Batherson?	6	MR. SANTOS: to you so you can have it here.
7	MR. BATHERSON: No, ma'am.	7	Maybe move to discussion? And then
8	MS. ROBERSON: You just look at me like that	8	MS. ROBERSON: Yes, we can.
9	all the time, huh?	9	Mr. Batherson, you have what you need? We're
10	MR. BATHERSON: Yes, I do.	10	ready to move to discussion?
11	MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Okay. I'm always getting	11	MR. BATHERSON: Let me let me read it just
12	in trouble. All right, I don't have any other comments	12	real quickly.
13 14	on it. I understand it.	13	MS. ROBERSON: Okay.
15	MR. SULLIVAN: I think that's	14 15	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, go ahead. MS. ROBERSON: I'll start, if that's okay,
16	MS. ROBERSON: So, are we is there further discussion?	16	since I rarely get to start. So so, in there are
17	MR. SULLIVAN: he's calling for a vote.	17	actually, I see two pieces to your proposal, and you
18	MR. BATHERSON: All right, Mr. Santos, are you	18	correct me if I'm wrong. One piece would begin to issue
19	ready?	19	monthly reports, which is currently not done, so that's
20	MR. SANTOS: Yes.	20	your intention in this recommendation, right?
21	MR. BATHERSON: All right, so we're going to	21	MR. SANTOS: Treat both the same, so correct.
22	call for a vote to approve part one of 2015-098. Mr.	22	MS. ROBERSON: So, treat both the same, okay.
23	Sullivan?	23	MR. SANTOS: Right. That's implicit, though.
24	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.	24	MS. ROBERSON: Exactly. Okay.
25	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos?	25	MR. SANTOS: I can entertain further amendments

if you feel that will clarify.

MS. ROBERSON: No, no, no. I just wanted to clarify. I understood it.

MR. SANTOS: Yes. Okay.

MS. ROBERSON: I just wanted to make sure it was clear. And then the second part of this, which is revising our procedures, which we're going through now, to create some formalized product where any Board member can request feedback from DOE. Those are the two parts, right? Yeah, I don't -- I don't really have any -- any questions on this. I just want to make sure I understood what you were proposing.

MR. SANTOS: Instead of what I envisioned, and we can have an open dialogue, I envisioned this to happen on like an automatic basis where the Board is actually forwarding this to DOE and DOE's requested feedback if they so desire in written, you know, format. But, again, any Board member can move to stop the automatic nature of it. As opposed to -- I don't want to necessarily burden the Board that every week we have to say, okay, give it to -- okay, give it to -- you know what I'm saying?

MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm.

MR. SANTOS: So, that -- that's what I envisioned, and in the Board product I envision it to be simply some sort of cover letter that makes it a Board

giving feedback to you? Is that -- is that your goal?

MR. SANTOS: No. I -- well, yes, and by extension the Board. I do feel that if we get feedback on the weekly reports, we can increase actually the amount of information available on a particular issue or items affecting the complex.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Because, again, we got this FOIA animal. We've got issues. In one universe, if the -- if the staff is giving a draft product that is intended to be public anyway, that will -- that will -- they're just giving it to them a little bit early. I don't see that as an issue with FOIA because it's ultimately going to be made public anyway.

I'm just not sure this -- the format of what would now be sending over as an agency product and what feedback we might be getting might all be in the realm of that -- that stuff, both way, now might be needed to go into the public domain, which, again, it's not necessarily a problem.

It's just your first part we were discussing the deliberative process privilege, which would -- which would allow us to protect things. I'm wondering if this second part would make it so that we couldn't protect anything, because now it's a formal agency product. So, I'm just wondering if there's a little bit at odds there.

product and attaches the standardized form to forward, attaches the report and makes it a Board product, instead of a staff product.

MS. ROBERSON: And let me just be clear, so I understand what you're saying, and when the Board develops that product, it would be subject to another vote anyway, right?

MR. SANTOS: I'm sorry?

MS. ROBERSON: So, the Board -- or maybe you would propose to the Board that tool, that instrument, that would be incorporated into our procedures, and by definition, the Board would vote again on that --

MR. SANTOS: Correct.

MS. ROBERSON: -- acceptance of that tool.

MR. SANTOS: So, I envision that when the Board votes to approve the revised Board procedures, I will be providing what I consider the template for this new Board product, so you are correct.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. I don't have any additional questions.

Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm just trying to understand here. The -- you said your goal was to obtain timely feedback from DOE on site rep reports. You want feedback, right, as a Board member. You want DOE to be

MR. SANTOS: I understand. Again, I just don't see any difference of what happens today. It's just -- I'm just looking to formalize it, because today you could argue that it is an agency product, for which the Board previously agreed to waive the process. And I expect that to be the predominant way that we'll continue to do business. I consider it to be an exception basis where we're actually moving to -- to waive it. I mean, in my six months here, I haven't seen a single move to do that.

So, all I'm trying to do is kind of formalize things that happen today.

MS. ROBERSON: I don't want to interrupt. I'm just thinking.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. No, I guess my point is the whole first thing was about deliberative process privilege and whether or not by a case-by-case basis we're going to try to stop that train.

MR. SANTOS: Mm-hmm.

MR. SULLIVAN: Which is okay, right? But if in the second part of this we're now making this thing a Board product, I mean, we may not -- we may have lost the ability to stop it at all, I guess that's -- that's kind of it, because we're automatically making this an agency product, and so now you can't stop that train. You know, the FOIA rules, as I understand them, would say, oh,

34 (Pages 133 to 136)

1	3	7

you've got an official agency product, the public is entitled to that information.

So, all I'm saying is I think your second -your second part of this may make your first part moot,
because there's no -- we're automatically making it an
agency product that has no deliberative process -deliberative process privilege protection at all under
FOIA.

MR. SANTOS: And I understand, but I -- I'm not really seeking FOIA protection with this proposal, and I see today we have that issue today.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. I was just --

13 MR. SANTOS: Yeah.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- I'm talking about --

MR. SANTOS: Again, my goal is to -- sorry.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- actually potentially making something moot that we just did.

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

MS. ROBERSON: The -- I mean, you want me to just comment, we may need, as we talked about earlier, we may need a little bit of help from legal on what's a staff product and what are our obligations and vice versa, and I think that's fair.

I also think we can disposition that matter through our process on Board procedures, once we have

what our obligations are depending on who's document it is and how that would either be overcome or not.

3 Am I understanding what you were saying, Mr. 4 Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I'll try to say it again.

6 MS. ROBERSON: Okay, so, I was wrong?

MR. SULLIVAN: No, no. Just for clarity. The first part was all talking about the deliberative process privilege involved in site rep weekly reports. You know, just -- that's what it was all about. My second one, all I'm saying is if we are automatically converting this site rep weekly report from some staff document coming to the Board to some Board document, there may not be any privilege left to protect.

So, the whole discussion of deliberative process privilege, which we just had, in my view, becomes moot. Now, that doesn't mean it's a problem; that doesn't mean it's a FOIA problem, because if somebody FOIAs something, then we will release it as we're required by FOIA. I'm not -- I'm not talking about any problems. All I'm saying was not more than about three or four minutes ago we took an action and now we might be taking an action which makes the one we just took moot. That's all I'm suggesting.

So, with that said, I don't know that I care to

that insight to our approval of Board procedures. So, I think we definitely need some, which we've already put on your list of to-do, Mr. Batherson --

MR. BATHERSON: Yes, ma'am.

MS. ROBERSON: -- is provide us some insight on, you know, if the Board issues something versus the staff. We need to just understand what our -- what the obligations are.

MR. BATHERSON: And we're talking at a -- at a later time? Or --

MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, I don't expect you to answer that right now. I don't. I mean, other Board members may want more insight.

MR. SANTOS: I just want to clarify, my goal with the proposal is not to seek FOIA protections or anything like that. It's to simply formalize the receipt of feedback from DOE on the reports.

MS. ROBERSON: I think I -- I think I understand what you're saying. And Mr. Sullivan will correct me if I don't understand what he's saying. So, in item one, we've just voted to support any Board member's desire to waive privilege that would release something based on, you know, the execution of their duties. The second, without recognizing that, they could conflict. And, so, we need to make sure we understand

talk about this anymore, unless somebody wants more from me.

MS. ROBERSON: I'm done. I don't -- I don't need any additional discussion.

Did you want to say something else, Mr. Santos? MR. SANTOS: To avoid being repetitive, no.

MR. BATHERSON: So, is the Board ready to vote on the amendment? Or is the Board considering tabling?

MS. ROBERSON: On this one, I'm prepared to vote, but I actually think the question is on the table. I don't know, are you prepared to vote, Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm prepared to vote.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: I mean, these votes, we could take another vote sometime later if we look back at this and decide, oops, maybe we didn't do the right thing. So, I don't -- I don't see this as the end of the world one way or the other.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Then I think we're ready to vote.

MR. BATHERSON: All right. To Mr. Santos' 2015-098 part two, which he has read the amendment and I had previously read the original request, how do you vote to amend, Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so point of order, we're

35 (Pages 137 to 140)

1	4	1	

voting on the amendment, which simply replaces the other one? We're going to have to vote a second time? MR. SANTOS: Correct. MR. BATHERSON: Correct. MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Yes. MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos? MR. SANTOS: Yes. MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson? MS. ROBERSON: Yes, I think. MR. BATHERSON: That's a yes. All right, the vote to amend item two of Mr. Santos' 2015-098 is approved three to zero. Now we turn to the actual item. Mr. Santos? MR. SANTOS: Yes. MR. BATHERSON: Did you want to have discussion -- any further discussion? MS. ROBERSON: No. MR. BATHERSON: Okay, so, now --MS. ROBERSON: Please vote. MR. BATHERSON: -- we'll have a call of the roll. Mr. Sullivan? MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos? MR. SANTOS: Yes.

the Board shall be provided to all Board members within one business day. The DNFSB staff is requested to affirm to the Board by July 13, 2015, that the necessary changes to staff procedures have been made.

So, having read it, let me talk about it. The -- as I was alluding to this morning, we have these staff issue reports, and then they come to us, and then it's typically at least three to four weeks, based on our process, before we can act on them and send them over. And, so, this as written would require that at the same time we receive these reports we would give a draft copy to our department representative so that they would have it to do what they might want to do with it within the Forestall Building. I imagine they might want to send it to the people who might be impacted, just give an opportunity for them to provide necessary information up through their chain to program secretarial officers.

For purposes of the public, again, the staff issue report is typically anywhere from two to ten pages long. They're technical in nature; they do analysis

of a particular issue within the -- the staff does, and they -- and they write a technical report.

And the reason why I'm submitting this is because I've received feedback from folks at the senior

MS. ROBERSON: Yes.

MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?

MR. BATHERSON: All right, the vote carries three to zero. The action proposed, as amended, part two of Mr. Santos' 2015-098 is approved. And I think we move to the next agenda item.

MS. ROBERSON: The next agenda item is proposed actions 2015-102, request for Board action by Board Member Sean Sullivan, revise applicable staff procedures governing staff issue papers. And, Mr. Sullivan, do you want to read it, or would you like Mr. Batherson to read the proposal?

MR. SULLIVAN: I can read it.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay.

MR. SULLIVAN: So, the request for Board action states direct the DNFSB staff to revise applicable staff procedures governing staff issue papers. The revision shall require a copy of the staff issue paper to be provided to the Department of Energy's department representative to the Board by not later than the time such staff issue paper is provided to the Board under Section 3.1 of the Board procedures (Orange Folder routing).

The revision shall further require that any comments regarding the staff issue paper received from the Department of Energy's department representative to

places in the Forestall Building that says, look, when we approve these things, after a quick classification review, they -- they go to the -- they go out and into the press and to the public, and it's very quick from the time we approve it. And, so, a technical report then lands in the public eye that they've never seen.

Now, I know our staff generally outbriefs when they do a review at a site, which would lead them to write such a report. Sometimes these reviews actually happen within the Forestall Building itself. It might be looking at a program run out of the Forestall Building.

But in any event, the difference between what the staff may say and what they may hear at an outbrief is a little bit different than written words, which are going to come out, and then get into the public domain and be read by members of the public, members of the press, members on Capital Hill, et cetera.

And, so, the point of this proposal is pretty simple. It's just to give the people in the Department of Energy a couple of weeks to review and staff themselves what this report is actually going to say before it becomes public. These are papers that are intended to become public. The staff submits them to us intending them to become public. And, so -- so, they would just simply have some additional time to know

36 (Pages 141 to 144)

what's going to be in this technical report before it comes out.

It's very similar to what is actually mandated by statute with our recommendation, although that actually is a process that's much more detailed. I was trying to not make this detailed. I was trying to not make this where it would make our process necessarily take even longer. It's just -- this is simple. We give it to the department representative's office. We don't even ask them to give us feedback. If they have feedback, okay, it'll come to Board members and we'll -- we'll figure out what to do with it, if we get some.

So, that's it. That's my explanation of it. I think it is a simple -- a relatively simple thing, and I invite other comments from the other Board members.

MS. ROBERSON: Did you want to go ahead, Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Yeah. So, to clarify, it's just to provide an advance copy. There's no expectation on -- again, I'm just repeating your words -- receiving any feedback or expecting any Board action based on whatever feedback, if anything, we get from -- from DOE. It's just simply that they get a copy in parallel as we get it and then we are deliberating on it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Right.

to the staff member and say, well, we have these comments. What does our staff member do with that? Well, if the staff wants to have their own process to, you know, to do something with those, this doesn't preclude that. It just says, here's the only -- here's the only thing that we say you really do need to do, send it to us.

What would we do with it? We would decide that on a case-by-case basis, and again, I think it would take a majority of the Board to make any decision. So, I'm not particularly worried about that. You know, if we get something, we have procedures where we could do something if a majority of the Board wanted to.

MR. SANTOS: My follow-on comment would be, so, early this morning we saw the results of your nonscientific study, where you expressed the concern that our processes may take, you know, too long. Do you envision this could have an unintended consequence of -- at the staff level of adding even more time?

MR. SULLIVAN: There's always could-be, unintended consequences. So, anything is possible. I'm not sure why it would, as I'm sitting here answering you. But I'm sure somebody could later say that it is, but it's certainly not my intention. If anything, I would like to speed things up. All this would require them to

MR. SANTOS: It's just an advance draft copy basically?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. I mean, here's the point. If I receive another -- in another conversation with a program secretarial officer at, you know, some sort of -- you know, some sort of complaint, if you will, as to, hey, this thing just came out and I didn't even get a chance to see it, my response will be, well, your department representative had it a couple of weeks ago.

So, you know, beyond that, I can't control what they do with it, what the Department of Energy might do with this, what the department representative will do with it. The part about comments is simply that anytime you give somebody something they may comment or they may want to comment. So, if they say I have a comment, the question is for our staff, what do they do with it. So, I just wrote down, okay, staff doesn't necessarily need to do anything with it, other than send it to us. If staff wants to do something with it, this procedure wouldn't preclude it.

So, the whole comment thing, in my view, was -was not to solicit comments from the Department of Energy or anything. It was simply recognize that just as we are independent from them, they are independent from us. So, if they decide they want to say something, they go back do is give it to the department representative, generally speaking, a couple of weeks prior to the time it's going to become public anyway.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you. No further question -- comments.

MS. ROBERSON: Well, I don't know if my -- if I have questions or comments. My -- obviously, one of my concerns here is what's in -- what's a Board product versus a staff product. By definition, we're talking about an issue paper, which is something the Board is -- this Board is going to own it. The Board's going to shape it. And the question we talked about earlier this morning, what are our transparency obligations.

I like the process Congress imposed on us for recommendations. I don't know if we can mimic that for this, but I would prefer, to take your phrase, a little more structure. And I'd also -- one of my concerns is I want -- I would like to see the staff products from the staff, because I think that's the only way I can judge. It's not that I don't take input from all kinds of sources, but I would like to see the staff product kind of raw. I mean, that's just my preference.

Yes?

MR. SANTOS: Is your concern because today we get raw -- raw staff product. Is your concern that if we

37 (Pages 145 to 148)

	149		151
1	now provide this to the department reps and they very	1	legal obligations here in public.
2	quickly come back to the staff with feedback, that that,	2	MS. ROBERSON: Right.
3	then, is going to actually shape, influence the raw	3	MR. SULLIVAN: Is that is that true?
4	product?	4	MR. SANTOS: That's right.
5	MS. ROBERSON: That could be a concern. It's	5	MS. ROBERSON: Right.
6	the same thing Mr. Sullivan just said, anything could	6	MR. SANTOS: I just want to confirm let
7	happen. But my primary concern is by definition I	7	me let me ask the General Counsel, is this the type of
8	mean, if we were talking info papers and trip reports, I	8	questions that you will be that you will answer?
9	would feel differently, but by definition, it's an issue	9	MR. BATHERSON: Not here.
10	paper. And by our own structure, the Board is going to	10	MR. SANTOS: Not here, no, no, no.
11	act on whatever that is. And, so, that where is this?	11	MR. BATHERSON: I would prefer, yes.
12	I don't know that we can just say, staff, go do this.	12	MR. SANTOS: Sure.
13	I'm not comfortable with that.	13	MR. BATHERSON: These are the sorts of
14	Do you understand what I'm saying?	14	questions.
15	MR. SANTOS: Yes, because by the time Mr.	15	MR. SANTOS: Okay.
16	Sullivan is proposing it's a staff draft product that the	16	MR. BATHERSON: And if you if you would,
17	Board has not shaped yet.	17	there's been discussion back and forth. You need to
18	MS. ROBERSON: Right. That's right.	18	clearly articulate the question so that we have it and we
19	MR. SANTOS: Have it being a staff having it	19	can go back go back to it.
20	being a Board product, your concern	20	MR. SANTOS: The question is can the Board
21	MS. ROBERSON: Yeah.	21	release a product to DOE prior to with some type
22	MR. SANTOS: may go away.	22	prior to releasing it to the public, you know, give some
23	MS. ROBERSON: Yeah. That's and there are	23	time between the moment it was released to DOE and the
24	other issues with that, as Mr. Sullivan pointed out	24	moment it got actually published.
25	earlier. And I just need to better understand that. For	25	MR. SULLIVAN: Well, let me point a little bit
	150		152
1	me	1	more clarity on that, if I can.
2	MR. SANTOS: Okay.	2	MR. SANTOS: Thank you.
3	MS. ROBERSON: that's an important element.	3	MR. SULLIVAN: All right. So, I mean, my my
4	MR. SANTOS: Will there will there be a way	4	thought in doing this was it would nominally be at least
5	to provide and and I don't know who can answer this,	5	three weeks and that the department representative would
6	but probably legal, to provide a the Board product	6	have three weeks to do whatever the department
7	with heads-up time for DOE prior before releasing it	7	representative can do given the department
8	to the public?	8	representative's authorities and their own its own
9	MS. ROBERSON: That's the question. I mean	9	procedures, et cetera.
10	MR. SANTOS: And we do that.	10	So, I think the question is once we deem
11	MS. ROBERSON: that's the question. And I	11	something to be a Board product, can we then can we
12	don't know that we have	12	then give Department of Energy three weeks to look at it
13	MR. SANTOS: Because I think that will satisfy	13	before it will become public. Is that the question?
14	Mr. Sullivan's point of heads-up	14	MR. SANTOS: I think that's yes.
15	MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm.	15	MR. BATHERSON: And no other no other
16	MR. SANTOS: and your point of Board	16	communication back from the Department on that?
17	product. But I just don't know if that's something that	17	MS. ROBERSON: I think that's the question. I
18	can be done.	18 19	think we can shape it in writing to make sure legal
19	MR. SULLIVAN: So		answers the right question. All the Board members can MR. BATHERSON: Yeah, because it's I get the
20			NAN DA LOCK NAME TERM DECRINE II S == 1 OPT THE
20	MR. SANTOS: I'm just yeah.	20	
21	MR. SANTOS: I'm just yeah. MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm. No, it's the right	21	question. Are there nuances to that question that aren't
21 22	MR. SANTOS: I'm just yeah. MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm. No, it's the right point.	21 22	question. Are there nuances to that question that aren't being articulated here?
21 22 23	MR. SANTOS: I'm just yeah. MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm. No, it's the right point. MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so, I understand we're	21 22 23	question. Are there nuances to that question that aren't being articulated here?  MS. ROBERSON: I'm not articulating a nuance.
21 22	MR. SANTOS: I'm just yeah. MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm. No, it's the right point.	21 22	question. Are there nuances to that question that aren't being articulated here?

	153		155
1	expectations from DOE once they receive that information.	1	MR. SANTOS: Yes.
2	Is that correct, Mr. Sullivan?	2	MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?
3	MR. SULLIVAN: We're not yeah. Let me	3	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.
4	caveat	4	MR. BATHERSON: The question the issue is
5	MR. SANTOS: Yeah, go ahead.	5	tabled, and we will
6	MR. SULLIVAN: in my reply. I wasn't	6	MR. SULLIVAN: We're done.
7	we're not formally soliciting any feedback.	7	MR. BATHERSON: Hold on, on the table, let me
8	Nevertheless, the real world says we're going to get	8	just get it for the record here, 2015-102, request for
9	some. So, I would expect there will be feedback.	9	Board action by Board Member Mr. Sullivan, revise
10	MR. SANTOS: That's different.	10	applicable staff procedures governing staff issue papers
11	MR. SULLIVAN: Well	11	has been tabled.
12	MR. BATHERSON: That's why I asked.	12	We'll move on to the next agenda item.
13	MR. SANTOS: Yeah.	13	MS. ROBERSON: The third item, the third
14	MR. SULLIVAN: yeah, so, I mean, I just I	14	request for action is 2015-099, request for Board action
15	mean, that's just the real world, right? You give	15	by Board Member Daniel J. Santos, incorporate the legal
16	anybody a draft copy of something, they're likely to say	16	opinion of DOJ OLC into a Board policy.
17	something.	17	MR. SANTOS: I will ask the General Counsel to
18	MR. SANTOS: Yeah.	18	read it first.
19	MR. SULLIVAN: You know, then the question	19	MS. ROBERSON: All right.
20	becomes, well, what do we do with what they say? So, how	20	MR. BATHERSON: Request for Board Action 2015-
21	does that shape this legal question that we're asking?	21	099, made by Board Member Daniel Santos, incorporate the
22	Do we need to decide that now? I don't think we do. I	22	legal opinion of DOJ OLC. The purpose of this request is
23	sense that we've got a motion to table coming here.	23	for action to gather additional information to support
24	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.	24	the development of a Board policy to incorporate the
25	MR. SULLIVAN: So that we can go and answer	25	legal opinion rendered by the Department of Justice
	154		156
1	some legal questions, which is okay. And I guess I'm not	1	Office of Legal Counsel dated May 21, 2015.
2	sure that we actually need to further refine. I know	2	The DNFSB office directors, in consultation
3	that you want the question the legal question further	3	with the DNFSB General Counsel, are requested to apply
4	refined. I'm just not sure we need to do that publicly	4	reasoning associated with the legal opinion rendered by
5	either.	5	the Department of Justice to generate and provide a list
6	MR. BATHERSON: And, so	6	of all types of information currently not available to
7	MR. SANTOS: Sorry to interrupt. To the point	7	all Board members. The DNFSB staff is requested to
8	that the issues could be appropriately decoupled, the	8	provide this information to all Board members by July 31,
9	better for me, because we can't really envision all the	9	2015. Once the list is provided to the Board members,
10	combinations that could could happen in the real	10	the intention is to have one or more Board member develop
11	world. That's all.	11	a draft policy and submit such policy for Board approval.
12	MS. ROBERSON: Okay.	12	That's the end of the request.
13	MR. SULLIVAN: Well, the longer we sit here,	13	MR. SANTOS: Are there any questions from
14	the more nuances we're going to get.	14	fellow Board members?
15	MS. ROBERSON: Yeah. So, I'm actually going to	15	MS. ROBERSON: I don't have any questions.
16	make a motion to table and seek some counsel from legal	16	MR. SULLIVAN: I don't have any questions and I
17	on the question or questions that we have put on the	17	support the action.
18	table.	18	MR. BATHERSON: All right, are we ready to take
19	MR. BATHERSON: Understand.	19	a vote on the action?
20	MR. SULLIVAN: So yeah, I'll second it.	20	All right, Mr. Sullivan?
21	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, we have a second for the	21	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
22	motion. We can go ahead and vote on the motion.	22	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos?
23	Mr. Sullivan?	23	MR. SANTOS: Yes.
24	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.	24	MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?
25	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos?	25	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.

7

8

9

10

13

18

21

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

160

157			159
	1	objection, so	

MR. BATHERSON: All right, the request for Board action by Mr. Santos 2015-099 is approved, and we can move on to the next agenda item.

MS. ROBERSON: The fourth proposed action is 2015-101, request for Board action by Board Member Sean Sullivan, revise Board policies and staff procedures regarding the drafting of recommendations.

MR. BATHERSON: And, Ms. Roberson -- or, I'm sorry, Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Again, I can read it. The specific request is in three subparagraphs that were all intended to be voted on as one.

The first paragraph, request to create or revise applicable Board policies to require the Board affirmatively act to authorize the staff to proceed beyond the creation of an outline in the drafting of a recommendation to the Secretary of Energy. The affirmative act shall be a vote of the Board and may be made by notational vote or during a meeting or portion thereof that is closed to the public in accordance with 10 CFR 1704.4(c). Prior to voting, the Board shall receive from the Technical Director an outline of the recommendation to be drafted. The outline need not exceed one page.

24 25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17 18

19

20

21

22

Subparagraph two, request or direct the DNFSB

objection, so --

2 MS. ROBERSON: Well, I'm not objecting. I 3 mean, I do have a proposed amendment, but I'm not 4 objecting to changing the date. 5

MR. SANTOS: Can we vote one at a time?

MS. ROBERSON: Yeah.

MR. BATHERSON: Okay, so, do we have any objections to a friendly amendment to the date?

MS. ROBERSON: No, no, no. He's got the floor, right?

11 MR. SULLIVAN: Right, but I was proposing a 12 friendly amendment, and so --

MS. ROBERSON: Oh, it's a friendly --

14 MR. SULLIVAN: -- I think that's done, 15 basically without -- you know, if there's no objection, 16

then we can all consider the date to be August 19th 17 instead of July 13th, as written.

MR. SANTOS: No objection.

19 MS. ROBERSON: No objection to Mr. Sullivan 20 amending his own.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.

22 MR. BATHERSON: Great. 23

MR. SULLIVAN: So, now to the substance of the -- of what I'm requesting is I go back to last year, we

did write a recommendation on emergency preparedness. I

158

staff to revise applicable staff procedures covering the drafting of a recommendation to the Secretary of Energy. The revision shall require an affirmative act of the Board as discussed above.

Subparagraph three, the DNFSB staff is requested to affirm to the Board by July 13, 2015, that the necessary changes to the staff procedures have been

Any questions before I talk about it?

MS. ROBERSON: No, I don't have any questions before you talk about it.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so the first thing I'd like to say is I have received some feedback from the staff that says that they think the date in subparagraph three is a bit aggressive, and I think the date I was provided that would be better was August 19th, if I have that right, so I'd seek a friendly amendment from the Board -- my fellow Board members to just go ahead and revise subparagraph three to change the date in there from July 13th to August 19th.

Do I have agreement?

MR. BATHERSON: Madam Chairman?

23 MR. SANTOS: I second that.

24 MR. BATHERSON: Madam Chairman? 25

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, I'm not hearing any

think the recommendation -- it began in earnest shortly after the accident at WIPP, Waste Isolation and Power Plant. And the -- which occurred -- there's actually two separate accidents in February -- February 5th and 14th, 2014, if memory serves me correctly.

And I think the -- the Board members at the time all -- even prior to those accidents felt that emergency preparedness was a problem generally in the Department of Energy, and we were contemplating whether or not we thought a recommendation should be needed. And then having actually had an accident, which -- where there were some issues by the Department in responding, felt that, okay, we really need to have one. Nevertheless, we didn't have something, and, again, by statute, we -- we now sent a draft over to the Secretary, and if memory serves me correctly, we did that in June.

So, the point of all that lead-in was that that was a long time. And it was a considerable amount of effort from the staff to produce that. They ultimately produced something which -- which is about 60-some-odd pages in total. So, it was a lot of work. The staff put in a lot of good work to come up with that recommendation. But we didn't -- we never acted on it as a Board until months had gone by, and we got the 60-someodd-page document.

And, so, the purpose of this is just to throw in some sort of check early on where the Board would affirmatively say, yes, go do this, to the staff. Under our current procedures, this isn't necessary, so we can get into the scenario where the staff will, for their own reasons, and they may be very good reasons, decide to invest all of this time -- staff time and staff effort -producing something, which even if it's a good product, if the Board at that point, at the end of all that staff work were to decide either, no, this is not an issue of adequate protection or, two, it is but maybe you didn't have the right factors in it, whatever the Board might decide, the potential exists that we have exerted an awful lot of staff time without the Board ever weighing in on the topic and potentially making all of that staff time -- or much of it -- have been wasted or time that could have been spent on something else if we told them early on, no, don't -- don't go do that or do it differently.

So, I see this -- and this is the intention with which I've presented this -- it's just a very simple thing, which would say, staff, just bring the issue to us as soon as you think you have an issue that is an issue of adequate protection. Bring it to us and the Board must act on it. It allows us to act in any -- any of the

amendment?

MS. ROBERSON: I'd like to make a friendly amendment, but let me -- I mean, I think it's a good recommendation, I do. I think this is a good recommendation. My proposed friendly amendment is more for structure than -- at least maybe it makes me comfortable, it doesn't mean anything to the others.

But my amendment is to keep Mr. Sullivan's number one, which is the essence of what he's proposing, and I propose to modify its steps. And I'll read those, and then I can hand you my notes, that after Mr. Sullivan's original one that we had a second that says "The staff proposes an outline that specifically incorporates the basis of an adequate protection gap. The staff shall request unanimous consent from all Board members on that outline. This consent is affirmation that each Board member will receive through the outline, regardless to the recommendation, the type of information they require to actually register a vote to direct the staff to produce or not to produce a proposed recommendation consistent with the Board member statutory duties."

I would recommend that this outline receive unanimous consent by July 13th. So, is that -- is that first -- let me just read the whole thing, and then

ways that we might act as a board. So, it doesn't necessarily need to slow us down by something where we'd have to go put notice -- Federal Register notices and -- and go through the time requirements to -- to have a -- an actual meeting.

So, I see this as a relatively simply proposal, and I encourage you to accept it as such.

MS. ROBERSON: So, I'd like to propose a friendly amendment. Can I do that? Because -- no, if you want to say something else before I do it.

MR. SANTOS: Just one clarifying question.

MS. ROBERSON: No, please.

MR. SANTOS: Is the intent for -- is the staff the only one that can create such an outline, or can Board members also work or create or, you know, the same thing, the outline?

MR. SULLIVAN: So, my favorite answer, anything's possible. So, if this is adopted as written, the staff would have to give us something that they propose. Nothing would prevent us from using our existing procedures to revise the outline that they give

MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: So, now can I explain myself?

MR. BATHERSON: So, your -- a friendly

1 people can ask me questions.

And then the second step would be, The staff and the Board should revise their respective procedures to incorporate the consensus process, and this step should be completed no later than 45 days from the date that unanimous consent on the outline is provided, or it could be the same date Mr. Sullivan has changed his overall action to, August 13th. Either one.

So, questions from me on the friendly amendment?

MR. SULLIVAN: Yes. Yes, if I may. So, let's just -- let's go -- to be clear here, so my -- my paragraph one -- subparagraph one we're keeping? Okay.

My subparagraph two would go away and be replaced with your --

MS. ROBERSON: That's what I'm proposing. MR. SULLIVAN: -- what you're proposing?

MS. ROBERSON: Right.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. What about my paragraph three, does that go away, too?

MS. ROBERSON: That -- yeah, I just restated it. It doesn't change the outcome, but, yes, I would

propose a replacement, simply because of the date, nothing more. If Board members don't like my date, then

it doesn't go away.

41 (Pages 161 to 164)

Defense N	Nuclear	Facilities	Safety	Board
-----------	---------	------------	--------	-------

	165		167
1	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. So, if I understand what	1	amendment and change July 13th to August 19th? Do we
2	now becomes would become paragraph two under your	2	want to do that?
3	friendly amendment, the the staff is supposed to	3	MR. BATHERSON: You can do that.
4	propose an outline that incorporates the basis of an	4	MS. ROBERSON: I have no objection to doing
5	adequate protection gap, but you want them to do that by	5	that.
6	July 13th of this year?	6	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.
7	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.	7	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Santos?
8	MR. SULLIVAN: We're talking about a my	8	MR. SANTOS: No objection.
9	outline was dealing with an outline of a proposed	9	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. And then then, your
10	recommendation which doesn't exist at the moment, so I'm	10	final paragraph, Ms. Roberson, would say staff and the
11	not sure what they're supposed to do by July 13th of this	11	Board would revise their respective procedures to
12	year.	12	incorporate the consensus process. This step should be
13	MS. ROBERSON: So, my it's really aimed at	13	completed no later than 45 days from the date that
14	more structure. My outline is a proposed outline, no	14	unanimous consent on that outline. So, that's by
15	matter what the recommendation is, so that each Board	15	August 19th, they're going to present us this standard
16	member can actually be informed when they asked about	16	format outline, and we're all going to consent to it.
17	so, for instance, I may require a different piece of	17	And then within 45 days after that, everybody's got to
18	you know, a different type of information that you might	18	revise their procedures accordingly. Did I get that
19	need to make a decision. And if we want the staff to do	19	right?
20	this and we want to be efficient in doing it, we need to	20	MS. ROBERSON: Absolutely.
21	make sure very Board member is going to get the	21	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. And, so, my three goes
22	information they need in that early document.	22	away and replaced by this. Okay. I'm happy with all
23	MR. SANTOS: May I make a suggestion to your	23	that. So, this was a friendly amendment?
24	friendly amendment, to say the staff will propose an	24	MS. ROBERSON: It's a friendly amendment.
25	outline structure, because that's what we're talking	25	MR. SULLIVAN: I consent to your friendly
	166		168
1	about, you know, these are the sections of an outline	1	amendment.
2	that will get filled up with the necessary information	2	MR. BATHERSON: All right.
3	when a future recommendation is being worked on. Just to	3	MR. SANTOS: Did my friendly amendment to your
4	make it more clear.	4	friendly amendment to add the word "structure" or
5	MR. SULLIVAN: Well okay. If we want	5	"standard"
6	suggestions on top of friendly amendments on top of	6	MR. SULLIVAN: Where do you want to add it?
7	amendments	7	MR. SANTOS: In the first sentence, the staff
8	MR. SANTOS: Yeah.	8	proposes an outline structure.
9	MR. SULLIVAN: we're just going to get lost	9	MS. ROBERSON: I have no objection.
10	here. I mean, one of the beauties of a meeting is we	10	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Sullivan?
11	have a record now of what we're talking about. So, as	11	MR. SULLIVAN: Neither do I.
12	long as I think we make clear what our intent is on the	12	MR. BATHERSON: Okay.
13	record, then the words, while important, will probably	13	MR. SULLIVAN: We're setting a world record
14	not be as ambiguous as they might otherwise see later.	14	here on
15	So, I just think that what I understand you're	15	MS. ROBERSON: Friendly amendments.
16 17	doing is I envisioned that they be giving us an outline	16 17	MR. BATHERSON: Friendly amendments. MR. SULLIVAN: friendly amendments.
18	on a case-by-case basis, whenever they thought they had	18	MS. ROBERSON: We're the friendliest bunch.
19	an issue of adequate protection. And you're you want them now to march forth and create what is basically a	19	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay.
20	standard outline that later, on a case-by-case basis,	20	MR. BATHERSON: Any further discussion on 2015-
21	they'll have to fill in all those specific things and	21	101?
22	then send it back to us. Did I get that right?	22	Okay, I'm going to ask the Board to cast their
23	MS. ROBERSON: You absolutely right.	23	votes on Document 2015-101, Request for Board action by
24	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Do we do we want to	24	Board Member Sullivan, as amended.
25	then consider friendly amendment of the friendly	25	MR. SULLIVAN: Yes.
-	J		

Defense Nuclear	Facilities Safety	Board
-----------------	-------------------	-------

25

issues that staff is working on. They're all doing very

good work. If we can do it more efficiently, more

			0,0,=0.0
	169		171
1	MR. BATHERSON: Mr. Sullivan is a yes.	1	effective, get if it needs you know, if getting the
2	Mr. Santos?	2	Board involved earlier would help, and I think it would
3	MR. SANTOS: Yes.	3	help, I think it would help from the standpoint of not
4	MR. BATHERSON: Ms. Roberson?	4	having the Board expend time and energy on something if
5	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.	5	they don't have a majority of the Board that's going to
6	MR. BATHERSON: Okay, Document Request 2015-101	6	support it at the end anyway. So, hopefully, it's
7	is approved, and I believe that completes the listed	7	received in that vein and not in the vein of lack of
8	agenda items.	8	trust. Thank you.
9	MS. ROBERSON: Yeah. That does complete the	9	MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Sullivan.
10	listed agenda items. I'll go around to the Board members	10	Mr. Santos, any comments?
11	to see if they have any additional comment on those items	11	MR. SANTOS: Not at this time.
12	before we move to closing this session.	12	MS. ROBERSON: So, I thank the Board members
13	Mr. Sullivan?	13	and I thank all of you for enduring with us. We had good
14	MR. SULLIVAN: Well, thank you. So, I'll just	14	discussion today. I think one of the things we spent
15	well, first of all, before we close the session, I	15	quite a bit of time on earlier that I just want to
16	mean, I think you asked this morning for some additional	16	reiterate is, you know, we went through some of the
17	feedback.	17	reviews. Mr. Welch went through some of the reviews and
18	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.	18	talked about the actions we're taking, and we take those
19	MR. SULLIVAN: So, perhaps we can get that	19	very serious.
20	before we close the session. Secondly, so, I want to	20	And I think one of the things that I wanted to
21	reiterate, again, earlier today we heard one of our staff	21	reemphasize, we talked a lot about nonconcurrences and
22	members, one of our group leads stand up and say, you	22	DPO, and so I'm going to do another commercial, and that
23	know, some of this could be interpreted as, Board, you	23	is if if for any reason any of our employees believe
24	don't trust the staff. And, so, I just want to reiterate	24	that we are overlooking a matter of adequate protection
25	that that is not the case here. I am seeking to try to	25	and you don't feel you can get our attention, we do have
	170		172
1	institute some changes that I think will just make us	1	an IG now, and I encourage you, you can do that
2	more effective and more efficient and might also help us	2	anonymously. I would never want one of our employees to
3	work better with the Department of Energy. It's all	3	struggle with that kind of information, so we have many
4	designed, in my view, anything we do would be to further	4	levels and many opportunities to make sure the Board
5	the mission of the agency.	5	understands your issue.
6	So, again, I encourage that people to walk	6	And I appreciate the work that the staff does.
7	through my open door or my virtually closed door, come	7	I appreciate the work the Board does. And I thank our
8	talk to me if you don't if you think that I am	8	office directors today and everybody that's attended.
9	indicating in any way that I don't trust the staff,	9	So, having completed consideration of each of the
10	because that's not the case here. I do actually trust	10	business items on the agenda today, I just want to thank
11	them. I do actually value their input.	11	you again for your participation in this business
12	And as I mentioned earlier this morning, at the	12	meeting.
13	very beginning of my day today here, here at 625 Indiana	13	MR. SULLIVAN: Point of order?
14	Avenue, I had a discussion with the Technical Director	14	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.
15	about a particular piece of of correspondence, which	15	MR. SULLIVAN: I think we've said we were
16	is which the staff has been working on. And I was	16	didn't we were going to try and get some feedback.
17	only asking about it because I've seen a draft and I	17	Were we going to do that on the record?
18	think it's a good product.	18	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.
19	And maybe I'm just you know, got trigger	19	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. Mr. Batherson, on that
20	finger. I'm ready to I'm ready to move on it, and why	20	list of items from earlier.
21	why can't I. And it was in that sort of vein, not in	21	MR. BATHERSON: Yes. All right, so
22	the vein of, hey, I don't trust you guys to do the right	22	MS. ROBERSON: You should have stopped me
23	thing. It's, hey, these are these are very important	23	before I was on my roll.
2.4	income that staff is anothing on. There're all dains are	24	MD DATHEDSON, So we've get several relieve

MR. BATHERSON: So, we've got several policy

statements which suggest that we might need to either

24

25

develop or revisit design construction review policy statement concerning DOE directives; Policy Statement 2, whether that needs to be repealed or revised; Policy Statement 5, whether we need to add something regarding risk assessment on non-tier-one items; legal restrictions on agency actions for FOIA, sending as staff products to DOE and a closed meeting issue regarding internal personnel or procedures relating to employee-type concerns.

And then Mr. Santos had a issue regarding reviewing the statute and comparing a line-by-line statute to maybe existing policies or policies we may need to develop. And, so, from my office's standpoint, we would need significant time to look at these. We're short-staffed now, so I can't give you -- I can't give you any precise data on how long this would take, but certainly we could -- we could prioritize these and start taking a look at them. But it would -- it would involve an effort, and -- but we're prepare to do that.

MR. SANTOS: One more for the record, and it's that if we're going to explore a tiered approach, tier one, tier two items, which is different from the staff's tiered approach, this is a Board-level tier approach to issues, and whatever policies or criteria we need to develop on that. I just want to be complete.

our other departments here could be taking the lead on to provide something. And, again, I think at this point we're probably just talking about a plan for a plan.

MR. BATHERSON: Yeah, I mean, for purposes of completeness, I read through the entire list, but you're right, there are two items specifically -- actually, three -- directed at legal, and that's the restrictions on the FOIA matter, the closed meeting, and then review of the statute for Mr. Santos' issue. So, those three -- I would prioritize those three likely as the restrictions on the agency action, FOIA, being the first one. Obviously, that's something that came -- staff reports versus Board, completed Board actions, so we can look at that first.

And then the closed meeting on the internal procedures, I would prioritize that as number two, just based on the fact that I anticipate we'll be having more of these closed meetings and following on the heels of the -- of the various surveys and viewpoint studies, so that would be something we'll be turning to next.

And then kind of -- kind of not a back-burner but an ongoing process to look at the statute, see what policies we have. I know we have already encountered in our mission statement from amendments the last go-around from Congress that there are some changes there which we

MR. BATHERSON: Got it.

MS. ROBERSON: I'm sorry, go ahead.

MR. SULLIVAN: So, our legal is a small staff to begin with, and then, you know, one or two people go off and take a different job, then they -- then they really get short-staffed, so I understand that. So, I guess my first question would be of the list we have just gone through, eventually legal touches everything, but the -- you know, some -- some initial thoughts or some initial, you know, outlines, what would go in a -- for example, a policy statement on -- on review of design -- new construction and design. I mean, I would think that might actually fall within the tech staff to give us the first cut --

MS. ROBERSON: Yes.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- at something.

MS. ROBERSON: He was hitting the microphone.

MR. SULLIVAN: And, again, not even a -- not even a smooth product. So, okay, so, I mean, there's a couple of those, you know, that, you know, we may want to go back through the list, that are strictly legal.

MR. BATHERSON: Correct.

MR. SULLIVAN: And as much as you might want help, you're not going to get it. But some of these others, I think, you know, some of the other -- some of

could -- we've talked about that may warrant us looking at a new policy on, you know, how this advice and analysis is given to the Secretary. So, that's -- that's what I would give from our office.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. And, Mr. Stokes?
MR. SULLIVAN: Just before we hear from the
Technical Director, I want to say that for the record
that I agree with that priority list. I just wanted to
add for the record the first one, the FOIA one, I think
we need that to act on the -- on the request for Board
action that we tabled tonight. So, you know, in the
interest of trying to get to that tabled action, I think
we should try to look at that.

And the other one on -- on potentially closing a meeting to talk about internal issues and personnel issues, given the timing of the Federal employee viewpoint survey, you know, which the results don't come out until the fall, so that might be a good time to be, you know, trying to hitch those two together if we can so that when those results come out, if we decide we should do something in a closed session, we might be prepared to do it.

MS. ROBERSON: So, just so we close out here, I agree with that order, and I guess subject to any comments that Mr. Santos has, I think the Board's kind of

44 (Pages 173 to 176)

asking legal to come back to the Board with kind of the plan for the plan for those, with that priority.

MR. BATHERSON: Correct.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. MR. BATHERSON: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you.

MR. STOKES: Okay, so, I'll first talk to the question about a policy statement for design and construction. I'd add several comments. First, in effect, we have a policy on -- for design and construction in the form of the Congressionally mandated report, the joint report from 2007. So, that -- that, by and large, has formed the basis for how we've done design and construction in -- for -- since 2007, as far as when we do communications with the Department, along those lines, which is a -- which is the policy question.

I'd like to point out, too, that from a technical perspective there is very little that's unique about design and construction reviews over any of the other technical reviews that we do of systems, structures, and components. So, it would be -- it might not be a valuable exercise to form a policy statement that attempts to prescribe what we would do from a technical basis. Our generic procedures govern that activity, in my opinion, quite well.

to decide what to do.

But to the point you made before that about the -- what the technical staff does and their technical reviews, I agree, and I don't think we would have anything about a policy statement that would try to redirect the technical nature of a review. But there is a big difference, in my view, on design and construction as opposed to review of operating facilities, and that is that the design and construction isn't -- you know, if there's a threat to the adequate protection of the public health and safety, that threat will not manifest for some time.

So, just from a timing perspective of, you know, when are we looking at and what are we looking at, should we -- I just, you know, suppose we were a thousand-person agency, would we descend two or three people continuously on a project that's stretching over years, or would we try to take a huge group of a hundred and try to go for a short period of time? I mean, there's other -- there's other things from that standpoint in terms of what makes the most sense and what's the best utilization of our resources. And, in any event, I think as a Board and as a Board policy that sort of material probably should be fair game.

MR. SANTOS: I just want to add to that and

The last thing that I would offer is that we are currently, because of a previous Board action, at the present time we are engaging with the Department of Energy to revisit the practices, for lack of a better term, policies that were enacted in 2007 to do a lessons learned so that in view of that fact-finding there would be essentially a desire at that time to be able to reflect on those findings and then at which time there may be sufficient rationale to be able to have the Board move in the direction of a unique policy to replace or to supplement what currently exists.

MS. ROBERSON: And the directives review?
MR. SULLIVAN: Do we want to talk about those each individually? I mean, because -- okay.

So, okay, I agree with everything the Technical Director just said. To take your last point first, I know we're doing this review. A review is -- at this point, it's open-ended. I mean, there's -- there's -- it's a blank slate. I know we're -- we're going to -- the Secretary hasn't even formally responded to our letter. We -- we have indications that we'll get a favorable response, something will happen, but exactly what will happen or how long it will take, I don't know. And that's okay. Maybe we'll know more when -- after somebody meets with somebody at the staff level in order

react to the comment that there might not be anything unique or different, but I think there is between an

3 existing facility and new construction, also when it 4 comes to items like the testing and commissioning

comes to items like the testing and commissioning programs, the validation, and having worked with existing

5 programs, the validation, and having worked with existin 6 facilities and new construction, those are very different

7 activities that require a different set of skills and look at, so the approach is associated with a full

9 commissioning or testing program for a new construction 10 is way different than a -- than a normal facility. So, I 11 think there's room for additional things that could

think there's room for additional things that could warrant a Board policy to complement and augment what you guys already -- are already doing.

MS. ROBERSON: Do you have any comment, Mr. Stokes?

MR. STOKES: I've got a couple of comments. First and not to -- not to belabor the point, the skill set that we have at the Board is confined to the number of people that we have here. Despite the -- the potential differences in commissioning of a new facility versus an existing facility, the resources that we use are identical. So, it's a training and qualification issue at that point versus a policy decision. The staff that we have that perform those reviews do those reviews consistent with existing DOE standards. So, if there is

45 (Pages 177 to 180)

an -- if there is an issue in that regard, we also have the ability to look at their directives and to develop and resolve any potential gaps there, as well.

One other -- one other comment is to recognize that in the design and construction activity we do have a work plan. The Board approves the work plan. So, if there is a matter of priorities on an annual basis, the Board is already engaged in ensuring that the mixture of priorities consistent with what our legislated mandates are to review design and construction in a timely and effective way, those are also reviewed by the Board annually when they approve the work plan.

So, if you're -- and one other -- one other, I think, substantive point to understand is, is that delaying design and construction activities beyond a point in time in a design process where fixes are easy and inexpensive, that does have a -- that does have somewhat of an expiration date on it, if you will, so that the -- the moving of resources around with relative priorities, also, and the Board is asked to make these kinds of decisions when they look at the annual work plan, is, is that -- is, is that they -- if you delay certain things with regard to design and construction, the opportunity to do those in a timely way goes with it.

And those -- those items are also reflected in

other things, so there's -- there is that aspect of it.

And then to my final point, which is when could we do this, it would take a considerable amount of planning and staff work to be able to provide an adequate schedule, both since we have not been able to respond to the Department's -- you know, we haven't received the Department's response --

MS. ROBERSON: Right.

MR. STOKES: -- on the previous letter. So, at this point in time, I could not do anything more than provide a plan for a plan.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: Well, so, I'd like to suggest that after there is some initial meeting of somebody from our staff with somebody from the Department of Energy staff, which I think they'll be talking at a very high level about what to do in response to the letter that we sent out, but I guess if ultimately we're going to have some staff members trying to look at the issues that were raised in that letter, which was really, you know, is there a way we could be more efficient for both of us, you know, what are our agency -- you know, what's our agency opinion about what's our most efficient and effective way.

And, so, again, I think that is a -- you know,

the work that goes into the preparation of the work plan. So, my point is, is that the Board already does have a vehicle for being able to address the kinds of concerns that Mr. Sullivan raised about the relative priority of design and construction versus operating facilities, and that's in the Board-approved work plan.

MS. ROBERSON: So -- and I want to recognize everybody's comments, and I appreciate your comments, too. And I think the -- a -- a Board policy -- the benefit for a Board policy isn't necessarily by definition intended to change what the staff does. That would be the value that I see. To me, the value is something where the Board members can find some alignment on what they're after, which could be helpful to the staff. So, I don't see it as dipping necessarily -- MR. STOKES: And I wasn't --

MS. ROBERSON: I know. I know.

MR. STOKES: -- framing -- that's not my intent.

20 MS. ROBERSON: I know.

MR. STOKES: It's to -- at this stage, it's to inform the Board that if we -- we essentially may already have existing policies that -- and if we -- if the Board so chooses to consolidate those into a distinct policy, it would then manifest itself by changes to a variety of

1 we are the agency. It's the -- at the moment, it's the

three of us sitting here. So, yeah, I think we should --

3 I'd like to hear something after the initial meeting, and

then that might lead to something where we could try to

5 come up with a format for us to create something that

might again provide some guidance if we're going to go

forward with the Department of Energy, what is it that we

-- we are trying to achieve. We're at the highest

possible level in that one letter we sent to the

Secretary, so we may need more.

Secretary, so we may need more.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Yeah. I just want to be careful on the terminology because you mentioned we already have policies. I think you referred to the staff --

MR. STOKES: No. No.

MR. SANTOS: -- because the Board policies were described this morning --

MR. STOKES: We have a document that is in effect, and that's the clarification, a Board policy. There was a joint report to Congress that was signed by the Department of Energy --

MS. ROBERSON: Right.

MR. STOKES: -- and the Board in 2007 that describes what the Board and Department agree to as far as integrating safety early into the design of new

46 (Pages 181 to 184)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

187

188

185

construction projects. It prescribes in there the same kinds of activities that one would logically have put into a policy regarding, for example, we shall provide early communications, which provide staff-to-staff discussions in an attempt to resolve issues soon. We will provide project letters, and we actually have incorporated that into our performance plan, and we track that, and we work -- we work to those, and that manifests itself into items in the work plan.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15 16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11 12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So, there is a document, and it's been in place since 2007, that, in effect, does have policy implications, ergo, I call it a -- you know, a policystatement-like document that does that. And -- and that's what we are attempting to revisit to see if it is still as effective as it -- as it was determined to be in 2007.

MR. SANTOS: So, maybe it's just a matter of format and organization as we go through our revised structure for procedures and policy. What -- what else is out there that is considered a policy-like item but we actually don't call it a -- a policy? Anyhow.

MS. ROBERSON: So -- well, I was just going to say I -- I think our best approach is kind of what Mr. Sullivan laid out. We ought to see what we and the Department have learned and think we might do differently as the starting point.

MS. ROBERSON: And then the second item, Steve, you don't --

MR. STOKES: The directives.

MS. ROBERSON: The directives. If you're prepared; if you don't have anything.

MR. STOKES: Yeah, we've -- the -- if I understand correctly, one of the things that we're -we're looking at a number of things in directives. In a short discussion in between sessions, I think there's a couple of things that need to brought to bear. Number one is we currently have quite a few comments. The revising of the concurrence process is only one of many things that we have to do. Our current process is to -is that is not the number one priority currently. If we change the number one -- that to the number one priority, it will have a cascading effect into all of the other things that we're currently working on which require us to reprioritize.

I'm not prepared at this point in time to say what that priority would be and where everything would sort itself out to, because we've -- in our database that I mentioned earlier, we currently have 134 comments. Roughly 20 percent deal with some aspect of the concurrence process. The concurrence process is embedded

186

and use that as a jumping off point to decide if we need to do something more. That would be my opinion.

MR. SULLIVAN: Yeah, I agree. I think I've heard a lot here, and it all actually sounds more like agreement to me than -- than not. But, again, it's actually pretty simple. I think as the Technical Director said, if we had this -- you know, we had this 2007 document and if we weren't even thinking about potentially changing anything, well, then, it would be pretty simple. We would take that document, translate it somehow into something that's a Board policy statement, and we're done.

But we also have a Board-approved letter. All right, so, the Board has already gone on record as saying, well, Mr. Secretary, maybe we should look at this with you to see if we can't even improve upon a process that is now eight years old. And, so, we're talking about potential changes. Now, the realm of change is anything, including nothing. And, so, that's fine, but, you know, what -- what is it we think, if anything, should be some sort of starting point. That's -- I think that's the question we're ultimately trying to figure out how we might get to as a -- as an agency, as a Board.

MR. SANTOS: I think your proposal, just me speaking, is reasonable. Use the letter and the dialogue

in numerous different internal controls that we currently have. So, what will be required is a completely different relook at what we would -- what we have planned, and that will have a fairly significant cascading effect through not only the existing procedures as well as the ones we're currently trying to produce.

The plan that we put together was done to optimize getting as many of the phase two directives out with the least amount of effort and then tackling the -revising the tier one documents, and then embedded in that is the stuff with the concurrence process. So, it's -- in the short time that we've had to evaluate it, we just can't -- I cannot give you a definitive description of what that will involve, nor how much time it will take.

MS. ROBERSON: Board members, comments? MR. SULLIVAN: So, can we get a plan for a plan?

MS. ROBERSON: So, my proposal would be I think it's -- you sensitized this well. Obviously, this is veins running through a lot of internal control procedures. I guess my recommendation would be that the Board discuss the prioritization of this effort during the work planning process and whether we -- how we want to prioritize it or not. You guys are already developing

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

	189		191
1	your work plan for the coming year.	1	MR. STOKES: For every one.
2	MR. STOKES: That's correct.	2	MR. SANTOS: Okay. Thank you.
3	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, so, if I understand what	3	MS. ROBERSON: Is there another action?
4	you're saying, you'll you'll just direct the technical	4	MR. SULLIVAN: There was one there was the
5	staff, which you can do, to put it in their work plan to	5	potential second shoe to fall on Policy Statement 5,
6	come up with something with regards to a policy statement	6	which was the one for assessment of risk for a
7	for on directives. Is that is that what you're	7	recommendation.
8	going to ask them to do?	8	MR. STOKES: And I'll put that I can the
9	MS. ROBERSON: No. Actually, I was asking the	9	best we could do at the present time is have a plan for a
10	Board to it will be on the list, but the Board will	10	plan, but not with a date, particularly concerning the
11	prioritize it when it goes through its review of the	11	fact that for us to do risk assessment, and particularly
12	staff's work plan.	12	if we're involved with the tier one and tier two topics,
13	MR. SULLIVAN: Right, but it's got to be there	13	those need to be defined first by the Board before we
14	from the beginning for us to figure out, yeah.	14	could figure out how to do that, so there would be a two-
15	MR. STOKES: It is in the work it will be	15	step process, as I understand it, and then depending upon
16	MS. ROBERSON: You will put it in the work	16	the tools that would be necessary, we would have to
17	plan.	17	decide what to do now.
18	MR. STOKES: it will be in the work plan.	18	In my recollection, it took us several months
19	MS. ROBERSON: Okay. All right.	19	to develop Policy Statement Number 5. So, I would
20	MR. SULLIVAN: Okay. All right. I understand.	20	estimate that we would be on the same order to revise it.
21	Thank you.	21	MS. ROBERSON: So, I'm going to propose
22	MS. ROBERSON: Okay.	22	sorry, Mr. Batherson, but I actually think I I think
23	Mr. Santos?	23	in one of the in some legal analysis done for us this
24	MR. SANTOS: Refresh my memory again, what date	24 25	was touched on already. I guess I'd ask legal to
25	is this?	23	actually take the first step. I think there is knowledge
	190		192
1	MR. STOKES: The work plan is scheduled to be	1	out there. I think the Board needs to does need to
2	reviewed by the Board on September 23rd. We are	2	decide on the definitions, but I think we need to rely on
3	currently producing it. It's an activity that will take	3	what exists in the legislative record, as well, too. So,
4	us a couple of months because it involves every activity	4	I think that first action comes back around to General
5	for the next fiscal year, so we will currently take what	5	Counsel.
6	we're working on, roll it into the updated plan for	6	MR. BATHERSON: Okay.
7	for staff activity, and then the Board will review that	7	MS. ROBERSON: I mean, if you're telling me
8	and we'll it'll we'll have another business meeting	8	if you think I'm wrong, tell me.
9	on September 23rd.	9	MR. BATHERSON: No, I mean, I know that we did
10	MR. SANTOS: So, if I'm clear, September 23rd	10	the Office and Ms. Blaine did particularly substantial
11	is where I'll see a proposed plan to	11	work on the initial cut with Mr. Tontodonato on the
12	MR. STOKES: You will see a draft plan in	12	Policy Statement 5 together, because it resulted from a
13	advance of that meeting.	13	change to our legislative mandate and added specific
14	MS. ROBERSON: You will see a the staff's	14 15	language. And, so, we you were right, we were involved in what does that mean.
15 16	proposed work plan.	16	MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm.
16	MR. SANTOS: Correct.	10	IVIS. RODERSON. IVIIII-IIIIIII.

MR. SULLIVAN: And, so, in the interest of a

something, whoever it was, somebody put some thought into

MR. SULLIVAN: And then based on all the other

what needs to be done in order to ultimately get to the

point where we would have something that we could vote

plan for a plan, again, I'd be satisfied if in the

MS. ROBERSON: Mm-hmm.

respective work plans they just brought us back

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

on.

MS. ROBERSON: Which includes all activities

MR. SANTOS: Got it. And including what your

MS. ROBERSON: And you will have the

opportunity to express your individual opinion as to

whether it's the right priority or application of

estimated duration for each one. Got it.

that they would undertake.

resources.

MR. SANTOS: Okay.

work we need to do, we'll -- we'll either tell them it's a priority or -- or it's not.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. And, unfortunately, I'm looking at you.

MR. BATHERSON: Thank you.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Thank you.

Any more questions for Mr. Stokes before he sits down? Mr. Santos?

 $MR.\ SANTOS:\ No.\ Thank\ you.$ 

10 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Sullivan?

MR. SULLIVAN: No.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Stokes.

MR. SULLIVAN: We did have the one issue that I think was in the General Manager's realm. That was the --

MS. ROBERSON: Come on up, Mark.

MR. SULLIVAN: -- looking at the issue of the staff saying that they -- they're not free to go talk to Board members.

MR. WELCH: Yeah, so, just a point of clarification, I quickly went through the Towers Watson briefing over lunch. I didn't see a specific question on that. I did see the question that they were -- staff was uncomfortable about putting things up the chain of command. Was that what you were referring to?

recommendation is we -- because I don't really know if -- what Mark can do now, unless the Board members have a solution. I think we need to use that outside expertise to help us weave our way through this. That would be my opinion. But that's open to other Board members, obviously.

MR. SULLIVAN: Sounds like a -- like a reasonable thing to do. I just don't know what their -- what their time frame was. I know they also started talking about coming back with another assessment in three years, so I'm hoping we don't have to wait something -- some period of time measured in years to go try to figure out more in-depth if there -- if there seems to be a lot of staff members who feel this way, why do they feel that way and what, if anything, can we do about it.

MS. ROBERSON: To my understanding -- you correct me, Mark -- is over the next, I believe their -- their activity extends another six months. I think their contract actually involves them working with us to do this in the next few months.

MR. WELCH: Right.

MS. ROBERSON: I'm assuming at three years they're coming back to see if not just our efforts but their efforts have been successful. So, I think it's

MR. SULLIVAN: I'm not sure what they put in their report. I know they said it in the briefing that they gave us in this very room. They said that the staff members did not feel that they could go and approach Board members with their concerns.

MR. WELCH: Okay, that may have been something that came out of a focus group that they were -- they were mentioning, but I think in either respect, I think it boils down to communication -- the communication in leadership areas, which are two of the areas that Towers Watson is going to recommend that we have followup actions on. So, I think it will -- it will be covered by the results to action workshops.

MS. ROBERSON: So -- so let me -- let me offer a path forward, because when I talked to him, it's kind of unclear what leads and what follows. I mean, this is important, but it's -- what they weren't able to tell us yet, and I think it's one of the things they're going to work with us on starting in July, is whether this was a result, whether this was a symptom or the disease -- or the disease itself.

They -- so, what they told us is looking at everything they have is they're going to work with us to identify the handful or fewer things that they think will be the thread through all the issues they saw. So, my

months, and that is a part of their current activity with us.

MR. WELCH: That's correct. So, they're -over the next several months, they'll be working with us
on these results to action workshops which will drill
down the -- drill down the data to some degree and
hopefully out of that we'll get a better understanding of
what was driving some of these questions and then we can
put plans into place to correct that.

MR. SULLIVAN: Okay, I understand this is just a wait and see what happens.

MS. ROBERSON: No, we got to jump in there. They're going to expect us to help.

MR. SULLIVAN: Oh, okay. It will happen.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Thank you. Anything else? Did you have any comments, Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: I would just reiterate that, yes, there's a process and let's go through that. That's fine. In the meantime, I'd even mention I have a reverse door policy, so anybody is more than encouraged to come see me. I'll try to visit often. And if you don't want me there, shut the door in my face, but if not, I'm coming in. There's -- there's nothing that -- that should be standing in the way between staff and getting access to -- to me. So, I just want to -- while I will

49 (Pages 193 to 196)

1 follow the formal process to get the experts to provide 2 feedback, in the meantime, anybody should feel free to 3 come see me. 4 MS. ROBERSON: And my experience is lots of 4 CERTIFICATE OF REPORT 2  3 I, LINDA METCALF, the off 4 foregoing testimony was taken, do here.	icer before whom the
2 feedback, in the meantime, anybody should feel free to 3 come see me. 4 MS. ROBERSON: And my experience is lots of 4 foregoing testimony was taken, do h	icer before whom the
3 come see me. 3 I, LINDA METCALF, the off 4 MS. ROBERSON: And my experience is lots of 4 foregoing testimony was taken, do h	
4 MS. ROBERSON: And my experience is lots of 4 foregoing testimony was taken, do h	
	1
5 people do come to see you. Your door is always open. 5 proceeding was digitally recorded by	
6 So, I think they're right in saying, well, there must be 6 reduced to typewriting by me or und	
7 something else behind it, and their job is to help us 7 said testimony is a true record of the	
8 figure out what it is and solve it. So, are you 8 neither counsel for, related to, nor er	
9 comfortable with that? 9 the parties to the action in which this	
10 Anything else that we left off? 10 taken; and, further, that I am not a re	
Thank you, Mr. Welch.  11 of any of the parties hereto, nor final	
So, I'm going to start to my closing and I'm  12 otherwise interested in the outcome	of the action.
going to come back around to the Board members one more 13	
time for any closing comments they may have.	
15 Mr. Sullivan? 15	
16 MR. SULLIVAN: No thank you. I've said enough 16 17 today. 17 LINDA METCALF	
20 MR. SANTOS: You've circled back, and I'm very 21 encouraged that we had such what I consider a productive 21 21	
public meeting, and I do look forward appropriately to 22	
public meeting, and I do look forward appropriately to 22 frequent public meetings that we can actually show the 23	
24 stakeholders the business of the Board just beyond our 24	
25 notational boards vote sheets, sorry. So, I want to 25	
25 Hotational boards - vote sheets, sorry. 50, I want to	
198	
1 thank fellow Board members for what I think was a very	
2 very good meeting. Thank you.	
3 MS. ROBERSON: Thank you both. And having	
4 completed consideration of the business items on the	
5 agenda and followup discussions on that list of items	
6 that we wanted to have additional staff follow up, I'd	
7 like to thank everyone for their participation in this	
8 business meeting.	
9 The Board will post the results of today's	
votes on the Board's public website, and agenda items	
that were tabled during this meeting will be addressed by	
the Board's document processing and notational voting	
procedures within 30 days of this meeting, unless further	
table is agreed to by the Board.	
This concludes the Defense Nuclear Facilities	
Safety Board's business meeting. This meeting is	
17 adjourned.	
18 (Whereupon, the public meeting was adjourned at	
19 2:38 p.m.)	
20	
21 22	
22 23	
23 24	
25	

[200]

A	accuracy 58:14	194:13 196:5	72:15 83:1 88:1	158:6
A-11 7:18,24 8:3	62:11,15 71:7	199:9,12	91:5,13 182:3	affirmation 163:16
<b>a.m</b> 3:3	accurate 67:4 79:3	actions 23:23 88:22	addressed 23:24	affirmative 157:18
ability 54:19 59:24	91:25	91:4 92:17 93:16	59:2 62:21 93:18	158:3
65:6 67:18 69:12	accusatory 60:10	94:23 95:15 97:22	198:11	affirmatively
72:1 78:10,12	achievable 25:19	97:24 98:6 121:14	addressing 91:8	157:15 161:3
136:22 181:2	achieve 8:25 184:8	122:5,8 123:4,21	adequacy 22:23	afternoon 38:10
able 16:8 21:9 44:23	achieved 7:9,23	126:23 142:7	23:20 24:12 25:11	81:15 103:2,8
45:7 46:14 58:12	achievements 93:10	171:18 173:6	58:15 79:6	111:1 116:15,21
60:4 62:18 65:3	achieving 8:7,16	175:13 194:12	adequate 16:13 24:3	117:11,18 119:1
67:2,16,20 69:15	10:22 11:3 90:9	activities 5:24 23:4	25:20 31:6,21	agencies 6:25 7:6,18
71:13,23 72:1,19	acknowledge 93:9	26:17 28:6,19,25	44:12,16 65:3	7:20,25 8:6,8
74:3 77:11 78:3,10	acknowledgment	29:3,15,18 30:4	75:19,20 76:1,6	89:11 100:11
78:16 79:24 80:2,3	90:22	47:15 54:20 55:11	77:7,10 80:3 81:2	agency 7:5 9:4 16:12
81:16 88:1 100:5	act 3:21,21,23 5:23	89:24 91:10,12,20	81:22 82:15 107:3	16:12 21:6 34:15
100:25 115:6	6:20 8:4 30:10	92:3,5,9,14,18,22	109:3,4 161:11,24	36:4 39:8 41:13,20
178:7,9 182:3	37:12 79:7 82:19	93:19 111:2 180:7	163:14 165:5	42:5 45:5,14 48:15
183:4,5 194:17	100:6 103:6	181:15 185:2	166:18 171:24	57:18 89:25 90:5,8
absolutely 166:23	111:16 112:1	190:17	179:10 183:4	91:15,19 92:8,14
167:20	143:9 149:11	activity 27:6 51:2	adequately 23:24	92:20 95:3 100:19
accept 162:7	157:15,18 158:3	93:2 177:25 181:5	adjourned 198:17	100:20 101:13
accept 102.7 acceptance 24:25	161:25,25 162:1	190:3,4,7 195:19	198:18	102:7 114:19
25:3 134:14	176:10	196:1	adjust 15:8	135:15,24 136:4
accepted 24:9	acted 160:23	actual 7:23 66:22	adjusted 66:25	136:23 137:1,6
accepting 24:6	acting 2:10 3:14	141:12 162:5	adjustment 14:13	170:5 173:6
access 13:4 73:24	4:19 22:11,15	add 21:12 32:16	14:14,18,21	175:11 179:16
80:7 196:25	102:14 108:3	40:3 66:3,3 87:4	adjustments 14:2	183:22,23 184:1
accident 160:2,11	action 2:20 3:25 5:4	168:4,6 173:4	Administration	186:23
accidents 160:4,7	27:20 35:8 37:11	176:9 177:9	52:5	agency-wide 91:16
accommodate 65:24	38:1 39:8 78:25	179:25	administrative	agency's 90:17 93:6
78:3	79:4 82:17 94:3	added 20:8,9 93:25	51:16,18	<b>agenda</b> 4:16 5:6
accompanying	95:17 99:5 103:3	94:4 96:3 104:11	adopted 49:4 162:18	6:10 22:17 38:17
27:19	114:19 118:2	192:13	adoption 92:19	86:7 88:6 104:5,20
accomplish 29:24	119:5,8,12,15,18	adding 114:14	advance 104:8	104:22 142:5,6
54:19	119:19 120:10,12	147:19	145:19 146:1	155:12 157:3
accomplishing	120:14 121:8,12	addition 4:12 29:14	190:13	169:8,10 172:10
24:16	122:13 123:13	61:9	advances 28:11	198:5,10
accomplishments	125:19,19 127:15	<b>additional</b> 4:1 58:11	advantage 54:7	aggressive 45:25
92:6	127:18 128:17,22	74:13 76:25 93:16	advent 26:24	158:15
accountabilities	139:22,23 142:3,7	93:25 104:19	advice 16:15 17:1,16	ago 19:6 26:5 27:3
51:14	142:14 145:21	134:20 140:4	39:7 103:19 176:2	45:22,22 56:13,13
accountability 8:11	155:9,14,14,20,23	144:25 155:23	advise 16:13 43:25	58:20,24 59:6,12
92:11	156:17,19 157:2,4	169:11,16 180:11	advised 71:4	59:14 68:1,2 86:13
accountable 8:6	157:5 164:8	198:6	advisor 70:9,14	88:2 139:22 146:9
53:23 94:18	168:23 175:11	address 4:7 23:13	advisors 71:12	agree 47:25 58:2
accumulating 14:1	176:11,12 178:2	30:5 31:5 46:14	<b>affect</b> 69:12	68:20 82:18 84:24
accumulating 17.1	191:3 192:4	52:21 55:23 66:14	<b>affirm</b> 121:24 143:2	98:20 176:8,24
			1	ĺ

[201]

6/3/2015

-				
178:15 179:4	165:3,24 166:25	<b>anymore</b> 103:14	51:1,13 53:18 92:1	asks 17:19
184:24 186:3	167:1,23,24 168:1	140:1	100:10 104:23	aspect 183:1 187:24
agreed 84:16 85:13	168:3,4	anything's 162:18	appropriately 154:8	assess 10:9 23:7
136:5 198:14	amendments 122:24	anytime 146:13	197:22	25:10,25 30:8,13
agreeing 124:9	122:24 132:25	anyway 134:7	approval 138:1	30:19 48:16 55:14
agreement 85:23	166:6,7 168:15,16	135:10,13 148:3	156:11	assessed 26:19
158:21 186:5	168:17 175:24	171:6	approve 5:5 127:8	48:19
ahead 48:22 95:1	amount 51:11 59:24	apparent 90:25	130:22 131:18	assessing 24:12
111:20 117:25	66:4 68:17 69:4	appeal 74:5	134:16 144:2,5	87:24
123:10 132:14	135:5 160:18	appear 20:22 25:22	181:12	assessment 30:24
145:16 153:5	183:3 188:9	26:3,23 41:1 57:21	<b>approved</b> 4:2,15	31:7,13,20,25
154:22 158:18	analogous 57:8	appears 33:4	8:20 50:24 126:13	44:24 45:8,15,16
174:2	analysis 33:19 34:19	appendix 12:6	127:6 129:12	46:6,7 70:8 86:13
aimed 89:25 91:13	34:20,21 51:9 57:8	applecart 81:8	131:5 141:12	86:14 88:17 89:6,9
91:16,21 92:13,25	143:21 176:3	apples 58:21,21	142:4 157:2 169:7	89:12 90:3 97:22
93:19 165:13	191:23	applicability 26:4	approves 131:5	114:15 173:5
align 107:2	and/or 54:25 114:19	applicable 28:10,14	181:6	191:6,11 195:10
alignment 11:16	anecdotal 17:12	51:25 100:10	approving 128:14	assessments 2:16
51:14 182:13	anecdotally 17:3	119:13 120:12,18	<b>April</b> 89:14	5:1 31:2 88:13,22
allocation 52:12	animal 135:8	122:1 123:12	architecture 87:10	89:16,21,25 90:8
allow 48:20 71:23	announcement	127:16 128:16	87:13 88:2	90:11,13,20,25
102:11 106:24	94:24 97:15	142:8,15 155:10	archive 4:12	91:6 93:4,18
120:13 123:12	annual 7:6,8,18,21	157:14 158:1	area 21:7,7 40:17	assigned 19:16
127:17 128:22	7:25 8:1 12:6	application 190:22	90:6,10,24	51:17 52:2,9,11
135:22	13:13 24:20 26:15	applied 51:1 65:8	areas 40:7 44:20	55:18 83:14
allowed 12:23	29:9 53:16 88:24	apply 25:10 31:7	85:15 90:18,21	assignment 53:15
allowing 93:21	93:5 181:7,21	39:15 45:7 85:9,15	91:8,14 93:17,20	54:2
128:16	annually 181:12	156:3	95:19 110:6	assignments 51:20
allows 92:1 161:25	anomaly 61:6	applying 48:12	194:10,10	assist 23:22 24:16
alluding 143:6	anonymously 172:2	appraisal 11:18	aren't 20:24 152:21	27:14 95:17
alongside 82:5	answer 12:11 16:9	appreciate 18:21	argue 136:4	assistance 26:12
alternative 36:13	31:8 32:4,14 45:13	60:7 109:17,22	<b>Armed</b> 113:9	28:5 84:9
ambiguous 166:14	48:14 75:15 80:18	110:12,19 111:22	arrangement 51:10	associated 9:15
amend 127:5 140:24	82:3,6 94:7 116:11	113:15 172:6,7	arrived 56:24	10:24 59:15 62:2
141:11	138:12 150:5	182:8	articulate 151:18	120:15 123:15
amended 142:3	151:8 153:25	appreciated 5:10	articulated 152:22	127:20 128:24
168:24	162:17	105:15	articulating 152:23	156:4 180:8
amending 159:20	answering 147:22	appreciates 113:11	asked 33:21 41:7	<b>assume</b> 34:23
amendment 123:2	answers 25:13 76:15	<b>approach</b> 23:6 30:7	55:13 68:12,14	assumes 44:17
123:19,20,22,25	152:19	47:4,13 53:5,11,15	115:16 153:12	assuming 195:23
124:1,12,17 125:7	anticipate 175:17	53:17,21 54:15,18	165:16 169:16	assumption 63:23
125:8,9,10,16	anticipates 31:23	55:7,9 74:8 91:7	181:20	63:25
126:1,15,18,21,23	anticipation 119:5	93:24 116:4	<b>asking</b> 34:10 46:16	assurance 51:9
131:8 140:8,22	anybody 12:21	173:21,23,23	60:8 86:3 102:1,18	52:17,21,25 73:6
141:1 158:17	15:15 32:16	180:8 185:23	108:9 150:24,24	73:10,12 86:20
159:3,8,12 162:9	112:18 153:16	194:4	153:21 170:17	assure 25:20
163:1,3,5,8 164:10	196:20 197:2	appropriate 23:23	177:1 189:9	attached 36:10
	l	l	I	I

[202]

. 44 - 1 124 1 2
attaches 134:1,2
attack 95:15 100:4
attempt 17:22 53:20
65:15 73:25 185:5
attempted 68:6
attempting 185:14
attempts 42:2
177:23
attended 89:11
172:8
attention 26:19
29:11 52:20 96:9
171:25
<b>audience</b> 105:5,6
112:17
augment 180:12
August 28:20 30:7
158:16,20 159:16
164:8 167:1,15
author 60:18,19,23
61:18 65:18
<b>authorities</b> 152:8
Authorization 30:10
authorize 157:15
authorizing 24:5
automatic 133:15
133:18
automatically
136:23 137:5
139:11
availability 62:1
92:20
available 4:11,13
13:16,18 44:22
51:11 54:21 61:1
80:6 93:1 94:1
108:5 114:20
121:22 135:5
156:6
avenue 1:18 78:16
170:14
average 62:5 67:9
avoid 140:6
award 93:2,5
awards 90:21
aware 80:23 82:8
83:3 105:23

121:18 awareness 132:1 awful 40:15,17 161:14

## В

**B** 101:4,6,8,8,9 back 17:10 19:3,9 33:3,11,22 34:2,24 36:25 47:8 49:20 56:17 57:24 61:25 66:10,14 71:5,8 73:1 84:10 87:1 88:10,11 96:19 101:9,15 106:22 111:10,17 117:3 119:3 127:13 140:15 146:25 149:2 151:17,19 151:19 152:16 159:24 166:22 174:21 177:1 192:4,19 195:10 195:24 197:13,20 back-burner 175:21 background 24:4 backgrounds 110:5 **bad** 21:4 ballistic 16:18 bandwidth 46:14 **barrier** 47:10 based 14:25 17:13 33:21 35:23 36:1 37:14 42:24,25 60:13 80:24 83:12 93:3 97:22 138:23 143:8 145:21 175:17 192:25 basically 33:17 43:14 70:7 80:22 100:24 122:5,7,15 146:2 159:15 166:19 basis 2:11 4:21 10:25 22:19 46:10 50:12,16,22 59:20 66:7 73:8 77:11,15

77:17 78:7 108:4 120:14 122:19 123:13 127:18 128:17 133:15 136:7,16 147:9 163:14 165:4 166:17,20 177:13 177:24 181:7 Batherson 3:14 22:11,12,15 32:6 33:9 39:21,24 50:8 102:20 103:17 116:7,9,12,23 117:7 118:5 120:3 120:5,6,9 123:10 123:23,25 124:3 124:11,20 125:9 125:12 126:4,8,10 126:12,17,20 127:1,3,5,10,13 128:8,12 130:6,7 130:10,18,21,25 131:2,4,11 132:5,9 132:11,14 138:3,4 138:9 140:7,21 141:4,6,8,10,15,18 141:20,23,25 142:2,10 151:9,11 151:13,16 152:15 152:20 153:12 154:6,19,21,25 155:2,4,7,20 156:18,22,24 157:1,8 158:22,24 159:7,22 162:25 167:3,7 168:2,10 168:12,16,20 169:1,4,6 172:19 172:21,24 174:1 174:22 175:4 177:3,5 191:22 192:6,9 193:5 bear 19:11 58:18 67:9 71:21 187:11 bears 110:15 **beauties** 166:10 began 9:14 58:25

160:1 beginning 59:25 104:10 170:13 189:14 behaviors 91:18 **belabor** 180:17 believe 20:20 68:23 75:18 78:12 79:1,4 90:1 99:16,17 107:15 115:2,15 169:7 171:23 195:18 believed 88:1 believes 24:3 76:11 77:22,24 **belong** 76:16 belongs 81:11 benefit 13:2 24:1 96:3 182:10 best 13:11,11 53:6 67:17 179:22 185:23 191:9 better 18:7,19 21:25 36:17 42:1 45:11 57:23 69:15 87:25 92:2 98:18,22 110:4,12 149:25 154:9 158:16 170:3 178:4 196:7 beyond 21:2 146:10 157:16 181:15 197:24 big 40:19 179:7 bit 6:1 15:4 56:14 75:9 77:6 128:2 135:11,25 137:21 144:14 151:25 158:15 171:15 **Blaine** 192:10 **blank** 178:19 **board** 1:3,17 2:20 2:20 3:7,9,12,16 3:25 4:2,4,9,16,20 4:23 5:1,1,3,4,12

5:18,22,24 6:3,8

6:14,16,23 8:21

9:3,14,24 10:6,17

11:4,12,16,21 12:2 12:5,9,10,13 13:13 14:7,12 16:6 18:14 18:15,15 19:5,6,24 21:16 22:1,5,13,17 22:20,22,24 23:3,6 23:10,11,12,19,22 24:2,6,10,16,17,21 24:23 25:5,6,10,20 25:24 26:1,6,7,10 26:17,20,20 27:6 27:12,19,20,21,23 27:24,25 28:5,18 29:10,20,24,25 30:7,12,15,18,19 30:23 31:1,4,9,17 31:23,25 32:4,15 32:22,23 33:21 35:10 36:5,24,25 37:1,1,4,5,8,9,10 37:11,16,16,16,25 38:8,12,16,22,22 39:13,23,24 40:24 42:8,15,19 47:22 50:14 53:7 55:11 59:1,25 63:7 66:5 66:6,6,12 67:3,17 69:2,10,21,24 72:10,17 74:6,11 74:13 75:21 76:7 76:10,13,14,16,25 77:11,21 78:1,13 78:21,25 79:2,3,4 79:7,12,13,15,17 79:25 80:2,7,9,13 81:6,11 82:1,8,9 82:16,18,25 83:14 83:20 84:1,4,10,10 84:11,14 85:2,2,3 85:5,6,10,16,18,23 87:18 88:13,18,23 89:5,18,23 90:6,16 91:17 92:21 93:8 93:11,12 94:1,21 95:9 96:12,13,19 100:2,3,16 101:17 101:17 102:2,7,13

111:16,20 113:12 113:13,23 115:7 116:19 117:13 118:1 119:4,8,8,9 119:12,12,15,15 119:17,19,19,19 119:24 120:10,10 120:11,12,13,13 120:23 121:6,8,8,8 121:12,12,14,18 121:22,25 122:7,7 122:15 123:3,7,12 123:12,13,18,21 125:19,20 126:5 126:22 127:15,17 127:17,18 128:16	113:13,23 115:7 116:19 117:13 118:1 119:4,8,8,9 119:12,12,15,15 119:17,19,19,19 119:24 120:10,10 120:11,12,13,13 120:23 121:6,8,8,8 121:12,12,14,18 121:22,25 122:7,7 122:15 123:3,7,12 123:12,13,18,21 125:19,20 126:5 126:22 127:15,17 127:17,18 128:16 129:12,13,15,16 129:17,17,21 131:13,18,19,19 132:3 133:8,15,18 133:20,24,25 134:2,5,9,10,12,15 134:16,17,25 135:3 136:4,21	113:13,23 115:7 116:19 117:13 118:1 119:4,8,8,9 119:12,12,15,15 119:17,19,19,19 119:24 120:10,10 120:11,12,13,13 120:23 121:6,8,8,8 121:12,12,14,18 121:22,25 122:7,7 122:15 123:3,7,12 123:12,13,18,21 125:19,20 126:5 126:22 127:15,17 127:17,18 128:16 129:12,13,15,16 129:17,17,21 131:13,18,19,19 132:3 133:8,15,18 133:20,24,25 134:2,5,9,10,12,15 134:16,17,25	102:14,21 103:7 103:10 104:22 105:4,9,18,21 106:4,11,20,21 107:1 109:6 110:4 110:10,11,24,25
121:12,12,14,18 121:22,25 122:7,7 122:15 123:3,7,12 123:12,13,18,21 125:19,20 126:5 126:22 127:15,17 127:17,18 128:16	121:12,12,14,18 121:22,25 122:7,7 122:15 123:3,7,12 123:12,13,18,21 125:19,20 126:5 126:22 127:15,17 127:17,18 128:16 129:12,13,15,16 129:17,17,21 131:13,18,19,19 132:3 133:8,15,18 133:20,24,25 134:2,5,9,10,12,15 134:16,17,25 135:3 136:4,21	121:12,12,14,18 121:22,25 122:7,7 122:15 123:3,7,12 123:12,13,18,21 125:19,20 126:5 126:22 127:15,17 127:17,18 128:16 129:12,13,15,16 129:17,17,21 131:13,18,19,19 132:3 133:8,15,18 133:20,24,25 134:2,5,9,10,12,15 134:16,17,25 135:3 136:4,21 137:25 138:1,6,12 138:21 139:13,13 140:7,8 142:7,7,14 142:19,20,21 143:1,1,3 145:11 145:15,21 147:10 147:13 148:8,10	113:13,23 115:7 116:19 117:13 118:1 119:4,8,8,9 119:12,12,15,15 119:17,19,19,19 119:24 120:10,10 120:11,12,13,13
	129:17,17,21 131:13,18,19,19 132:3 133:8,15,18 133:20,24,25 134:2,5,9,10,12,15 134:16,17,25 135:3 136:4,21	129:17,17,21 131:13,18,19,19 132:3 133:8,15,18 133:20,24,25 134:2,5,9,10,12,15 134:16,17,25 135:3 136:4,21 137:25 138:1,6,12 138:21 139:13,13 140:7,8 142:7,7,14 142:19,20,21 143:1,1,3 145:11 145:15,21 147:10 147:13 148:8,10	121:12,12,14,18 121:22,25 122:7,7 122:15 123:3,7,12 123:12,13,18,21 125:19,20 126:5 126:22 127:15,17 127:17,18 128:16

161 14 04 160 1	Ι,
161:14,24 162:1	
162:15 163:15,17	١,
163:21 164:3,24	
165:15,21 167:11 168:22,23,24	
169:10,23 171:2,4	
171:5,12 172:4,7	
175:13,13 176:10	l
177:1 178:2,9	'
179:23,23 180:12	
180:18 181:6,8,11	l '
181:20 182:2,9,10	l
182:13,22,23	ľ
184:16,19,23,24	l
186:11,14,23	ľ
188:16,23 189:10	1
189:10 190:2,7	
191:13 192:1	
193:19 194:5	]
195:2,5 197:13,24	]
198:1,9,14	
<b>Board-approved</b>	
83:19 182:6	]
186:13	
<b>Board-level</b> 42:6	
173:23	
<b>Board's</b> 2:5,7,10,22	
3:14,15,22,23,24	
4:7,11,17,18,20	
5:6 6:12,23 8:19	
10:23 11:24 22:11	
22:18,25 23:16,17	
24:2,4,9,20 26:15	١,
26:22 27:2,13 28:7	
28:23 29:2,4,6,9	
29:17 30:5,11 31:3	١,
50:10,15,20,24 51:15 52:18 53:10	
53:14,16,18,22	
54:20 89:7,13 90:1	
91:1,13,22 122:12	
148:11 176:25	
198:10,12,16	
boards 100:11	
197:25	
boilerplate 66:21	1
boils 194:9	l
~ 3440 17 117	1

<b>bottom</b> 57:11 67:15 81:8
boxes 56:22
branch 41:1
<b>brave</b> 109:21
<b>break</b> 5:2 65:2
105:17 113:24
<b>bribe</b> 112:24 113:1
113:21
<b>brief</b> 6:17 61:11
88:9,16 104:17
<b>briefing</b> 27:7 193:22
194:2
<b>briefly</b> 5:18 6:21
88:19
<b>bring</b> 58:17 67:9
94:20 95:1 103:2
106:20 161:22,24
broader 62:20
<b>brought</b> 26:18 71:9
71:21 187:11
192:19
<b>budget</b> 7:17,19 8:1
13:3,8,9,12 14:5
15:6,18,20 17:18
17:19
<b>build</b> 89:22 90:16
92:22
<b>building</b> 17:1,14
41:10,21 42:3
65:10 91:8 93:19
143:14 144:1,10
144:11
<b>built</b> 77:18 110:9
<b>bunch</b> 16:22 66:21
168:18
<b>burden</b> 133:19
<b>bury</b> 66:20
<b>business</b> 1:10 3:8,17
3:18,23 5:20,22
6:10 42:7 59:4
115:10 121:4
136:7 143:2
172:10,11 190:8
*
197:24 198:4,8,16
<b>busy</b> 75:4

C 101:5,6,8,9,9	c
cadre 46:2	
calendar 13:15 20:5	c
36:1	c
call 47:14 48:1	
58:24 88:4,11	_
104:8 126:20	C
128:6 130:22	
141:20 185:12,21	C
called 63:6	
<b>calling</b> 130:17	C
can't 16:24 39:9	
44:3,12,19 61:14	C
95:13 101:11	c
108:19,19 109:12	c
115:11 136:24	C
146:10 154:9	c
	C
170:21 173:15,15	
186:16 188:13	C
capability 8:5 46:14	
<b>capital</b> 11:16 144:17	
Capitol 17:17	
card 113:4	C
care 139:25	
careers 110:6	
careful 184:12	
carries 142:2	C
cascading 187:17	
188:5	c
	c
case 20:16 25:5 36:3	
61:3 76:8 103:24	
107:25 131:15	C
169:25 170:10	
case-by-case 120:14	c
123:13 127:18	
128:17 136:16	C
147:9 166:17,20	
cases 20:7,12 26:12	c
26:20 30:23 37:4,5	
48:18 58:15 60:16	
62:17 67:5,19	
69:13 82:4 85:22	
	c]
cast 168:22	c
catalyst 94:5	c]
categories 31:8 93:3	
	$\mathbf{c}$

```
93:5
ategorization
79:21 82:6
ategorizations
79:18
ategorize 77:19
82:18
ategorized 77:20
77:25
ategory 10:21 11:3
44:15 77:21
ause 44:10,10 84:3
95:14
auses 66:25
aveat 153:4
ease 99:25
elebrate 92:6
entral 54:18
eremony 93:5
ertain 28:10 31:7
32:22 85:15 89:18
89:21 109:10,24
181:23
ertainly 18:20
45:21 77:12 95:18
102:20 118:11
147:24 173:17
CERTIFICATE
199:1
ertify 199:4
etera 43:25 128:17
128:17 144:17
152:9
CFR 157:21
hain 108:14,15,16
143:17 193:24
Chair 104:18 108:3
128:5
hairman 3:7 5:17
6:15 22:13 33:23
34:3,4,7,8 50:13
88:15 108:2,3
158:22,24
hallenged 100:12
hallenges 70:10
hallenging 18:14
hampion 94:20
```

[204]

				[204]
<b>chance</b> 15:2 98:6	clarifying 38:2	108:16 110:22	116:24 130:12	complaining 100:24
111:5 146:8	162:11	111:10 112:22	142:24 145:15	complaint 146:6
change 17:22,25	clarity 139:7 152:1	115:7 116:5 143:7	142.24 143.13	complement 180:12
64:18 72:22 93:13	classification 144:2	144:15 145:11	148:5,7 171:10	complete 30:3 169:9
	classified 77:24		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	173:25
101:4,8,8 111:7,9		149:2 160:22	176:25 177:9	
112:8 131:8,17	classify 35:7	170:7 176:17,20	180:16 182:8,8	completed 10:1
158:19 164:22	cleanup 29:14	177:1 184:5 189:6	187:12,23 188:16	20:13 62:9 63:2
167:1 182:11	clear 21:17 35:9	193:16 196:20	196:16 197:14	70:23 110:15
186:18 187:16	37:20,24 38:2	197:3,5,13	commercial 171:22	164:5 167:13
192:13	39:10 82:11 85:5	comes 39:1 60:21	commissioning	172:9 175:13
<b>changed</b> 41:22	94:17 98:13	64:3 82:1 100:22	180:4,9,20	198:4
57:12 164:7	106:22 127:23	105:16 109:11	commissions 100:11	completely 188:2
changes 9:20 20:8	133:6 134:4	145:2 180:4 192:4	commitment 87:18	completeness 175:5
32:1 34:16 71:7	152:25 164:12	comfort 110:11	89:22 93:6	completes 10:23
83:13 111:1,4,4,6	166:4,12 190:10	comfortable 78:22	committed 90:7	121:14 169:7
121:23,25 143:3	clearly 39:12,14	113:6 149:13	109:23	complex 47:12 55:1
158:7 170:1	85:18 106:25	163:7 197:9	Committee 113:10	76:1 129:4 135:6
175:25 182:25	111:25 151:18	<b>coming</b> 70:6 99:3	committees 15:19	compliance 25:16
186:18	climate 15:1	117:17 139:12	40:23	<b>comply</b> 10:2 30:22
changing 117:4,6	<b>close</b> 100:6 101:19	153:23 189:1	commonly 54:11	component 128:25
159:4 186:9	104:25 114:24	195:10,24 196:23	communicate 37:13	components 177:21
characterized 41:3	169:15,20 176:23	<b>command</b> 193:25	66:7 68:18,19 98:1	concept 16:11
43:16	<b>closed</b> 29:8 81:14,16	commences 7:2	106:22,25	128:23
<b>charge</b> 73:13	95:13 101:22	commensurate	communicates	<b>concern</b> 38:4 72:16
<b>Charles</b> 110:23	106:5 157:20	97:25	26:21	74:7,9 77:19 118:9
check 62:11,15	170:7 173:7 175:8	<b>comment</b> 4:9 10:17	communicating	147:16 148:24,25
161:2	175:15,18 176:21	18:21 22:4 32:17	98:4	149:5,7,20
checked 71:10	closer 40:1	32:18 39:21 47:21	communication 9:1	concerned 66:12
<b>chime</b> 98:20	<b>closes</b> 97:11	47:24 48:25 74:15	11:21 41:8 66:13	73:3
<b>choose</b> 70:13 99:25	<b>closing</b> 2:22 169:12	83:2 94:11 100:2	90:19,22 91:20,24	concerning 3:25
chooses 182:24	176:14 197:12,14	102:19,23 106:12	109:18 152:16	12:3 173:2 191:10
Christmas 20:2	coaching 92:9	106:16 110:24	194:9,9	<b>concerns</b> 71:6,13
<b>chunk</b> 40:18	cognizant 52:1,13	111:22 112:3,13	communications	72:15 78:17 79:7
<b>churn</b> 69:4	53:22 54:4,8,9,10	112:18 115:5	27:23 38:24 39:13	81:6 121:19 148:8
<b>circled</b> 197:20	54:13,24 55:5,18	137:20 146:14,15	91:18 109:17	148:17 173:9
<b>Circular</b> 7:18,24 8:3	66:1 69:8	146:15,21 147:14	177:15 185:4	182:3 194:5
circumstance 83:4	collaborative 94:15	169:11 180:1,14	company 89:7	concerted 93:14
circumstances	colleagues 3:9	181:4	<b>compare</b> 7:22 56:13	concluded 48:7
102:17	Colorado 29:8	<b>comments</b> 2:18 4:7	compared 26:5	57:16
<b>cited</b> 43:4	combinations	4:8 5:2,14 10:17	53:13 90:5	<b>concludes</b> 5:11 6:6,8
<b>citing</b> 63:20	154:10	16:3 22:9 39:25	comparing 173:11	12:8 32:3 55:22
clarification 184:19	come 3:17 21:24	42:8 48:23 65:19	comparison 19:7	94:6 198:15
193:21	38:7 41:9 61:7	66:17 82:24 86:5	58:21	conclusion 57:24
clarifications 9:21	64:12 75:14,21	86:23,24 96:19,20	competence 45:18	58:2
clarify 49:4 85:25	81:13,17 92:5	96:22,23 99:23	competencies 92:13	conclusions 33:20
124:5 133:1,3	93:10,14 96:18	104:2,4,7,15 106:9	competency 47:14	33:21 59:21
138:14 145:18	98:15 101:9	107:23 111:20	compiling 86:22	concurred 65:21
	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u> </u>

[205]

	I			
concurrence 65:22	consequences 21:1	contained 26:3	corner 83:23	<b>covered</b> 8:22 194:12
65:23 68:13 70:3,3	31:16 147:21	contains 27:14	corollary 30:19	covering 158:1
71:25 187:13,25	<b>consider</b> 5:3 47:17	contemplates 24:10	corporate 51:23	covers 29:4 41:17
187:25 188:11	109:7 111:3	contemplating	<b>correct</b> 33:8 69:19	create 41:13 50:1
concurrent 7:19 8:1	134:17 136:7	160:9	79:3 124:1,14,20	71:7 120:12
76:22	159:16 166:25	content 120:22	126:16,17 127:8,9	123:11 127:16
conditions 27:16	197:21	131:21	127:13 128:3,12	128:15,19 129:19
<b>conduct</b> 4:1 5:22	considerable 62:18	<b>context</b> 87:6 90:19	128:21 129:11,24	131:19 133:8
44:6,21 53:23	160:18 183:3	continual 89:23	131:11 132:18,21	157:13 162:14,15
59:15 89:6	consideration 2:20	<b>continue</b> 21:25 26:5	134:13,18 138:20	166:19 184:5
conducted 12:7 85:3	104:19 119:4	89:21 121:10	141:3,4 153:2	created 52:21 56:20
88:25 89:10,14,16	120:23 172:9	129:20 136:6	174:22 177:3	87:12
conducting 3:24	198:4	continuing 87:20	189:2 190:16	creating 35:5 83:17
conducts 10:14	considered 14:20	continuous 111:23	195:18 196:3,9	creation 42:24
<b>confidence</b> 8:5 65:2	119:22 185:20	continuously 179:17	correctly 41:4 47:7	121:3 157:16
65:6 67:18 100:25	considering 37:10	contract 195:20	125:15,22 160:5	criteria 22:22 25:9
106:7	112:10 140:8	contracted 89:5	160:16 187:8	25:12,14 35:6
confined 180:18	consistent 9:18 25:4	contractor 27:9,16	correspondence	49:11,22 82:11,13
<b>confirm</b> 151:6	27:20 28:4 50:20	<b>contribute</b> 7:12 90:2	170:15	82:17 116:5
conflict 73:4 138:25	52:19 68:7 77:15	95:2	corresponding	173:24
conflicting 106:3	163:21 180:25	contributing 65:17	42:16	critical 10:22 11:3,5
confuse 43:17 49:5,9	181:9	contributions 93:7	<b>could-be</b> 147:20	11:19
82:21	consistently 25:24	contributors 58:11	couldn't 43:14	cross-cutting 9:24
<b>confused</b> 117:16	consolidate 52:23	control 44:6 51:13	85:17 135:23	10:1
confusing 18:4 confusion 127:14	182:24	146:10 188:21	counsel 2:10 3:14	cry 77:14
	constantly 64:24	controls 10:3 11:12	4:19 22:11,16 39:4	<b>cryptic</b> 6:1
Congress 8:2 12:1,5	66:18 constitute 3:12	43:25 44:16 52:22	39:7,18 62:24	<b>culture</b> 44:7 72:4
12:6 14:12,22 17:24 24:21 26:15	constrained 14:11	83:15,16 87:8,19 87:22 188:1	100:8 102:10 119:17 151:7	89:7,18 90:18 91:12 93:21
29:10 40:22,23	14:17	conversation 108:13	154:16 155:17	cumbersome 19:2,3
46:19 48:14	constructed 73:4	146:4	154.16 155.17	curious 106:4
113:11 148:14	construction 12:4	Conversely 25:2	199:8	current 9:16 55:14
175:25 184:20	40:15,16 41:14	conversely 23.2	count 55:19 109:25	86:25 88:21 91:4
congressional 7:19	43:4 54:15 57:6	convey 105:21	counter 105:22	92:22 97:9 125:11
8:15 13:3,7,12	59:8 114:7 173:1	convincing 84:10	counterparts 54:12	125:18 131:9
15:6,18,19 28:4	174:12 177:9,11	Conway 33:23	couple 13:21 15:5	161:4 187:14
40:23	174.12 177.9,11	cooler 17:13	111:8 144:20	196:1
Congressionally	180:3,6,9 181:5,10	coordinated 54:6	146:9 148:2	currently 22:20
177:11	181:15,23 182:5	120:20	174:20 180:16	49:10 86:21 105:9
consensus 164:4	185:1	copy 4:12 5:5	187:11 190:4	108:2 115:12
167:12	construed 25:1	131:14 142:17	coupled 28:11	132:19 156:6
consent 117:9,13,14	consultants 46:20	143:11 145:19,23	course 43:12 54:22	178:2,11 187:12
117:21,25 129:22	consultation 156:2	146:1 153:16	78:24 79:1 106:6	187:15,18,23
163:15,16,24	consulted 14:22	core 45:21 91:15	court 100:13	188:1,6 190:3,5
164:6 167:14,16	consumption 79:20	92:3,19 94:13,23	cover 7:3 20:15	cut 174:14 192:11
167:25	contact 51:25 54:12	96:12 99:4 106:18	61:10,11 133:25	cycle 62:5
consequence 147:18	contain 7:3 25:1	122:14	coverage 43:7	cycled 61:25
1 1 1		l		

[206]

	1
D	187:24
daily 54:12	<b>dealing</b> 19:17 20:1
dance 60:8 64:14	45:2 58:24 165:9
106:14	<b>deals</b> 106:2
dancing 60:9 64:19	<b>debate</b> 68:21
67:15 86:10,11	<b>decades</b> 29:6 37:2
<b>Daniel</b> 3:10 119:8	59:3 70:17
119:15 120:10	<b>December</b> 19:23,25
155:15,21	26:9
data 30:13,23 31:6	decide 37:24 38:16
31:15,17 35:25	75:22 76:14
44:22 47:5 48:6,16	109:10,12 114:12
48:19 94:1 173:16	121:20 140:16
	146:25 147:8
196:6	153:22 161:6,10
database 187:22	161:13 176:20
date 10:18 11:25	179:1 186:1
20:13,14 60:18,21	191:17 192:2
60:23,24,25 61:1,4	decided 85:18
61:6 63:20,22,24	decides 78:21
158:14,15,19	decision 11:5 38:8
159:4,8,16 164:5,7	
164:23,24 167:13	70:7,19 78:21 80:
181:18 189:24	147:10 165:19
191:10	180:23
date's 65:8	<b>decision-</b> 69:19
dated 60:19 63:22	76:25
156:1	decision-maker
dates 19:11	69:22
day 22:8 36:23	decision-making
74:19 78:21 143:2	8:15 91:19
170:13	decisions 102:14
day-to-day 73:8	181:21
108:4	decommissioned
days 4:14 7:21 10:12	29:7
11:5,25 33:11	decommissioning
38:20 57:24 62:5	23:4 28:19,22,24
62:17 121:4,9	28:24 29:3,5,12,1
164:5 167:13,17	29:18,21 30:2
198:13	40:10,12
<b>DC</b> 1:20 68:12	decoupled 154:8
deactivation 29:11	decreased 29:18
29:21	dedicate 84:14
<b>deadline</b> 10:18 21:2	dedicates 53:17
deadlines 25:18	deem 152:10
97:9	<b>deemed</b> 104:23
deal 24:24 107:4	deep 62:2 113:12
ucai 24.24 107.4	defeats 39:14
	202000000000000000000000000000000000000

	<b>defense</b> 1:3,17 3:7
7 20:1	12:4 22:16 23:5
165:9	27:5,17 28:20,22
	29:5 30:1,9 50:19
	198:15
37:2	defensive 60:10
	defer 58:22
9:23,25	deficiencies 10:7
7.23,23	<b>define</b> 30:21 43:7
38:16	<b>defined</b> 54:20
30.10 4	191:13
-	defines 30:18
114:12	
):16	definitely 138:2
:8	definition 44:15,17
:6,10	45:3 134:12 148:9
5:20	149:7,9 182:11
1	definitions 192:2
::2	definitive 188:13
8	degree 47:2 78:4
1	196:6
5 38:8	delay 181:22
21 80:4	delaying 181:15
:19	delays 62:2
.17	deliberate 73:15
19	deliberates 111:1
1)	deliberating 145:24
Izon	deliberations 5:4
ker	106:5
1_2	
king	deliberative 120:15
	121:15 122:9
2:14	123:14 127:19
	128:24 135:21
oned	136:15 137:6,7
	139:8,15
oning	<b>deliver</b> 7:18,25
,22,24	delivering 53:6
5,12,15	delivery 8:12
0:2	demolition 30:3
	department 12:3
54:8	18:16 19:8,17
9:18	20:22 21:20 22:23
14	23:4,20 24:1 25:17
:17	27:1,4 28:1,19
.1/	33:6,22 36:9 37:3
23	37:14 38:23 40:16
3:12 1	41:2,23 46:9 47:3 47:3 50:19 51:24
+	1 47:5 50:19 51:74
	17.18 8 0.13 8 1.2 1

51:25 54:6 57:19 59:2,4 82:19 114:8 114:9,21 142:18 142:18,25,25 143:12 144:19 145:9 146:9,11,12 146:22 148:1 149:1 152:5,6,7,12 152:16 155:25 156:5 160:9,12 170:3 177:15 178:3 183:15 184:7,21,24 185:25
Department's 24:13
25:25 183:6,7
departmental 24:19 26:6 27:8 120:21 120:25 131:23 departments 175:1 depending 62:1
139:1 191:15
depends 32:23 depicts 51:3 52:12 52:15 53:8 deputy 51:6 52:16 52:18 56:19 61:20 61:22 65:13 69:2,9 70:14 71:11 73:18 77:8
<b>derive</b> 97:21
descend 179:16
<b>describe</b> 7:11 38:6 65:4 68:6 73:2
<b>described</b> 13:5
22:17 24:20 28:7 29:9 42:21 47:9 60:6 184:17
describes 22:25
26:16 28:21
184:24
describing 25:13
62:8 71:18
<b>description</b> 101:14 188:13
design 8:25 10:22,25

11:3 12:3 51:8

```
54:15 57:1,6 59:7
 114:7 173:1
 174:11,12 177:8
 177:10,13,19
 179:7,9 181:5,10
 181:15,16,23
  182:5 184:25
designed 29:1 47:12
 51:21 96:7 170:4
desire 59:23 103:11
 115:9 121:6 132:3
 133:17 138:22
 178:7
desired 87:9
desires 66:14 102:21
despite 95:10
 180:19
detail 13:5,14
detailed 9:4 24:17
 25:13 59:18 145:5
 145:6
deter 16:19
determination
 121:15
determine 28:14
determined 31:17
 185:15
determines 14:12
determining 91:17
deterrent 113:14
develop 15:6 18:19
 80:10 94:13
 156:10 173:1,13
 173:25 181:2
 191:19
developed 30:15,20
 87:7,10 106:19
developing 188:25
development 11:13
 91:15,21 92:25
 96:12 155:24
develops 26:18
 43:22 134:6
dialogue 133:14
 186:25
didn't 16:8 19:1
 40:13 41:1 49:9
```

6/3/2015

61:7 76:20,22	<b>directly</b> 3:10,11	discussions 37:23	145:22 150:7	84:24 87:4 96:18
83:18 84:21 85:8	37:5 42:25	80:24 122:23	151:21,23 153:1	96:21,25 99:17
85:21 96:1 115:19	director 2:13 4:21	185:5 198:5	173:2,7 180:25	101:5,7 103:13,13
140:16 146:7	45:13 47:24 50:10	disease 194:20,21	DOE's 11:5 12:4	106:12 107:24
160:14,23 161:11	50:15,17 51:5,6	dismissed 78:5	26:19 28:6 47:13	108:4,8,10 109:14
172:16 193:22	52:19 55:9 56:19	disposal 70:13	51:22,24 52:5	111:16 112:22
difference 22:7	56:19 61:20,20,22	disposition 121:10	133:16	114:3 127:14,23
136:2 144:12	61:23 62:10 64:14	121:12 137:24	doesn't 17:24 32:11	128:4 129:10
179:7	65:14 67:3 69:2,9	<b>distinct</b> 22:21 72:18	32:19 34:14 48:8	130:12 133:10,10
differences 12:2	69:9 70:2,14 71:11	182:24	57:21 76:5 78:16	133:19 134:19
58:10 92:6 180:20	73:19,24 74:2 77:9	distinction 82:14	100:16,22 101:1	135:12 136:1,12
different 34:16	78:15,20 108:13	distinguish 37:8	102:4 105:21	138:11,12,20
37:15 56:18,22	115:9 157:22	distribution 28:4	111:16,25 139:17	139:25 140:3,3,11
58:19 59:11 67:7	170:14 176:7	120:24	139:18 146:17	140:17,17 145:9
67:13 71:16,20,20	178:16 186:7	diverse 54:19 55:10	147:4 162:1 163:7	148:6,15,20
84:1 93:10 110:5,5	Director's 52:16	110:4	164:22,25 165:10	149:12 150:5,12
110:6,6 124:17,18	<b>directors</b> 4:17 14:7	divided 91:9	dog 110:18	150:17 153:22
144:14 153:10	116:16,22 156:2	<b>DNFSB</b> 120:18,22	<b>doing</b> 13:4 14:8 17:8	156:15,16 158:10
165:17,18 173:22	172:8	121:1,10,24	17:9 20:18 35:1,23	161:18,18 164:24
174:5 180:2,6,7,10	disagree 110:12	131:24 142:15	36:16 42:7 47:15	169:24 170:8,9,22
188:1,3	disagreement 85:22	143:2 156:2,3,7	48:4 59:7,8,11,14	171:5,25 176:17
differentiate 105:15	85:24	157:25 158:5	68:8,25 73:16,17	178:23 179:4
differently 149:9	disapprove 5:5	document 10:25	80:5 83:23 87:15	182:15 185:21
161:19 185:25	disapproves 131:5	26:22 30:24 46:9	87:17,19,24 96:16	187:3,6 195:1,8,11
differing 72:8,10,20	disaster 43:22	58:17 61:19 65:21	105:22 108:8,9	196:21
72:24 73:20,23	discretion 24:12	67:2 70:4 120:9	109:8 114:23	door 95:12,13 170:7
74:16 75:2,7	25:10 27:13	139:1,12,13	129:10,19 152:4	170:7 196:20,22
difficult 16:25 17:2	discuss 4:25 6:21	160:25 165:22	165:20 166:16	197:5
100:3,20	50:15 88:19 91:3	168:23 169:6	167:4 170:24	<b>DPO</b> 171:22
digitally 199:5	100:7 112:14	184:18 185:10,13	178:17 180:13	<b>draft</b> 46:9 65:12,13
<b>dipping</b> 182:15	188:23	186:8,10 198:12	<b>DOJ</b> 119:16 155:16	65:19 105:5
direct 11:23 112:8,9	discussed 158:4	documented 72:17	155:22	112:23 120:22
116:20 118:7	discusses 13:14	78:7,8	<b>domain</b> 135:18	121:1,5 131:24,25
120:17 142:15	discussing 105:18	documenting 11:23	144:15	135:9 143:11
157:25 163:19	135:20	documents 10:23	don't 12:17 17:15	146:1 149:16
189:4	discussion 22:8	70:20 86:23	18:19,20,20 32:11	153:16 156:11
directed 175:7	32:21 35:21 36:22	188:10	32:13,21,24,25	160:15 170:17
direction 30:15	40:18 46:25 49:2	<b>DOE</b> 10:7,16 25:11	34:22 35:22 39:5,6	190:12
35:18 52:20 81:5	50:1 71:3 81:16	26:21 28:22 29:13	41:15 42:7,13	drafted 157:23
106:3,25 114:3	102:3 103:4,12	29:17 45:17 54:12	44:15 46:13,21	drafting 30:24
178:10 199:6	115:1 120:2 128:6	55:1 57:9 81:4	47:19 48:19,23	119:20 157:7,16
directives 10:16	128:10 129:6	112:19,20,21	49:5,15 56:6 58:5	158:2
41:16,16,21 43:4	130:16 132:7,10	120:20 121:7,9,19	58:6 60:1,9 63:11	<b>draw</b> 59:21
86:21,25 114:10	139:15 140:4	122:17 131:21,23	63:18 64:19 66:19	drawing 90:20
173:2 178:12	141:15,16 151:17	131:25 132:1	66:20 70:22 72:2	<b>drawn</b> 53:25
181:2 187:4,5,9	168:20 170:14	133:9,16 134:24	74:19,21 75:23	<b>Drew</b> 113:6,8
188:8 189:7	171:14 187:10	134:25 138:17	76:3,12 79:8,19,22	<b>drill</b> 196:5,6
-	I	I	I	I

[208]

drive 53:2 63:1
drives 80:4
<b>driving</b> 98:9 196:8
due 20:8 43:22
duration 58:11
190:25
<b>duties</b> 138:24
163:22
<b>duty</b> 109:10
dynamic 65:16
93:24

 $\mathbf{E}$ **e-mail** 104:15 earlier 35:24 108:25 113:24 137:20 148:12 149:25 169:21 170:12 171:2,15 172:20 187:23 early 19:9,9 24:21 29:14 33:11 37:2 37:25 73:25 83:13 92:19 99:14 117:9 117:24,24,25 135:11 147:15 161:2,18 165:22 184:25 185:4 earnest 160:1 easier 75:9 111:14 easy 48:2 84:6 181:16 echo 112:13 editor 65:9 editorial 9:20 **effect** 30:19 177:10 184:19 185:11 187:17 188:5 effective 21:6 35:1 36:16 108:23 170:2 171:1 181:11 183:24 185:15 effectively 50:25 51:24 53:14 98:4 effectiveness 8:10

8:17 31:13

efficiency 8:17 **efficient** 27:1 108:22 165:20 170:2 183:21,23 efficiently 50:24 170:25 effort 84:15 93:14 103:23 160:19 161:7 173:19 188:9,23 efforts 94:5 195:24 195:25 Eggenberger 34:4 eight 11:9 20:16 61:4 186:17 eight-page 36:10 either 43:22 107:16 139:2 154:5 161:10 164:8 172:25 193:1 194:8 **element** 150:3 **elements** 24:2 31:18 31:21 47:18 51:6 52:1 eligible 89:2 **EM** 52:6 email 4:7,7,8 26:24 embarking 15:5 embedded 55:7 187:25 188:10 **embrace** 107:4 **emerged** 89:19 **emergency** 31:11,14 31:18 43:15 44:14 44:16,17 47:16 159:25 160:8 emerging 59:19 emphasis 92:3 emphasize 54:17 employed 25:24 199:8 employee 76:24 88:24 91:20 92:2 92:11 93:11 105:9 176:16 199:10

employee-type

173:8 employees 11:17 27:15 46:21 89:2 90:1,12,14 91:16 91:23,25 92:5 93:7 93:12,22 99:2,7 102:6,16 108:2 115:2,6 171:23 172:2 employment 116:3 employs 46:7 enables 53:6 **enabling** 17:22 28:8 30:11 40:8 50:20 enacted 178:5 encountered 24:19 175:23 **encourage** 6:3 94:25 97:17 162:7 170:6 172:1 encouraged 5:19 94:12 196:20 197:21 encourages 7:18,25 encouraging 92:5 endeavor 38:6 endorse 109:8 enduring 171:13 energy 12:3 19:8,17 20:22 22:23 23:2,4 23:8,20 24:5 26:12 27:5,15 28:1,19 30:9 33:6 36:9 40:24 41:3,23 52:1 54:6 57:19 114:8 114:21 144:20 146:11,22 152:12 157:17 158:2 160:9 170:3 171:4 178:4 183:15 184:7,21 **Energy's** 50:19 51:24 66:19 114:9 142:18,25 engage 5:4 99:2 engaged 91:17

engagement 91:20 92:2 105:12 engaging 178:3 engineer 43:24 54:4 54:14 69:8 engineering 56:25 57:9 **engineers** 52:2,13 54:9,10,24 **ensuing** 87:11 **ensure** 50:25 51:22 52:19 54:5 71:13 77:9 91:25 93:17 ensured 71:5 ensuring 181:8 entering 10:16 enterprise 113:14 **enters** 63:5 entertain 5:1 132:25 entertaining 116:3 entire 25:4 51:19 54:1 55:20 70:12 87:1 131:17 175:5 entities 88:14 89:17 entitled 28:18 31:11 81:9 137:2 environment 91:22 94:15,18 environmental 30:4 52:6 envision 35:4 133:24 134:15 147:18 154:9 envisioned 87:14 88:2 133:13,14,24 166:16 envisioning 15:9 envisions 32:22 EPA-regulated 30:3 **equal** 104:17 equally 112:9 equipment 47:16 48:8 equivalent 115:24 era 84:1,21 ergo 185:12

error 43:23,23 44:3

44:4,8,9 especially 18:14 37:21 44:22 essence 77:14 80:11 163:9 essentially 50:23 56:21 57:4 58:21 178:7 182:22 establish 25:19 41:8 50:23 107:17 established 3:16 7:13,24 8:23 9:6 9:19 10:4,10,15,19 11:1,6 23:17 27:4 establishes 7:8 22:22 23:6 25:9 26:10 30:7 51:13 establishing 9:15 **estimate** 191:20 estimated 190:25 et 43:25 128:17,17 144:17 152:9 evaluate 55:14 72:14 188:12 evaluating 23:20 24:17 26:6 evaluation 31:25 59:19 73:17 96:4 event 23:23 144:12 179:23 199:7 eventually 174:8 everybody 5:10 35:10 37:20,24 75:16 94:17,17 98:3,21 172:8 everybody's 167:17 182:8 evident 89:23 evolutionary 107:16 exactly 44:8,9,19 99:17 101:5 106:22 107:12 108:7 132:24 178:22 example 24:25 25:16 33:7 40:9 48:2 51:16 52:1,10

105:14 181:8

[209]

53:5 56:24 59:7,10	expec
60:20 61:5 66:4,8	98:5
66:16 70:23 72:9	153
73:21 80:1 85:3	expec
94:1 174:11 185:3	107
<b>examples</b> 43:3 45:5	expec
60:14 63:20	153
115:22 116:1	expec
<b>exceed</b> 157:24	expec
exceeds 104:18	exper
excellence 8:25	exper
14:24	49:1
<b>exception</b> 9:20 67:6	70:1
78:5 136:7	110
exchange 103:10	exper
106:21	exper
Excuse 16:1	53:1
execute 45:19 55:8	70:1
executed 99:12	96:8
execution 69:18	195
138:23	exper
<b>executive</b> 3:15 41:1	expir
executives 92:21	expla
exercise 42:13,24	101
43:8 115:23	162
177:22	expla
exercised 72:13 exerted 161:13	expla
exist 31:6,17 52:8	expla
54:3 103:12	explic 115
165:10	explic
existed 24:22	120
existing 6:14,23	explo
12:9 22:18 52:23	expos
68:4 87:22 162:21	expre
173:12 180:3,5,21	190
180:25 182:23	expre
188:5	147
exists 30:13,23	expre
48:13,16 72:11	expre
161:13 178:11	exten
192:3	exten
expanded 92:24	exten
93:2	exten
expanding 93:5,6	exten
expansion 115:21	104
115:25	extre

expect 16:8 44:3 98:5 136:5 138:11 153:9 196:13 expectation 106:18 107:6 145:19 expectations 24:2 153:1 expecting 145:21 expects 150:25 expend 171:4 experience 45:24,24 49:16 58:5,23 67:9 70:17 95:2 96:2
110:6 197:4
experiences 101:25
expertise 52:10,14 53:18 58:18 69:14 70:15 85:9,15,16 96:8 110:7 113:12 195:3
<b>experts</b> 24:11 197:1
expiration 181:18 explain 13:6 71:16 101:10 129:9 162:24
explained 75:12
explaining 74:10 explanation 145:13 explicit 42:18 114:3 115:1 128:23,25 explicitly 30:24 120:19 122:11 explore 173:21 exposure 47:10
express 98:6 106:17
190:21
<b>expressed</b> 7:14 147:16
expressing 72:3
expression 7:15
extending 77:5
extends 195:19
extension 135:3
extensive 54:19
extent 53:3 55:15
104:23
extremely 65:5

<b>eye</b> 144:6
$oxed{\mathbf{F}}$
<b>face</b> 196:22
faced 72:23 115:2
facilitate 29:25
facilitating 27:23
<b>facilities</b> 1:3,17 3:7 12:4 22:16 23:5
27:5,9,17 28:20
50:20 51:8 179:8
180:6 182:5
198:15
facility 27:9 28:22
29:5,16 30:1 43:20
43:23 114:16 180:3,10,20,21
fact 41:18 60:3 62:3
72:11 86:19 95:10
175:17 191:11
<b>fact-</b> 27:5
fact-finding 178:6
<b>factors</b> 31:7 161:12 <b>facts</b> 71:4
factual 58:14 62:11
62:15 71:7 79:5
factually 79:3
<b>fail</b> 47:10 48:9
failure 31:18
fair 22:3 37:17 43:6
50:2 74:8 81:19 109:23 137:23
179:24
fairly 21:21 82:22
188:4
<b>fall</b> 92:19 174:13
176:18 191:5
far 82:6 98:12
177:14 184:24 <b>faster</b> 108:19
fathom 47:3
faults 36:14
favorable 178:22
favorite 162:17
fear 111:8
<b>feasible</b> 7:15
<b>February</b> 7:1,7 8:21

160:4,4 **fed** 66:10,14 **federal** 3:19 8:5,6 8:10,12,17 27:15 41:1 88:24 104:6 117:19 162:3 176:16 **feed** 118:7 feedback 15:14,21 18:11,12 65:10 87:15,23 88:18 89:4 90:25 92:11 93:3 98:23,25 100:1 102:2 103:13 109:23 112:21 116:15,16 116:18,22 120:20 120:23 121:5,7,9 122:17,22 131:20 132:2 133:9,16 134:24,25 135:1,3 135:16 138:17 143:25 145:10,11 145:21,22 149:2 153:7,9 158:13 169:17 172:16 197:2 feel 20:21 57:19 64:23 68:23 79:15 79:15 95:9 99:11 105:14,14 113:5 115:6 133:1 135:3 149:9 171:25 194:4 195:14,15 197:2 feels 75:25 fell 44:14 **fellow** 75:4 79:12 131:13 156:14 158:18 198:1 **felt** 160:7,13 **FEVS** 88:25 89:5,9 94:4 97:8 fewer 194:24 **field** 24:11 fifty/fifty 34:5 **figure** 16:22 17:11

17:12 18:5,6 84:23 97:12 108:7,11,21 145:12 186:22 189:14 191:14 195:13 197:8 fill 166:21 filled 71:3 166:2 filtering 49:10 81:21 final 30:3,5 65:13 72:2 74:3 89:12 93:2 94:2 120:23 124:13 167:10 183:2 finalized 68:4 **finally** 4:21 7:20 11:2 23:5 88:20 90:25 115:8 financially 199:11 find 16:11 100:2,3 101:16 182:13 **findings** 178:8 fine 186:19 196:19 **finger** 170:20 fingers 36:5 **finish** 20:1 finishing 29:22 first 4:17 6:10,11 7:7 9:2,8,11,14,25 11:22 18:25 23:11 23:15,17 24:16,20 24:22 36:18 50:23 58:1,25 63:21 84:11,11 89:22 91:9 98:19 103:18 119:23 120:4 122:6 123:2,7,19 125:5 127:7,7,14 128:11 135:20 136:15 137:4 139:8 155:18 157:13 158:12 163:25 168:7 169:15 174:7,14 175:11,14 176:9 177:7,9 178:16 180:17 191:13,25 192:4

[210]

-	
<b>first-order</b> 43:18,20	2
fiscal 7:22 8:20,22	1
9:17,18 30:10 89:4	for
90:7 99:19 190:5	For
fit 84:23	1
five 13:10 20:3,12	1
35:25 60:14,16	for
63:10 65:1 104:18	3
121:4,9	$\begin{array}{c c} 3 \\ 1 \end{array}$
fix 18:1 21:5 43:24	for
43:25	1
fixes 181:16	1
flag 64:8	for
<b>flat</b> 51:10	for
Flats 29:8,12	1
flexibility 55:10	1
flexible 53:15 55:7	for
<b>flip</b> 110:3	1
floor 12:13 16:5	for
64:14 96:24 99:23	1
120:1 159:9	for
focus 8:11 51:11	7
53:6 89:11 95:19	1
194:7	for
focused 29:10,20	8
52:20	1
<b>FOIA</b> 39:8 114:20	1
135:8,12 136:25	1
137:8,10 138:15	for
139:18,20 173:6	1
175:8,11 176:9	for
<b>FOIAs</b> 139:19	for
folder 60:22 63:6	for
66:9 142:21	For
folks 6:1 69:10 95:8	for
110:16 143:25	for
<b>follow</b> 37:25 64:21	9
104:12 197:1	1
198:6	1
<b>follow-on</b> 147:14	1
<b>followed</b> 104:14	1
<b>following</b> 4:24 51:5	1
61:17 85:4 121:3	for
175:18	for
<b>follows</b> 73:15	fou
127:16 194:16	fou
followup 15:11	fou
	I

23:23 67:21	
194:11 198:5	
foregoing 199:4	
Forestall 17:1,14	
143:14 144:1,10	
144:11	
form 7:15 25:13	
33:14 72:14 134:1	
177:11,22	
formal 35:6 120:20	-
122:21 131:20	
135:24 197:1	
formality 85:2	]
formalize 103:3	
121:17 136:3,10	
138:16	
<b>formalized</b> 31:4	]
122:19 133:8	
formalizing 122:5	:
122:13	
formally 23:25 37:2	
72:17 129:12	
153:7 178:20	
format 13:14 81:13	
81:18 84:19	
133:17 135:14	
167:16 184:5	
185:18	
<b>formed</b> 45:22	]
177:13	
<b>forming</b> 73:16	1
forms 93:11	1
formulated 68:3	1
Forrestal 41:21	
<b>forth</b> 151:17 166:19	1
<b>forward</b> 63:7 96:8	
98:15 99:1,7	1
100:22 106:8	
107:2,18 121:7	]
128:20 134:1	
184:7 194:15	1
197:22	
forwarded 46:10	
forwarding 133:16	
<b>found</b> 43:14 68:10	
foundation 91:13	
four 5:3 7:3 8:23 9:7	
	l

22:20 23:13,13
65:1 76:23 77:20
77:21 79:14,16
80:16,17,19 99:18
119:4 125:2
139:22 143:8
fourth 9:3,9,13
119:18 157:4
frame 33:13 40:22
195:9
frames 62:7
framework 94:16
<b>framing</b> 182:18
free 57:19 95:9
102:14 115:6
193:18 197:2
frequent 54:11
197:23
frequently 27:8
34:22,22 64:5
friendliest 168:18
friendly 158:17
•
159:8,12,13 162:9
162:25 163:2,5
164:9 165:3,24
166:6,25,25
167:23,24,25
168:3,4,15,16,17
<b>front</b> 21:16 66:23
94:21
fruit 58:25
<b>full</b> 23:17 180:8
fully 6:2 20:10 23:24
28:4 84:24
function 24:16
61:24
<b>functions</b> 7:4 11:19
43:5 53:3
<b>fundamental</b> 53:12
92:7 94:14
<b>funding</b> 17:17
<b>further</b> 9:6 22:4
26:20 28:3,13
30:21 32:1 37:11
48:25 49:25 63:7
80:1,4 128:6
130:15 132:25
150.15 152.25

141:16 142:23 148:4 154:2,3 168:20 170:4 198:13 199:10 Furthermore 23:25 furthest 56:3 future 24:24 26:7
31:25 41:14 45:18
91:18 94:5 111:14
166:3
<b>FYI-type</b> 37:25
<u>G</u>
<b>game</b> 179:24
gap 82:15 163:14
165:5
<b>gaps</b> 181:3
gather 27:12 155:23
gathered 27:24
gathering 27:6
68:12
gathers 37:15
general 2:7,10,16
3:14 4:17,19,25
6:12 7:3,12 22:11
22:16 39:4,6,17
59:21 62:24 68:23
89:13 100:8
102:10 115:3
151:7 155:17
156:3 192:4
193:14
generally 17:24
20:15 33:14,20
44:2 56:12 59:14
61:10 77:6 90:13
144:7 148:1 160:8
generate 47:5 156:5
generic 53:21
177:24
generically 61:15
genesis 26:16
<b>get-</b> 113:3
<b>getting</b> 64:23 83:14
91:16 130:11
135:16 171:1

188:8 196:24

```
give 34:2,6 85:3
 87:6 101:11,11,20
 102:11 103:18
 104:16,19 106:11
 107:22 111:5
 112:21 113:22
 116:11,16,17
 117:25 131:14
 133:20,21 143:11
 143:15 144:19
 145:8,10 146:14
 148:1 151:22
 152:12 153:15
 162:19,21 173:15
 173:15 174:13
 176:4 188:13
given 5:23 98:6
 107:3 121:4 152:7
 176:3,16
gives 117:10
giving 5:20 17:18
 36:21 39:7 122:22
 135:1,9,11 166:16
glad 115:17
go 13:12 34:15 35:7
 35:7 36:18 42:24
 43:6,24,24,25
 44:10 45:6 48:22
 49:8,8 56:14,17
 58:22 60:22 64:5
 66:1 72:9 75:5,14
 77:21 83:23 84:13
 85:8 95:1 101:1
 106:4,13 108:8
 111:11,17,20
 115:24 117:25
 123:10 126:6
 128:7 132:14
 135:17 144:3,3
 145:16 146:25
 149:12,22 151:19
 151:19 153:5,25
 154:22 158:18
 159:24 161:3,18
 162:3,4 164:12,14
 164:20,25 169:10
 174:2,4,10,21
```

[211]

	l
179:19 184:6	168:22 1
185:18 193:18	172:16,1
194:4 195:12	174:24 1
196:18	183:18 1
<b>go-around</b> 175:24	185:22 1
<b>goal</b> 9:9 10:19,25	191:21 1
11:6,8,10,13 14:23	194:23 1
18:15 58:14 90:9	197:12,1
91:25 93:4 134:23	<b>good</b> 3:5 6
135:1 137:15	16:11,15
138:14	22:12 36
<b>goals</b> 6:22,24 7:3,9	41:25 43
7:11,12,13,23 8:8	47:1 48:2
8:9,13,23 9:2,5,8,8	60:9 63:2
9:11,13,15,16,17	81:10 82
9:19,22,23 10:4,9	84:3 94:
10:15 11:9 12:10	102:5 10
15:8,8,15 99:2	106:10 1
goes 17:16 20:19	160:22 1
21:2 27:7 34:25	163:3,4
62:10 66:1 68:24	171:13 1
69:20,20 77:25	198:2
80:5,9 94:2 167:21	gosh 17:8
181:24 182:1	_
101.24.102.1	- POLLEII I ).
	gotten 15:
189:11	govern 17
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16	govern 17 governing
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24	govern 17 governing 120:19 1
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2	govern 17' governing 120:19 1 142:9,16
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Government
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16	govern 17/ governing 120:19 1 142:9,16/ Governme 6:19 8:6/ GPRA 6:2
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8:
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8
189:11 <b>going</b> 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4	govern 17/ governing 120:19 1 142:9,16/ Governme 6:19 8:6/ GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 3/ great 17:8/
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24	govern 17' governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 3 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7 130:21 133:7	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9 group 18:2
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7 130:21 133:7 135:13 136:17	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9 group 18:1 45:21 51
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7 130:21 133:7 135:13 136:17 141:2 144:15,21	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 3 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9 group 18:1 45:21 51 52:9,11,
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7 130:21 133:7 135:13 136:17 141:2 144:15,21 145:1 148:2,11,11	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9 group 18:1 45:21 51 52:9,11,53:22 54
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7 130:21 133:7 135:13 136:17 141:2 144:15,21 145:1 148:2,11,11 149:3,10 153:8	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9 group 18: 45:21 51 52:9,11, 53:22 54 55:5,13,
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7 130:21 133:7 135:13 136:17 141:2 144:15,21 145:1 148:2,11,11 149:3,10 153:8 154:14,15 165:21	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 3 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9 group 18:1 45:21 51 52:9,11, 53:22 54 55:5,13, 56:25,25
189:11 going 6:17 35:16 47:4,10 55:24 60:14 63:3 73:2 77:14,16 81:14,23 85:14 86:24 87:9 87:20 88:16 95:16 97:4,4 98:10,14 99:1,6,11 102:12 103:6 105:4 106:4 106:8 107:5,13 109:24 110:1,1 111:9,10 112:8,24 113:1 114:1 116:3 117:12 124:12 125:1 126:4 127:7 130:21 133:7 135:13 136:17 141:2 144:15,21 145:1 148:2,11,11 149:3,10 153:8	govern 17 governing 120:19 1 142:9,16 Governme 6:19 8:6 GPRA 6:2 7:6,20 8: grabbing 8 great 17:8 67:18 98 107:10 1 126:1 15 greater 20 groundbre 59:9 group 18: 45:21 51 52:9,11, 53:22 54 55:5,13,

168:22 171:5,22
172:16,17 173:21
174:24 178:19
183:18 184:6
185:22 189:8
191:21 194:11,18
194:23 196:13
197:12,13
<b>good</b> 3:5 6:3,16
16:11,15 18:11,12
22:12 36:20,22
41:25 43:3,8 44:8
47:1 48:2,4 50:13 60:9 63:25 79:12
81:10 82:14,19
84:3 94:16 99:7
102:5 103:23
106:10 123:6
160:22 161:6,8
163:3,4 170:18,25
171:13 176:18
198:2
gosh 17:8 84:12
gotten 15:20 18:8
govern 177:24
governing 119:13
120:19 122:1
142:9,16 155:10
Government 3:20
6:19 8:6 41:2
<b>GPRA</b> 6:21,21,25
7:6,20 8:4
grabbing 83:21
great 17:8,9 65:5
67:18 98:22
107:10 125:4
126:1 159:22
greater 20:7 110:10
groundbreaking
59:9
<b>group</b> 18:19 41:8
45:21 51:17,19,23
52:9,11,16,17,21
53:22 54:2,9 55:4
55:5,13,17,18
56:25,25 57:1,2,3
57:7,8,9 61:18

65:17 66:2,5,11 69:1,8 70:18 71:1 71:10,11 73:6,10 73:12 77:8 78:14
86:20,20 89:11 96:4 105:10 169:22 179:18
194:7 Group's 52:25 groupings 56:18 groups 52:4 53:6
57:2 grow 107:16 growth 93:23 guess 34:17,25
44:24 45:12 46:16 46:20 64:1 81:8,19 83:25 95:25 101:19 103:9
109:6 113:20 116:13 117:9,23 118:6 136:14,22 154:1 174:7
176:24 183:18 188:22 191:24 guidance 24:17
25:15 26:3 29:2 30:15 42:6 68:7 102:10 184:6 <b>guide</b> 23:19 26:6
29:24 41:13 91:18 <b>guy</b> 49:1 130:3 <b>guys</b> 113:16 170:22
180:13 188:25 H half 45:22
hammer 81:7

## half 45:22 hammer 81:7 hand 17:21 163:11 handful 194:24 Hanford 29:12,22 85:4 happen 44:18 93:15 109:22 110:8 133:14 136:11 144:10 149:7 154:10 178:22,23

196:14 happened 41:20 44:18 66:8 83:12 103:10 113:24 happening 18:16 21:17,23 61:9,12 64:22 happens 72:22 136:2 196:11 happy 12:10 32:4 55:22 94:6 108:24 117:21,24 130:2,2 167:22 hard 17:11 18:17 37:8 67:1,16,19,24 68:8 108:7 hash 75:14 76:3 hasn't 33:22 108:16 178:20 haven't 15:20 18:8,8 49:4,11,11 54:16 56:11 79:19 81:15 81:15,17 97:19 136:9 183:6 **Hazard** 10:21 11:2 hazards 31:5 he's 12:22,23 70:15 70:15,17 73:13 130:17 138:20 159:9 163:9 headquarters 52:1 52:20 55:16 131:21 132:1 **heads-up** 150:7,14 health 16:14 28:6 76:2 81:2 179:11 hear 103:13 144:13 176:6 184:3 heard 46:18 103:4 169:21 186:4 hearing 85:5 128:5 158:25 hearings 12:7 85:4 heart 122:4 heavy 81:7 heels 175:18 **held** 3:19

help 18:15 85:9 90:17 96:4,6,9 99:5 115:18 137:21 170:2 171:2,3,3 174:24 195:4 196:13 197:7 **helpful** 75:10 182:14 **helping** 8:12 89:8 here's 48:5 100:19 111:8 146:3 147:5 147:5 hereto 199:11 hesitancy 79:6 hesitate 59:21 75:2 hey 36:11 146:7 170:22,23 **Hi** 110:23 high 65:5 73:2 183:16 high-quality 90:22 higher 98:22,24 highest 53:18 113:15 184:8 **highly** 55:12 Hill 17:17 144:17 historical 34:14 49:18 90:5 history 19:5 28:7 33:4 41:4 47:9 49:14 56:11 110:3 hitch 176:19 **hitting** 174:17 Hold 155:7 holding 8:6 **holiday** 19:18 holidays 20:2 hope 43:17 75:23 76:9 hopefully 36:22 171:6 196:7 hopes 40:16 hoping 195:11 hotwash 85:5 **House** 113:9

How's 56:13

[212]

<b>huge</b> 179:18 <b>huh</b> 130:9	63:20,22 64:10 67:15 73:1 75:1	ideally 85:14 ideas 95:1	46:24 59:23 60:4 87:23 90:7,17	INDEX 2:1 Indiana 1:18 170:13
human 11:16 43:22	80:23 82:8 83:3,6	identical 180:22	92:15 186:16	indicate 90:8 92:18
43:23 44:3,4,8,9	83:8 84:18 85:1,12	identified 53:16	improved 98:8	indicating 170:9
hundred 179:18	88:16 94:6,11	88:20 90:10,24	111:25	indications 178:21
hunts 110:18	95:22 96:8 97:13	91:5 93:17 98:5	improvement 67:25	individual 9:25 22:1
nunts 110.10	102:18 107:7,18	103:11	86:16 87:16 90:24	25:14 51:20 54:22
I	108:10,21 109:24	identifies 23:25	91:9 93:21 94:5	61:14 69:5 82:9
<b>I'd</b> 3:8 5:8 6:9,10	110:1,1,23,23	28:23	111:23	85:9 91:21 100:3
15:24 16:4 22:10	111:23 113:1,8,8	identify 96:5,6	improvements 53:2	112:21 122:15,19
23:12 37:23 50:9	114:1,3 115:17	102:16 194:24	58:13 59:3 86:25	190:21
54:17 55:22 58:1	116:7,10 117:12	IDPs 91:21	improving 8:4,7,10	individually 23:14
58:22 79:6 83:1	117:21,24 120:3	<b>IG</b> 15:14 83:14	8:15 11:11,15,21	32:24 36:21 83:20
88:10 95:25 96:10	122:4,21 126:4	172:1	14:25 89:25 91:11	178:14
96:10 101:8	128:2,3,18 129:11	igniting 50:8	91:22 92:25	individuals 4:5 46:5
105:10 111:3	130:2,2,11 132:18	illustrated 54:3	in-depth 195:13	57:1 69:1 72:16
116:14,21 117:9	133:21 134:8,22	imagine 75:1 100:11	inaccuracies 79:5	73:20,22 110:5
119:3 148:17	135:14,22,25	100:12 143:14	inadequate 77:23	inexpensive 181:17
158:12,17 162:8	136:3,10,12 137:3	immediate 90:12	inception 25:6 72:13	infinite 58:8
163:2 177:9,17	137:9,14 139:11	immediately 91:11	include 8:4 55:16	influence 149:3
183:13 184:3	137.9,14 139.11	impacted 143:15	90:18	influences 69:5
191:24 192:18	140:3,9,12 143:24	_	included 6:22 12:6	info 149:8
196:19 198:6	, , ,	<b>implement</b> 30:16 33:1 49:22		
I'll 12:23 22:4 28:17	145:20 147:10,21		includes 51:5 90:21	<b>inform</b> 79:7 118:3 182:22
56:5 61:15 64:12	147:22,23 149:13	implementation	91:10 190:17	
64:18,18 80:13	149:14 150:20	22:24 23:22 24:4,8	including 29:5 36:4	<b>information</b> 8:14,16
85:3 94:9 96:18	152:23 154:1,4,15	24:14 25:11,17	92:12 93:6 121:14	14:1 23:1 26:11,12
98:20 106:14	157:8 158:25	26:1 97:21	186:19 190:24	26:13,18,25 27:12
113:22,22 114:4	159:2,3,24 164:16	<b>implemented</b> 46:10	<b>incorporate</b> 119:16	27:13,14,24 28:3
117:25 120:1	165:10 167:22	91:10 93:17	155:15,21,24	28:11 32:9 33:6
126:20,20 127:13	168:22 170:19,20	implementing 3:22	164:4 167:12	34:1,5,11 35:7
131:14 132:15	170:20 171:22	30:21 87:12	incorporated 122:3	37:9,10,11,14,22
139:5 154:20	174:2 187:20	implications 62:13	134:11 185:7	37:25 53:1 67:10
163:10 169:10,14	190:10 191:21	185:12	incorporates 163:14	76:25 79:24 80:2,3
177:7 190:11	192:8 193:3 194:1	implicit 132:23	165:4	82:14,19,20 92:1
191:8 196:21	195:11,23 196:22	implicitly 42:18	increase 135:4	100:18 101:6,15
I'm 5:19 6:17 12:10	197:12,12,20	important 29:24	Increased 91:19	108:5 122:16
	I've 15:4 16:10	38:3 68:22,22,24	increasing 91:24	135:5 137:2
15:8 17:3 18:1,4,5	21:15 36:2 42:11	69:14 79:9 95:3	92:2	143:16 153:1
18:6 20:17 21:4,5	42:12 43:16 46:18	96:13 97:23 98:11	independence 71:17	155:23 156:6,8
21:21 22:15 32:12	47:9 57:13 64:13	106:19 108:18,21	71:21	163:18 165:18,22
34:17 35:5,15,15	64:13 67:11 76:23	110:17 150:3	independent 70:5	166:2 172:3
35:20,21 36:5,15	80:24 83:3 114:5	166:13 170:23	70:11 72:2,8,14	<b>informed</b> 6:5 25:21
38:11,15 39:9 41:9	143:25 161:21	194:17	73:14,17,17,21	165:16
46:16,17 47:24,25	170:17 180:16	importantly 92:7	74:8 125:19	Infrastructure 51:8
48:12,17 49:21,21	186:3 197:16	imposed 148:14	146:24,24	<b>initial</b> 23:21 24:18
50:15 55:24 60:8	idea 43:3 85:8	impressive 89:2,15	independently	65:12,19 94:22
60:10,11,14,20,25	111:11 112:10	<b>improve</b> 8:12,23	72:15	174:9,10 183:14
	I	I	I	I

6/3/2015

184:3 192:11	interested 5:21	27:19 33:15,15,16	36:19,20 37:8,9,15	185:20 187:2
initiate 120:13	64:12 104:7 122:5	33:19,25 36:1,12	37:17 38:2,3,6,9	items 38:5 42:20
122:7 123:13	199:12	43:20 57:22,23	38:15,17 39:5	49:10 79:14,16
127:17 128:16,22	interfaces 54:3	60:18 62:13 63:15	40:18,19 42:1,1,2	94:3 97:25 98:7
initiated 89:12	interiaces 34.3	63:16 64:5 66:22	43:2,2,6,8 44:11	135:6 169:8,10,11
initiates 121:8,12	interject 104:18	68:20,21 70:24	45:3,4,7,16 47:4,9	172:10,20 173:5
initiative 91:16 92:4	internal 10:3 11:12	75:19,25 76:6,11	47:21 56:15,15	173:22 175:6
93:3,9 94:12,20	18:25 27:22 30:20	76:13 77:7,10,24	57:21,23 59:17	180:4 181:25
95:3 98:20	31:4 52:22 53:5	78:6,16 80:10 81:1	60:13,19,21 65:16	185:9 198:4,5,10
initiatives 60:3	83:15,16 87:7,19	81:22 90:6 100:1	67:5 69:14 74:17	J
67:25 93:25 98:15	87:22 100:7	100:21 102:21	74:22 76:5 77:24	J 119:8,15 155:15
99:10	114:25 173:7	108:17,21 109:3,6	79:8,15 81:10,19	jabber 97:6
<b>input</b> 70:6,11,21	175:15 176:15	109:7,16 119:13	81:19 82:22 83:24	<b>January</b> 23:11 61:4
148:20 170:11	188:1,21	132:18 135:5,12	83:24 84:6,6 87:16	Jessie 3:4,6
insight 89:17 138:1	internally 80:6	137:11 142:9,16	94:16 96:13,24	JO 15:14
138:5,13	83:15	142:17,20,24	97:23 98:11	<b>job</b> 17:9,9 85:15
insights 103:11	<b>Internet</b> 26:24	143:7,19,22	100:20 101:10	86:10 112:20
Inspector 89:13	92:10,21	148:10 149:9	102:9 103:23	174:5 197:7
instance 165:17	interpretation 29:2	155:4,10 161:10	106:10,18 107:15	jobs 92:2
instances 54:22	interpreted 169:23	161:22,23,23	108:6,7,14,15,16	John 3:13 22:10,15
56:17 76:23	interrupt 136:12	166:18 172:5	108:19 112:10,14	105:8 107:21
<b>institute</b> 89:6 170:1	154:7	173:7,10 175:9	114:12 115:21	
instituted 84:3	interview 89:11	180:23 181:1	122:5,7,12,13,19	<b>joint</b> 177:12 184:20
institutionalize 35:9	<b>introduce</b> 3:9 18:23	193:13,17	126:1 128:25	judge 148:19
94:23	invaluable 26:6	issued 23:18 26:9	129:4,4 131:9	judges 22:22
instructions 10:2	invest 161:7	28:20 30:6 31:9	135:12,18,20,24	judgment 24:12 74:4
instrument 134:10	investing 92:14	issues 10:9 11:4 12:3	136:2 138:16	
integrate 98:18	invite 145:15	25:22 40:25 43:18	139:17,18 143:7	<b>July</b> 19:17,18 99:14 121:25 143:3
integrating 184:25	involve 99:7 114:18	43:19 44:1,1 45:2	144:4,19 145:3,8	
intended 23:19	173:18 188:14	45:6 48:18 58:23	145:18,22 146:1	156:8 158:6,20
121:22 135:10	involved 40:22,24	62:19 63:1 68:19	147:24 148:2,20	159:17 163:24
144:23 157:12	69:1,11 73:8 94:25	71:7 73:25 82:6	149:5,9,16 150:21	165:6,11 167:1
182:11	139:9 171:2	89:9 100:4 101:22	152:20 159:13	194:19
intending 144:24	191:12 192:15	114:16,18 116:4	161:8,21 163:3	jump 196:12
intends 42:19 106:5	involvement 54:23	135:8 138:6	165:13 167:24	jumped 62:7 85:7
intent 26:2 27:20	55:19 74:5	149:24 154:8	170:3,18,23 171:6	jumping 186:1
28:9 46:21 121:17	involves 190:4	160:12 170:24	173:20 178:18,19	June 1:14 19:15,15
162:13 166:12	195:20	173:24 176:15,16	180:22 182:21,21	19:16 88:23 97:11
182:19	irrespective 54:1	183:19 185:5	184:1,1 185:10,17	98:21 160:16
intention 28:5	isn't 49:13 60:25	194:25	186:5 188:11,20	Justice 155:25 156:5
132:20 147:24	70:19 72:5 84:19	issuing 31:10 82:21	189:13 190:3,22	justification 7:20
156:10 161:20	161:4 179:9	it'll 145:11 190:8	193:1,2 194:15,17	8:2 13:4,8,12 15:7
intentions 122:25	182:10	it's 14:20 15:14,17	194:18 195:25	15:18 79:6
interaction 32:23,24	Isolation 160:2	16:17,21 17:2,11	item 79:15 129:11	<u>K</u>
interactions 21:19	issuance 26:14 27:3	18:14,16 20:18	131:8 138:21	keep 6:4 17:17,18
<b>interest</b> 27:25 73:5	29:19	21:17 22:3,3 32:14	141:11,12 142:5,6	97:3,4 102:12
176:12 192:17	issue 19:7 20:3 22:3	32:23 34:13 35:9	155:12,13 157:3	71.5,4 102.12

[214]

				[214]
163:8	106:1,7,19 107:17	177:13	legislated 181:9	93:2,19 169:7,10
keeping 113:13	107:23 108:6,8,18	largest 56:25	legislation 17:23	listen 73:19
164:13	108:20,25 109:1,2	late 56:20	30:11 50:21 77:15	little 6:1 15:4 75:9
kept 100:25 115:19	109:6,14 110:7,17	latest 9:19	legislative 28:7 47:8	76:21 117:10
key 96:6	110:18,25,25	law 17:25 18:6	192:3,13	128:2 135:11,25
<b>kind</b> 16:17 18:16	111:5,12 112:8,10	laws 39:15	length 21:13	137:21 144:14
21:22,23 35:13	113:10 114:23	lay 67:23	lesser 78:4	148:16 151:25
37:8 42:3 46:13	115:19,22 116:19	lays 23:3	lessons 178:5	177:18
56:21 60:6 67:14	118:3 122:12,20	lead 48:13 53:23,24	let's 49:21,22 83:22	live 4:6 75:16
67:24 71:19 73:2	133:17,21 136:24	54:5,13 55:4,5,18	106:11 107:12	lived 56:11
74:3 77:5 78:15	138:6,23 139:9,25	60:15 61:18 66:2	131:6 164:11,12	LMI 89:6,7
80:4 87:4 101:11	140:11 144:7,25	66:20 69:1,7,8	196:18	locations 29:13
105:15 109:22	146:5,6,10 147:4	70:18,19 71:1,2,2	letter 11:4 17:7	lock-step 47:2
111:11,23 114:5	147:11,17 148:6	71:9,10,12,12 73:6	20:15 37:6 60:25	logically 185:2
129:8 136:10,22	148:15 149:12	73:12 77:8 86:20	61:11,11 66:21	Logistics 89:5
148:21 172:3		96:11 144:8 175:1	133:25 178:21	long 19:8 20:18
175:21,21 176:25	150:5,12,17 151:22 153:19	184:4	183:9,17,20 184:9	38:17 42:20 56:10
175.21,21 176.25	151.22 155.19	lead-in 160:17	' '	67:11 108:18
194:15	162:15 165:18	leaders 90:7 101:4	186:13,25 <b>letters</b> 10:6 17:7	143:20 147:17
kindly 123:21	166:1 169:23	leadership 36:9	21:14 26:21 27:19	160:18 166:12
kinds 46:2,8 59:10	170:19 171:1,16	90:19 91:2 92:14	185:6	173:16 178:23
59:16,20 62:2,7	174:4,9,10,20,20	98:10 194:10	level 73:2 76:6,13	long-term 88:21
69:5 70:9 148:20	174:25 175:23	leads 54:9,25 55:14	80:9 81:1 108:17	91:4 93:16,24
181:21 182:3	176:2,11,17,19	57:10 66:5,11	147:19 178:25	longer 20:9 33:16
185:2	178:17,19,23,24	75:18 78:14	183:17 184:9	57:17 58:3,6
know 5:23 14:1	179:9,14,15	101:14 169:22	levels 91:17,24	114:12 145:8
17:15,16 18:19,20	182:17,17,20	194:16	92:13 93:8,15	154:13
20:24 21:2 32:12	183:6,20,22,22,25	learned 24:21 62:12	172:4	look 15:7 19:4 21:5
32:13,25 34:11,12	185:12 186:7,20	87:11 178:6	life 29:4	24:25 33:11 36:12
34:22 36:7,13,23	192:9 194:2 195:1	185:25	Likewise 94:4	37:23 40:1 44:25
38:8,9 39:8,11,16	195:8,9	leave 36:8 117:24	limited 54:21	47:1,7 48:3 55:25
42:7,13,15 43:21	knowledge 37:1	120:1	104:21	58:22 59:13 64:10
45:3 46:18,19 47:8	51:23 191:25	led 41:5 45:23 83:15	<b>LINDA</b> 199:3,17	64:11,19 67:24
47:20 58:6,7,13,15	known 3:21 78:17	83:19	line 41:8 42:15,15	68:8 69:18 74:24
58:22 59:8,22,25	100:23	<b>left</b> 139:14 197:10	67:16 71:19 81:8	75:8 82:2 84:18
60:8,11,13,18,19	knows 96:14	legal 2:11 4:20	99:9,10 107:7	86:21,22 98:15
64:6,11,19 67:1,12	L	22:19 39:6,7 102:2	115:11	100:9 102:21
67:15,25 70:17	lack 69:15 83:16	102:4 103:11	line-by-line 173:11	103:18 106:6
71:18 72:5 73:11	91:1 171:7 178:4	114:17,22 119:16	lines 177:16	107:2 108:14
74:6,20,22 75:7,12		119:16 137:21	links 13:5	111:9,10 114:17
76:3,15,23 77:13	lacks 79:5	150:6,24,25 151:1	list 99:11 102:23	114:23 115:9
79:4,8,19,22 81:6	laid 185:24	152:18 153:21	116:8,13 138:3	130:8 140:15
81:8,9,14 82:9	lands 144:6	154:1,3,16 155:15	156:5,9 172:20	144:1 152:12
83:6,21,22,24 84:8	language 25:1	155:22,25 156:1,4	174:7,21 175:5	173:14,18 175:13
84:9,10,12,19,24	192:14	173:5 174:3,8,21	176:8 189:10	175:22 176:13
86:16 96:2,5 97:25	large 68:9 73:8 80:8	175:7 177:1	198:5	180:8 181:2,21
101:7 102:13	80:9 113:11	191:23,24	<b>listed</b> 54:16 92:9,17	183:19 186:15
	I	I	I	1

197:22	maintain 51:22	<b>Mark</b> 6:11 15:3	179:19 192:7,9,15	100:21,22 101:17
looked 15:16 19:7	53:15 54:11 73:1	88:11 193:16	194:16	103:10 109:3
19:19 20:3 46:6	maintenance 47:15	195:2,18	Meaning 70:8	119:8,12,15,19
87:1	48:2,3,4,6,7	matches 115:25	meaningful 82:16	120:10,13 121:8
<b>looking</b> 19:5 33:3	major 7:4 27:5 29:7	material 44:10	means 17:12 25:25	121:12 122:7,15
49:7 59:8 60:4	40:7	179:24	63:6 65:22 80:19	123:13 127:17
83:15 86:17,18	majority 47:5 76:4,4	materials 27:8 51:7	80:21	128:16 133:8,18
87:1,2,13,21,22	109:7 118:1	52:3 55:3 57:4	measurable 7:14	134:25 142:8
90:16 96:8 99:18	147:10,13 171:5	105:10	measure 8:8 9:25	147:1,2 155:9,15
114:11,13,22	maker 69:20	matrix 53:11,21	11:10 16:23,25	155:21 156:10
115:4,5 122:21	making 23:7 30:8,14	54:15,18 55:15	17:2 18:17	157:5 163:17,21
136:3 144:11	66:18 75:4 77:1,13	73:9	measured 16:23,24	165:16,21 168:24
176:1 179:14,14	104:23 105:1	matrixed 55:20 57:2	20:7 60:17 195:12	member's 75:17
187:9 193:4,17	108:25 109:13,17	matter 68:13 82:21	measuring 11:17	138:22
194:22	111:4,6 114:19	122:13 137:24	18:8	members 3:17 4:16
looks 15:17 70:10	122:9 136:20,23	165:15 171:24	mechanism 13:25	5:12 6:8,16 12:14
110:4 125:1	137:5,16 161:15	175:8 181:7	14:4 122:22	16:6 22:13 23:12
lost 136:21 166:9	manage 73:12 74:6	185:17	mechanisms 66:15	24:10,17 25:10
lot 5:23 19:1 20:23	79:25	mattered 16:20	71:22 121:18	32:15 38:16 40:23
34:14,19 35:13	management 7:17	matters 88:12 100:7	meet 42:16,17,19	42:8 47:22 50:14
36:21 39:14 40:12	9:1 11:12 14:24	110:13 114:25	53:4 55:10 87:14	53:25 54:22,25
40:15,17 44:20	41:11 51:13,15	<b>mature</b> 45:11	meeting 1:10 3:1,8	65:17,20 74:13
59:1,15 60:12 62:6	52:6 89:1,6 90:4,6	maximizes 117:12	3:15,17,18,19,24	75:13 78:13 79:7
63:10 68:24 74:18	121:3	maximum 51:11	4:1 5:6,20 8:13	79:13 80:25 82:25
101:22 111:7,14	management-rela	mean 12:18 16:18	22:17 35:23 38:13	83:20,22 84:11,14
112:19 160:21,22	53:4	16:25 17:5,19 21:1	81:14 100:5	92:22 95:9,9 96:19
161:14 171:21	<b>Manager</b> 2:7,16	32:21 33:17 35:21	101:22 102:13	100:2,3 101:24
186:4 188:21	4:18,25 6:12 115:3	35:23 39:3,11,22	104:21 114:24	102:13 104:22
195:14	<b>Manager's</b> 193:14	44:7 45:12 46:20	119:6 157:19	105:4,18 106:11
<b>lots</b> 197:4	managers 8:12	47:25 49:19 62:1	162:5 166:10	109:1 113:23
<b>loud</b> 35:5	92:21	63:19 64:2 70:2	172:12 173:7	115:7 117:13
low-hanging 58:25	manages 50:24	74:19 75:1 77:12	175:8,15 176:15	121:18,23 123:3
lunch 5:2 113:24	managing 73:7	78:20 79:16 81:17	183:14 184:3	126:5 128:22
117:2,12 118:16	mandate 30:16	82:4 84:5 95:18	190:8,13 197:22	129:12,16,21
193:22	192:13	98:19 99:1 103:14	198:2,8,11,13,16	131:13 138:13
lunchtime 113:21	mandated 48:15,15	107:25 108:12,19	198:16,18	143:1 144:16,16
	145:3 177:11	112:19 117:23	meetings 6:2 35:22	144:17 145:11,15
<u>M</u>	mandates 46:19	118:5 123:11	81:17 175:18	152:19 156:7,8,9
ma'am 50:4 67:22	181:9	128:13 136:8,21	197:23	156:14 158:18
110:14 116:12	manifest 179:11	137:19 138:12	meets 178:25	160:6 162:15
117:1,7 130:7	182:25	139:17,18 140:14	member 5:19 10:13	163:16 164:24
138:4	manifests 185:8	146:3 148:22	20:13 22:1 39:24	169:10,22 171:12
Madam 5:17 6:15	manner 5:22 57:10	149:8 150:9 152:3	55:17 69:10 71:23	182:13 183:19
36:18 38:11 50:13	manpower 40:19	153:14,15 159:3	75:18,24 76:10	188:16 193:19
88:15 158:22,24	march 61:7 110:22	163:3,7 166:10	77:23 78:11 80:25	194:4,5 195:2,5,14
mailbox@DNFSB	110:23,23 112:2	169:16 174:12,19	81:4 82:9,18 84:4	197:13 198:1
4:8	112:12,16 166:19	175:4 178:14,18	96:13 100:16,18	<b>memory</b> 80:15

[216]

160:5,16 189:24	175:24	99:20 107:17	40:1,7 42:4 44:16	43:4 52:22 54:15
mentality 111:24	mixed 46:18	116:19 123:5	45:10 67:12 76:11	59:8,8 93:3 107:17
mention 5:18	mixture 181:8	124:7 126:5,13	79:25 82:1,20	114:6,7,8 131:19
196:19	Mm-hmm 12:20	128:4,8,20 131:6	84:18,23 90:24	134:17 174:12
mentioned 114:6	48:21 116:6 128:1	132:7,10 133:18	91:8,14 93:17,20	176:2 180:3,6,9,20
170:12 184:13	133:22 136:18	136:9 142:4	96:25 100:8	184:25
187:23	150:15,21 192:16	155:12 157:3	103:14,18 107:3	newest 52:17
mentioning 194:8	192:24	169:12 170:20	109:17,22 116:21	nice 86:9
message 18:2	model 54:7	178:10	117:11 131:15	nimble 20:23 36:4
<b>METCALF</b> 199:3	moderating 38:15	moved 56:22 125:16	132:9 137:20,21	NNSA 10:7 52:5
199:17	Modernization 6:20	127:23	138:2,7,25 140:4	nomenclature 28:10
methods 30:21	8:4	moving 81:4 90:8	146:17 147:6	nominally 152:4
metric 10:1 11:10	modification 30:12	123:23 125:21,23	149:25 151:17	non-tier-one 173:5
11:13 16:14,20	modifications 30:11	136:8 181:19	153:22 154:2,4	nonconcurrence
17:5,17 21:4,4	<b>modified</b> 63:17,21	music 3:5	157:23 160:13	65:23 76:24
metrics 2:8 4:18	63:23	<b>mutual</b> 90:14	162:2 165:19,20	nonconcurrences
6:14,24 7:16 9:15	modify 64:24	mystery 21:23	165:22 172:25	171:21
9:17,24,25 11:22	163:10	105:18	173:4,13,14,24	nonconcurring
12:9 13:4,11,23	moment 151:23,24		176:10 184:10	78:23
14:2,9,13,15,25	165:10 184:1	N	186:1 187:11	nonmonetary 90:21
15:15,21 16:11,23	Monday 7:7	name 3:4,6 22:15	191:13 192:1,2	nonscientific 147:16
17:4,15 18:3,4,19	monetary 90:21	50:14 70:3 74:21	193:1 195:3	normal 71:18
microphone 174:17	monthly 120:16	104:9 105:8	needed 62:21	103:21 180:10
mid 34:24	122:2 123:16	names 104:11	103:24 114:12	Normally 62:16
mid-cycle 14:18	127:21 131:22	narrative 13:14	135:17 160:10	Notably 29:17
middle 64:7	132:19	<b>National</b> 30:9 52:4	needs 14:12 32:25	notational 4:2 5:25
midyear 92:12	months 15:5 20:7	natural 43:22	51:19 66:25 75:21	61:2 157:19
milestone 10:22	21:22 36:8 88:18	<b>nature</b> 55:11 60:6	87:15 88:1 99:12	197:25 198:12
11:3,5	111:12 136:9	68:20 133:18	104:25 105:14	<b>notes</b> 115:14,20
<b>million</b> 96:5	160:24 190:4	143:20 179:6	106:21 111:25	163:11
mimic 148:15	191:18 195:19,21	near 23:17	171:1 173:3 192:1	<b>notice</b> 4:10 104:6
mind 39:4,10 75:18	196:1,4	nearly 84:22	192:21	117:19 162:3
<b>mindful</b> 66:18	<b>moot</b> 137:4,17	necessarily 87:4	neither 168:11	<b>noticed</b> 3:18 23:9
mine 18:24	139:17,23	114:4 128:4	199:8	notices 162:3
minimizes 51:15	<b>morning</b> 3:5 6:16	133:19 135:19	never 39:13 41:5	notifications 73:16
minimum 7:3	18:24 21:10 22:12	145:7 146:17	46:9 58:7 76:7	notionally 99:13
<b>minor</b> 9:20	32:3 50:13 108:12	162:2 182:10,15	82:1 100:15	notwithstanding
<b>minute</b> 129:9	117:17 143:6	necessary 24:3	109:11 110:8	46:23
minutes 28:17	147:15 148:13	30:15 51:23 53:1,4	144:6 160:23	November 19:22
104:19 139:22	169:16 170:12	53:12 55:10 80:2	172:2	60:20,21 61:3,6
<b>missed</b> 115:15	184:17	87:14,25 116:5	nevertheless 20:12	NRC 45:24 46:1
missile 16:18	<b>motion</b> 126:5	121:25 143:3,16	36:8 44:20 48:6,14	<b>nuance</b> 152:23
<b>mission</b> 9:3 11:19	153:23 154:16,22	158:7 161:4 166:2	81:10 128:19	nuances 152:21
16:21 29:4 52:25	154:22	191:16	153:8 160:14	154:14
53:10,14 59:1	<b>Mound</b> 29:15	need 7:16 14:1 19:3	new 5:18 7:1 11:14	nuclear 1:3,17 3:7
89:23 90:1 94:14	move 35:17 47:2	21:7 28:15,15	21:21 23:11 25:21	12:4 16:19 22:16
113:11 170:5	59:24 68:8 96:20	32:16 37:12,13	30:16 40:15 41:14	23:5 24:11 27:5,17
-	1	<u> </u>	1	1

[217]

Defense	Nuclear	<b>Facilities</b>	Safety	${\sf Board}$
---------	---------	-------------------	--------	---------------

28:20,22 29:5 30:1	obsolete 28:12	
44:10 50:18,20	obtain 122:22	4
51:6,7,8,8,12 52:2	134:23	1
52:3,4,10,11 53:10	obviously 15:19	
55:3,3 57:3,4,8	36:20 42:17 148:7	,
59:4 105:9 113:13	175:12 188:20	8
113:14 198:15	175.12 188.20	
number 10:1,12	occasions 46:4 64:7	9
11:17,18,25 12:7	occur 44:4,9 55:1	]
46:23 61:24 62:17	65:8 92:18 93:13	]
71:24 87:3 119:7	occurred 83:13 84:1	]
123:5 124:13,15	160:3	
125:13,14 127:12	October 23:18	
163:9 175:16	89:10	
180:18 187:9,11	odd-page 160:25	
187:15,16,16	odds 135:25	
191:19	offer 71:23 105:11	
<b>numbers</b> 35:24 97:9	113:22 178:1	]
numerous 33:11	194:14	
188:1	<b>office</b> 4:17 7:17 14:6	]
nutshell 32:9	50:17 51:4 52:5	
<b>NW</b> 1:18	55:9 62:24 70:2	]
	88:25 89:13	1
0	116:16,22 119:16	]
objecting 159:2,4	120:21,25 131:23	]
objection 128:14	145:9 156:1,2	]
159:1,15,18,19	172:8 176:4	1
167:4,8 168:9	192:10	1
objections 124:3	<b>office's</b> 50:11	1
126:18 159:8	173:13	]
<b>objective</b> 7:14 10:19	officer 146:5 150:25	1
11:1,6,11,15,20	199:3	1
29:24	officers 143:17	1
objectives 6:22,24	offices 9:4 11:12	1
7:4,12 8:16 9:7,9	63:11	1
9:10,11,13,16,23	official 137:1	1
10:4,10,15 11:10	officially 39:13	]
12:10	offs 63:5	]
obligations 137:22	<b>OGC</b> 70:1	]
138:8 139:1	<b>oh</b> 48:24 86:1 96:25	]
148:13 151:1	97:3 125:12	]
observation 81:19	136:25 159:13	
observations 21:15	196:14	1
36:7 59:17,22 66:8	<b>Ohio</b> 29:16	O
66:10 71:4,5	okay 12:24 14:16,19	olo
observe 27:12	14 22 15 10 10 12	~;

14:23 15:10 19:13

33:3,10 35:12,19

observe 27:12

observed 27:10

```
36:19 39:3 56:7
 57:14 60:7,21 63:9
 63:19 66:17 69:17
 69:25 71:15 77:4
 79:10 80:18,19,23
 81:22 83:10,22
 86:1,4 95:20 96:25
 97:3,5,14 99:8,15
 101:4,15 102:25
 103:5,16,20,22,25
 103:25 104:5
 107:9,14 108:15
 109:5,15 112:2
 118:12,14 119:3
 120:8 123:1,8
 124:24 125:4,21
 126:4,12,20
 127:22 128:7
 130:4,4,11,11
 132:13,14,15,22
 132:24 133:4,20
 133:21 134:19
 135:7 136:14,19
 137:12,18 139:6
 140:13,19,25
 141:5,18 142:13
 145:11 146:17
 150:2,23 151:15
 154:1,12,21
 158:12,25 159:7
 159:21 160:13
 164:13,19 165:1
 166:5,24 167:6,9
 167:21,22 168:12
 168:19,22 169:6
 172:19 174:19
 176:5 177:4,7
 178:14,15,24
 189:3,19,20,22
 190:19 191:2
 192:6 193:3,6
 194:6 196:10,14
 196:15 197:18
 LC 155:16,22
old 38:20,21 186:17
OMB 7:17,24 8:3
 14:11,21 15:14,17
```

```
once 43:14 63:1,4
 94:1,21 109:24
 137:25 152:10
 153:1 156:9
one-year 45:25
one's 17:24
ones 75:22 77:22
 78:5 87:12 188:6
ongoing 26:17
 175:22
onsite 10:14
oops 140:16
open 1:10 3:20
 12:13 37:15 38:11
 42:25 47:21 94:15
 95:12 99:23 120:1
 120:1 133:14
 170:7 195:5 197:5
open-door 78:13,14
open-ended 178:18
opening 2:5 5:11,12
 6:6,8
operate 32:24 70:22
 109:24
operated 34:15
operating 3:23,24
 10:2 11:17 23:12
 30:20 31:4 32:20
 32:22 179:8 182:5
operation 23:18
 47:13 110:11
operational 30:2
 59:16,16 110:12
operations 7:4 8:24
 25:23 27:10 44:6
 44:21 59:15
opine 39:18
opinion 36:23 43:9
 71:20,24 72:10
 73:21,23 74:17
 75:3,7 79:18 81:10
 81:10 119:16
 155:16,22,25
 156:4 177:25
 183:23 186:2
 190:21 195:5
opinions 43:1 72:2
```

```
72:20 74:22
opportunities 14:25
 92:25 172:4
opportunity 5:19,20
 6:1 15:7 18:17
 22:14 41:12 66:13
 98:12 104:17
 106:11 107:22
 143:16 181:24
 190:21
opposed 21:4 27:1
 133:19 179:8
optimist 107:18
optimize 188:8
orange 60:22 63:6
 66:9 142:21
order 3:18 6:10
 46:13 49:3 100:6
 101:10 104:13
 117:15 119:23
 127:11 140:25
 172:13 176:24
 178:25 191:20
 192:21
orders 114:10
organic 68:16
organically 98:12
organization 15:2
 45:11 46:19 50:23
 51:4 53:9 55:21
 57:12 70:16 72:19
 74:20 89:12 92:15
 185:18
organizational 2:14
 2:16 4:22,25 14:10
 50:12,16,22 51:5
 51:10,22 52:6
 56:21 88:13,17,19
 88:22 89:9,18,20
 90:17 91:5,11 93:4
 93:15,18,21
organizations 18:13
 89:8
organized 50:17
original 27:21
 126:22 127:6
  140:23 163:12
```

originally 87:5,14	<b>paper</b> 36:10 66:9	<b>parties</b> 5:21 104:7	73:12 86:20 90:4,6	<b>plan</b> 6:23 7:1,2,7,8
ought 36:12 40:6	70:24 80:10	199:9,11	92:12,23 185:7	7:10,11,13,19,24
44:25 185:24	142:17,20,24	parts 26:23 28:12,14	performed 55:5,8	8:1,13,19,22 9:6
out-of-recommen	148:10 149:10	28:14,15 65:7,18	61:21 62:24	13:23 14:18 24:9
113:4	papers 27:22 33:16	127:6 133:9	performs 53:9	25:11,17,18,20
<b>outbrief</b> 144:13	119:13 142:9,16	Pasko 105:7,8,8	period 4:9 10:17	40:18 50:21,24
outbriefs 144:7	144:22 149:8	106:14 107:7,10	25:23 40:11 58:8	51:2,15 53:17,22
outcome 164:22	155:10	107:14,19 109:19	60:16 62:18 63:3,4	54:20 55:8,14 80:5
199:12	paragraph 123:7	110:14,21	87:11 179:19	83:18,19,20,21
outdated 26:24	131:10,17,18	pass 132:4	195:12	85:13 86:13 87:2,7
outline 88:21 157:16	157:13 164:13,19	passes 30:1 123:19	permanent 111:6,24	94:3,20 95:17 99:5
157:22,23 162:14	165:2 167:10	path 81:24,24 109:4	permit 104:20	175:3,3 177:2,2
162:16,21 163:13	parallel 51:21 52:4	194:15	person 73:14	181:6,6,12,22
163:16,17,23	62:23 63:3 64:2	people 17:14 45:21	personal 36:23 37:1	182:1,6 183:11,11
164:6 165:4,9,9,14	65:11,14,16 72:18	46:2 47:15 49:5,9	58:23	185:7,9 188:7,17
165:14,25 166:1	87:21 115:12	58:16 63:12 68:20	personally 73:1	188:18 189:1,5,12
166:16,20 167:14	145:23	70:21 71:25 72:3,6	96:16	189:17,18 190:1,6
167:16 168:8	parameters 32:20	74:20,22 105:5	personnel 27:9,16	190:11,12,15
outlined 31:3,14	100:9,14 102:11	107:4 129:9 130:5	52:10 88:25 100:7	191:9,10 192:18
91:12	103:12 114:24	143:15 144:19	114:25 131:25	192:18
outlines 174:10	paramount 94:16	164:1 170:6 174:4	173:8 176:15	planned 88:12,21
outside 15:13 85:13	pare 19:3	179:17 180:19	perspective 67:7	91:4,7 188:4
88:13 104:12	part 15:9,18 24:7	197:5	105:20 177:18	planning 6:18,19
195:3	25:2 57:11 72:4	perceive 85:21	179:13	44:5 99:14 117:17
overall 15:15 51:4	86:6 87:20 98:13	perceived 107:24	pertaining 29:2	183:4 188:24
164:8	121:20 127:8,14	108:10 109:14	119:10,25	plans 13:9 14:8
overcome 139:2	128:23 130:22	percent 33:25 40:18	phase 28:22 87:18	22:24 23:22 24:4
overtead 51:16	131:4,6 133:6	55:20 89:2,10,15	87:24 188:8	24:14 26:1 91:21
overlap 116:17	135:20,23 136:20	97:12,13 110:15	phases 29:4 30:2	92:23 98:16
overload 34:23	137:4,4 139:8	187:24	87:11	192:19 196:9
overload 54.25	140:22 142:3	percentage 10:6,16	<b>phone</b> 5:8	plant 29:22 160:3
overnight 93:14	146:13 196:1	10:21 11:2,22	phone 5.6	play 31:24 92:7
oversight 10:14	participants 65:22	63:15 98:23	phrase 148:16	played 73:20
11:24 23:3 28:18	participants 03.22	perception 74:16	pick 17:3 95:25	please 6:13,17,25
28:23 29:4,15,17	95:1 97:18 98:3	perform 45:15,21	picked 19:20	8:3,19 9:6,12,14
29:25 50:19 51:12	participated 88:24	46:3 50:18 53:3,25	piece 36:10 48:8	10:12 11:8,20 16:5
53:5,10 54:20	participation	54:23 180:24	109:17 132:18	17:9 22:20 23:15
55:11	172:11 198:7	performance 2:8	165:17 170:15	34:2,6 51:3,20
overview 6:18 88:12	particular 31:22	4:18 6:14,18,20,23	pieces 65:18 132:17	52:15 56:17 88:16
88:17	48:7 66:9,12 69:6	7:7,8,9,11,16,19	pile 113:10	89:20 91:7 92:17
	101:14,24 115:1	7:21,23,23,24 8:1	pitch 96:14	113:5,5 141:19
P	135:5 143:22	8:7,9 9:15,17,19	pivotal 90:1	162:12
<b>p.m</b> 1:15 117:3	170:15	9:23,25 10:3,9,14	place 13:11,12 63:5	plenty 12:19 44:22
119:2 198:19	particularly 43:3	10:19,25 11:6,9,11	84:11,12 87:9	45:5 108:5 126:1
page 2:3 41:3 66:22	59:6,19 111:2	11:13 12:9 13:8,11	185:10 196:9	plot 106:6
157:24	147:11 191:10,11	14:6,8 51:9 52:17	placed 26:21	plutonium 29:21
pages 143:20 160:21	192:10	52:21,25 73:6,10	places 144:1	podium 97:1 115:4
_ <del>-</del>	-, -, -,	,20 , 5.0,10	1	

[219]

114:6,8,11,13
119:17 155:16,24
156:11,11 172:24
173:1,2,3 174:11
176:2 177:8,10,16
177:22 178:10
179:5,23 180:12
180:23 182:9,10
182:24 184:19
185:3,11,19,21
186:11 189:6
191:5,19 192:12 196:20
policy- 185:12
policy-like 185:20
pool 54:1
poor 48:8
<b>portion</b> 120:17
123:16 127:21
157:19
portrayed 52:12
<b>positive</b> 10:8 17:6,6
17:10,20 90:4 93:13
93:13 <b>possibility</b> 111:3
117:20
possible 24:23 31:20
67:4 114:6 147:21
162:18 184:9
<b>post</b> 198:9
<b>posted</b> 5:6 11:24
104:12 118:6
potential 10:7 82:15
102:3 107:11
109:2 111:1 114:8 161:13 180:20
161:13 180:20 181:3 186:18
181:3 186:18 191:5
potentially 137:16
161:15 176:14
186:9
<b>Power</b> 160:2
PRA 45:16,20,21,24
practicable 53:3
74:1
practice 28:2
<b>practices</b> 27:17 48:7

170.4
178:4
PRAs 46:13 47:4
precious 84:15
precise 173:16
preclude 146:20
147:5
<b>predict</b> 44:4,19
predominant 136:6
<b>prefer</b> 35:17 148:16
151:11
preference 148:22
_
preliminary 103:18
preparation 182:1
<b>prepare</b> 24:8 79:24
173:19
prepared 24:24
46:11 140:9,11,12
176:21 187:6,20
preparedness 31:11
31:14,19 43:15
44:14,16,17
159:25 160:8
preparing 55:13
prescribe 177:23
prescribes 185:1
<b>present</b> 4:18,19,21
6:13 167:15 178:3
191:9
presentation 2:7
12:8 32:3 80:7
94:6 105:1
presentations 4:16 4:24
presented 46:25
79:13,17 119:23
161:21
presenter 6:11
15:24 22:10 50:9
presenters 21:9
Presently 29:20
preside 3:8
President's 7:2
17:18
press 144:4,17
<b>pretty</b> 17:20 19:2,2
40:19 47:10 57:15
60:9 64:23 144:18

186:6,10	
prevent 18:16	p
162:20	
previous 8:21 13:10	
37:16 89:1 178:2	
183:9	
previously 4:15 5:3	
119:5 136:5	
140:23	p
primarily 29:12,20	p
80:12	
<b>primary</b> 55:2 70:13	p
149:7	
principally 27:22	p
<b>prior</b> 105:17 120:23	
148:2 150:7	р
151:21,22 157:21	•
160:7	
priorities 106:7	р
181:7,9,20	P
, ,	
prioritization	
188:23	
prioritize 46:22	
173:17 175:10,16	
188:25 189:11	
priority 53:18	
113:15 176:8	
177:2 182:4	
187:15,16,21	
190:22 193:2	
privilege 120:15	
121:16 122:9	
123:15 127:19	
128:24 129:17.22	
135:21 136:16	
137:7 138:22	
139:9,14,16	
probabilistic 46:7	
probability 31:15	
31:18	
<b>probably</b> 22:4 38:10	p
40:5 49:13,14	
75:13 81:3 86:10	p
99:18 100:8,14	1
109:8 116:2	р
131:14 150:6	p
166:13 175:3	ľ
100.13 173.3	

```
179:24
roblem 17:25
20:20,20 43:21,22
43:24 45:3,4 48:5
68:16,16 100:19
101:6,10,10
135:19 139:17,18
160:8
roblematic 101:16
roblems 58:19
106:2 139:21
rocedural 25:16
84:2 112:8
roceduralized
72:12 74:17 77:1
rocedure 31:2
74:21,25 108:6
128:18 146:19
rocedures 3:23,24
4:1 10:3 11:14
18:25 20:10,17
23:12 26:10 30:20
31:4 35:9,14 47:16
77:18 84:8,22 87:9
111:2 119:10,13
119:20,25 120:11
120:18 122:1
128:3,16,22
129:19 131:19
133:7 134:11,16
137:25 138:1
142:8,16,21 143:4
147:12 152:9
155:10 157:6
158:1,7 161:4
162:21 164:3
167:11,18 173:8
175:16 177:24
185:19 188:5,22
198:13
roceed 22:8 38:11
103:19 157:15
roceeding 4:4
199:5,9
roceeds 61:19
rocess 15:9,15
21:17 27:2 31:3
```

[220]

6/3/2015

33:5 49:16,18 60:13 61:2 63:5,6 64:4,7 65:7,16,20 66:4,10 67:23,25 68:3,5,10,14,16,17 69:5 70:3 71:16,20 71:25 72:8,11,12
72:22 73:7,13 74:17 75:5,7,12,23 76:2,12,22 77:1 78:2,22 81:20,21
82:2 84:19 86:16 87:16 94:3 98:12 98:14,18 106:24 107:3,5,10,16
120:15 121:16 122:9 123:15 127:19 128:24 135:21 136:5,15 137:6,7,25 139:8
139:16 143:9 145:5,7 147:3 148:14 164:4 167:12 175:22
181:16 186:16 187:13,14,25,25 188:11,24 191:15 196:18 197:1
processes 65:24 72:18 84:22 147:17 processing 51:7
52:3 55:4 57:4 105:10 198:12 <b>produce</b> 7:1 70:8 82:5 83:4 85:9
87:18 160:19 163:20,20 188:6 <b>produced</b> 160:20 <b>producing</b> 69:11
161:8 190:3 <b>product</b> 21:16,18,24 65:5 69:11,12,16 69:20 70:6,9 72:2 85:10 94:21
108:14 129:17 131:20 133:8,24

134:1,2,3,6,18 135:9,15,24 136:4 136:21,24 137:1,6 137:22 148:8,9,21 148:25 149:4,16 149:20 150:6,17 151:21 152:11 161:8 170:18 174:19 productive 197:21 products 53:7 64:22 64:22 67:17 69:6
85:16 114:21
148:18 173:6
professional 72:10
72:20 73:21,23 74:17 75:3,7 90:11 92:24 93:10,22 113:9
program 8:7,7,10
8:13,14 46:1 52:3 52:11 143:17 144:11 146:5 180:9
programmatic
52:13
programs 8:18 31:14,19 51:7,9 55:3 57:8 92:3 180:5
progress 8:10 17:24
25:21
<b>project</b> 11:4 15:6 41:11 52:13 54:24 179:17 185:6 <b>projects</b> 10:22 11:3
40:25 53:19 54:16 57:6 114:7 185:1
promoting 8:11
promptly 26:19
<b>properly</b> 54:6 71:13
proposal 49:8 131:9 132:17 137:10 138:15 142:11 144:18 162:6 186:24 188:19 propose 122:24

122.2 124.10
123:3 134:10
162:8,20 163:10
164:23 165:4,24 191:21
- ·
proposed 119:9,24
120:11 125:11 126:22 131:7
126:22 131:7 142:3,6 157:4
142:3,6 157:4 159:3 163:5,20
165:9,14 190:11
165:9,14 190:11 190:15
proposes 163:13
168:8
proposing 49:24
133:12 149:16
159:11 163:9
164:16,17
<b>protect</b> 135:22,23
139:14
protected 16:16
protection 16:13
31:21 44:12 75:19
75:20 76:1,6 77:7
77:10,23 79:9 81:2
81:23 82:15 109:3
137:7,10 161:11
161:24 163:14
165:5 166:18
171:24 179:10
protections 138:15
protocol 73:15
<b>prove</b> 27:25 <b>proven</b> 89:8
proven 89:8 provide 6:17 22:14
25:20 28:5 29:1
31:21 34:20 37:4
37:25 39:18 44:24
53:1 65:3,10 67:2
68:7 69:15 72:1
73:22 80:2 88:11
88:16,18,20 98:12
102:2 110:10
120:23 121:5
132:2 138:5
143:16 145:19
149:1 150:5,6
156:5,8 175:2
150.5,0 175.2

```
183:4,11 184:6
 185:3,4,6 197:1
provided 9:4 27:8
 37:2,2 45:16 65:19
 71:17 72:17 79:2
 89:17 114:4 121:1
 121:2 131:12,24
 131:25 142:18,20
 143:1 156:9
 158:16 164:6
provides 10:17
 24:17 25:15 55:10
 70:10 108:1
providing 8:14,15
 92:11 134:17
provision 111:15
 112:9
provisions 3:20
PS-1 22:21
PS-4 23:10
public 1:10 2:18 3:1
 3:8,17,18,20 4:9
 4:10,12 5:2,6,20
 5:21 6:2 8:5,11
 11:24 12:7 13:2,3
 13:17,18 16:14,15
 24:1 26:22 27:2
 31:22 38:3,12
 44:12 45:4 60:22
 61:1 74:11 75:19
 75:21 76:2 79:8,20
 81:2 92:4 94:24
 97:14 98:20
 101:19 102:12,16
 104:7,21 119:6
 122:10 129:13
 135:10,13,18
 137:1 143:18
 144:4,6,15,16,22
 144:23,24 148:3
 150:8 151:1,22
 152:13 157:20
 179:10 197:22,23
 198:10,18
publication 120:24
 121:11
publicly 8:9 121:21
```

154:4 published 151:24 purpose 16:12,18 25:9 39:14 49:2 50:18 155:22 161:1 **purposes** 6:21 8:4 143:18 175:4 **pursuant** 27:24 31:2 31:12 100:5 pursue 85:19 122:18 **pursuit** 27:16 **purview** 122:12 **put** 5:9 17:15 21:7 30:18 37:5 45:25 72:11 87:9 118:3 138:2 154:17 160:21 162:3 185:2 188:7 189:5 189:16 191:8 192:20 194:1 196:9 **putting** 93:20 115:11 193:24

## Q

qualification 44:5 44:21 180:22 quality 60:2 61:21 quantifiable 7:14 quantitative 31:6,13 31:20 45:15 46:6 quarterly 14:7 **question** 13:1 16:24 32:14,15 36:15,20 37:17 38:19 39:4,6 42:4 45:12 46:17 60:15 61:8 64:1 71:15 75:17 76:14 78:19,19 79:12 80:12 81:11,25 86:12 97:8 99:8 100:17 104:22 105:25 106:11 109:11 125:16,22 125:23 126:6,13 127:24 128:4

-				[221]
140:10 146:16	raised 72:16 77:10	129:10 133:10	38:25 39:2 191:18	reevaluated 129:16
148:4,12 150:9,11	77:19 88:12 89:9	137:10 147:6	recommend 28:13	referred 184:14
150:24 151:18,20	182:4 183:20	154:9 160:13	163:23 194:11	referring 79:21 85:1
150:24 131:10,20	random 19:20	165:13 174:6	recommendation	86:14 193:25
152:10,13,17,19	range 24:23	183:20 195:1	23:24 24:6,7,19	refine 154:2
	range 24.23	realm 135:16	25:2,4 26:14 31:9	refined 154:4
153:19,21 154:3,3			*	reflect 62:15 69:5
154:17 155:4	rarely 132:16	186:18 193:14	31:11,15,22 33:7	
162:11 174:7	rate 89:1	reason 53:12 57:22	37:12 41:18 43:16	87:23 178:8
177:8,16 186:22	rationale 178:9	57:22 75:3 85:17	45:19 47:7,11	reflected 30:16
193:22,23	raw 148:22,25,25	117:21 143:24	77:16 80:20 81:3,5	65:24 71:14 72:6
questioning 83:8	149:3	171:23	81:23 82:5,22 83:5	86:24 181:25
87:15	reached 33:20	reasonable 39:18	84:8,13,17 113:2	reflecting 42:11
questions 12:11,13	react 47:22 180:1	57:23 186:25	132:20 145:4	reflection 87:3
12:15,18,22 13:21	reacting 46:17	195:8	157:17,23 158:2	Refresh 80:15
16:8 25:13 31:8	read 4:9 47:9 120:4	reasoning 156:4	159:25 160:1,10	189:24
32:4 55:23 56:6	120:6 123:8,9,10	<b>reasons</b> 161:6,6	160:23 163:4,5,18	regard 29:11 99:6
61:23 62:6 65:1	127:13 131:13,15	recall 23:10 36:2	163:21 165:10,15	181:1,23
67:7,21 69:17	131:15,18 132:11	40:17,22 62:4	166:3 188:22	<b>regarding</b> 10:6 24:2
70:24,25,25 74:13	140:22,23 142:10	129:22	191:7 195:1	70:19 98:17
76:15,16 81:13	142:10,12 143:5	receipt 121:9 138:16	recommendations	106:18 119:20
88:3 90:4 94:7,10	144:16 155:18	receive 4:16 52:19	22:24 23:7,21 24:9	120:14 121:15
95:22 96:17,21	157:10 163:10,25	89:3 143:11 146:4	24:13,22,24 26:2,7	123:14 127:18
97:4 108:9 109:11	175:5	153:1 157:22	30:8,14,25 31:5	142:24 157:7
126:22 133:11	readiness 92:15	163:17,23	32:1 41:19 43:19	173:4,7,10 185:3
134:20 148:7	reading 27:2 104:14	received 4:8 15:13	45:5 119:21	regardless 163:18
151:8,14 154:1,17	reads 123:8	17:1 142:24	148:15 157:7	regards 189:6
156:13,15,16	ready 20:21 45:14	143:25 158:13	recommended 32:2	<b>register</b> 3:19 104:6
158:9,10 164:1,9	57:18 130:19	171:7 183:6	reconvene 117:10	117:19 162:3
193:7 196:8	132:10 140:7,19	receives 94:2	117:22 118:14	163:19
quick 13:1 15:11	156:18 170:20,20	receiving 36:24,25	reconvening 4:24	registered 104:13
27:1 57:24 59:18	real 16:14,24 36:11	91:25 145:20	118:7	regular 44:6
78:18,19 131:16	36:15 131:16	recess 4:23 88:7,8,9	record 89:8 131:14	regularity 90:23
144:2,4	132:12 153:8,15	118:16	155:8 166:11,13	regulation 30:1
quickly 34:19 59:18	154:10	recessed 117:2	168:13 172:17	regulations 3:22
67:20 76:12	real-world 18:3	recognition 90:18	173:20 176:7,9	43:6 100:5
101:14 132:12	realistic 25:19	90:20 92:4,24	186:14 192:3	reiterate 86:9
149:2 193:21	realize 67:14	recognize 6:11 14:2	199:7	107:25 169:21,24
quite 18:8 33:4	really 12:17 16:20	15:24 22:10 37:20	recorded 199:5	171:16 196:17
56:15 62:25	17:1,11 32:11,16	50:9 112:21	recording 4:4,5,11	<b>rejecting</b> 24:7 25:2
171:15 177:25	34:17,25 35:11,20	129:21 146:23	4:13	relate 9:2 44:2
187:12	37:11 41:24 42:3	181:4 182:7	recover 67:20	related 25:22 111:2
<b>quorum</b> 3:16	44:3,13 62:6 69:14	recognized 24:10	red 64:8	199:8
quote 66:20 99:17	76:22 78:6 87:25	recognizes 27:24	redact 121:20	relates 9:3 82:15
<b>quote</b> 00.20 >>.17	94:24 96:1,8 98:2	113:12	redirect 179:6	relating 173:8
R	100:23 101:5	recognizing 93:7	reduced 199:6	relationship 12:9
raise 63:16 64:8	100.23 101.3	138:24	reemphasize 171:21	54:10
67:6 76:13 117:24	113:15 122:19	recollection 37:7	reevaluate 111:13	relationships 54:8
	113.13 122.17	1 conceion 37.7	100 (4144400 111.13	Tolutonompo 57.0

[222]

90:11 107:17	report 6:13 7:21,22	127:20 131:22,23	requires 6:25 7:6,20	restoration 30:4
relative 8:17 79:22	8:9 10:24 11:25	142:19,25 143:12	24:5 31:15 63:16	restricted 5:24
79:23,24 181:19	12:6 13:13 14:6,7	146:9,12 148:1	77:16 125:23	restrictions 114:18
182:4 199:10	19:7,16,23 20:14	152:5,7	requiring 8:8,13	173:5 175:7,10
relatively 5:18 27:1	24:20 26:15 29:10	representative's	125:20	result 10:8 26:17
145:14 162:6	33:15,17,19,22	145:9 152:8	resident 113:13	27:18 44:8 89:4
release 58:12 129:18	34:2,6,10 36:11	representatives	resides 65:10	97:22 194:20
138:22 139:19	50:11 52:18 59:17	52:18 54:11	resolution 81:11	resulted 192:12
151:21	60:18,24 61:6,10	reprioritize 187:19	109:5	results 6:20 8:7,11
released 151:23	62:3,9 63:16,20,21	reps 55:19 62:12,16	resolve 72:7 73:25	8:14 13:10 57:16
releases 69:23	63:23,23 65:9,25	63:15 64:4 68:15	181:3 185:5	65:4 94:4 147:15
releasing 129:12	71:14 73:22 94:2	149:1	resolving 74:8	176:17,20 194:13
150:7 151:22	120:16 121:1,2,4,5	request 3:25 5:5	resource 51:18 52:8	196:5 198:9
relevant 26:25	121:13,19,21	38:1 84:9 119:8,11	92:10,21	results-based 11:18
47:17 70:21	122:10 127:20	119:11,14,14,18	resources 51:12	retired 34:8
reliance 27:2	128:25 131:24	119:24 120:6,10	52:9 53:13 54:21	return 88:7
<b>relied</b> 47:16	134:2 139:12	120:12,17 121:17	88:12 93:1,20	revealed 89:21
<b>relies</b> 47:13	143:19,23 144:5,9	122:3,14 123:7,11	179:22 180:21	90:13
relook 188:3	144:21 145:1	123:21 125:18	181:19 190:23	revealing 57:15
rely 70:15,18 192:2	177:12,12 184:20	126:22 127:6,8,15	respect 41:21 90:14	100:21 101:12
relying 70:7	194:2	127:16 131:9,18	91:1 194:8	<b>reverse</b> 196:19
remain 28:14	<b>REPORTER</b> 199:1	133:9 140:23	respective 55:6	review 10:16,18,24
remained 9:18	reporting 6:19	142:7,14 155:8,14	164:3 167:11	19:10,14,22 20:6
remaining 91:3	25:20	155:14,20,22	192:19	28:13 33:25 41:16
remains 25:21 29:20	reports 11:23 12:1	156:12 157:1,5,11	respond 24:6 80:13	43:4 45:15,16,20
29:23	20:4 23:1 26:11	157:13,25 163:15	80:14 98:21 183:5	53:23,24,24,25
remarks 2:5,22 5:11	27:19,21 33:12,15	168:23 169:6	<b>responded</b> 10:8 89:3	54:5,5,5,13,13,15
5:12 6:6,9 54:17	33:16 34:1,24 36:1	176:10	178:20	54:23,23,25 55:5
55:13,22	58:12 59:13 63:15	requested 121:24	responding 160:12	55:16 57:10,10,16
remedial 118:2	119:10,25 120:17	132:2 133:16	response 10:8 17:6	57:20 59:17,25
<b>remote</b> 104:15	120:17,19,22	143:2 156:3,7	17:10 24:25 25:5	61:21,21 62:20,23
remotely 4:6	121:11,23 122:2,2	158:6	30:14 31:12,14,19	63:7 65:4,4,15
rendered 28:12	122:17 123:16,16	requesting 159:24	47:17 60:8 77:6	69:1,7,7 70:18,23
155:25 156:4	123:17 127:21,21	requests 2:20 5:3	88:22 89:1,15	71:2,2,9,12,24
<b>rep</b> 63:11 68:12,12	129:13 131:22,22	119:4,7,22 123:4	98:23 146:8	72:1 73:22 75:5
69:8 129:13	131:25 132:19	125:19	178:22 183:7,17	92:12 114:2,4,7,9
134:24 139:9,12	134:24 135:4	require 32:20 33:2	responses 17:6	121:5 132:1 144:3
repealed 23:10	138:17 139:9	124:18 142:17,23	22:23 23:21 24:3	144:8,20 173:1
173:3	143:7,11 149:8	143:10 147:25	24:13,18,23 26:1,7	174:11 175:8
repeating 145:20	175:12	157:14 158:3	85:6 90:3,5	178:12,17,17
repetitive 140:6	representative	163:19 165:17	responsibilities	179:6,8 181:10
replace 178:10	10:13 11:23 54:4	180:7 187:18	28:24 51:14 52:7	189:11 190:7
replaced 8:21 28:15	54:14 97:24	required 30:12	responsibility 55:2	reviewed 14:21
164:15 167:22	119:10,25 120:16	139:20 188:2	74:3 82:10	181:11 190:2
replacement 164:23	120:19,21,25	requirements 6:19	responsible 51:18	reviewers 65:11
replaces 141:1	121:11,13,19,21	25:16 52:8 53:4	53:24 73:7 77:13	reviewing 173:11
<b>reply</b> 24:19 153:6	122:1 123:15	162:4	restated 164:21	reviews 10:1 27:18
	<u>I</u>	I	I	I

6/3/2015

42:2 53:12 54:25 62:9,17,25 63:2,3 72:6,7 73:11 144:9
171:17,17 177:19 177:20 179:4 180:24,24
revise 119:12,19 120:12,18 123:12 127:16 128:15
142:8,15 155:9 157:6,14 158:1,19 162:21 164:3
167:11,18 191:20 revised 30:22 134:16 173:3
185:18 <b>revising</b> 41:10 133:7
187:13 188:10 revision 119:9,24 120:11 131:19
142:16,23 158:3 <b>revisit</b> 38:10 103:7 173:1 178:4
185:14 rework 64:21 67:1 69:3
rewrites 61:24 Rich 86:10 Rich's 70:15
<b>right</b> 3:10 13:7,24 38:14 48:10 49:15
56:9 60:1,4 75:15 79:18 81:5,24 83:7 84:6 86:18 87:17
97:16 99:13 103:17 106:13 120:9 123:6 124:7
124:10,23 125:3 127:5,10 128:5,9 129:22,23 130:12
130:18,21 132:20 132:23 133:10
134:7,25 136:19 138:12 140:16,21 141:10 142:2
145:25 149:18,18 150:21 151:2,4,5

152:3,19 153:15
155:19 156:18,20
157:1 158:17
159:10,11 161:12
164:18 166:22,23
167:19 168:2
170:22 172:21
175:6 183:8
184:22 186:14
189:13,19,20
190:22 192:14
195:22 197:6
rise 76:6
rises 80:9
risk 23:7 30:8,13,19
30:24 31:1,6,7,13
31:20,25 44:24
45:8 46:6,7 48:16
114:15 173:5
191:6,11
<b>River</b> 29:13 70:25
road 75:2
<b>Roberson</b> 3:4,4,6
5:15 6:7 12:12,20
12:24 13:21,25
14:11,16,19,23
15:10,12,23 16:2,5
18:9,12 19:13
21:11 22:2,13 32:6
32:18 35:3 36:19
38:12,15,19,21,25
39:20 40:3 42:10
43:2,11 45:9 46:16
48:10,21,24 49:13
49:18,24 50:2,5,7
55:24 56:3 64:16
74:12 76:17,19
77:4 78:18,25
79:10,20 80:12,18
82:3,13,24 83:6,10
84:24 85:24 86:2,5
88:4,10 94:8 95:5
95:21,23,25 96:18
96:22,24 97:2,5
99:22 102:1,6,18
102:22,25 103:5,9
103:21,25 104:2,4

101.2 01 100.7 16
191:3,21 192:7,16 192:24 193:3,6,10
192.24 193.3,0,10
193:12,16 194:14 195:17,23 196:12
196:15 197:4,18
198:3
<b>Rocky</b> 29:8,12
role 29:3 31:24
72:21,22,23,25,25
73:20 92:7
roles 52:6
roll 126:5,21 141:21
172:23 190:6
room 1:19 26:22
27:2 75:14 117:3
180:11 194:3
rose 81:1
<b>roughly</b> 99:14
187:24
<b>routing</b> 142:22
row 17:21
rule 67:6 76:4,4
rules 136:25
rulings 100:13
run 14:3 144:11
running 73:13
188:21
rusty 128:3
S
sacrifice 60:1
safe 113:14
<b>safer</b> 27:16
0 4 1 0 17 0 7 0

S
sacrifice 60:1
<b>safe</b> 113:14
<b>safer</b> 27:16
<b>safety</b> 1:3,17 3:7,9
8:24,24,25 10:7,9
10:14,24 16:14
22:16 23:1 24:11
26:11,25 27:14
28:6,23 31:5 44:6
44:12 46:10 47:13
50:19 51:12 53:10
59:4,20 76:2 81:2
90:1 110:18
179:11 184:25
198:16
<b>sample</b> 35:25 97:24
<b>SANTO</b> 43:10

Santos 3:10 5:16,17 6:7 12:25 13:1,16 13:20 15:11,12,13 15:22 18:9,11 21:12,13 22:2,14 35:3,4,12,15,19 36:18 37:18,19 38:14 42:10,11 45:9,10 46:15 48:25 49:1,17,19 49:25 50:5,6 56:8 64:17,18 67:21 68:2 69:17,25 70:5 71:15 72:21 74:10 74:12 78:19 79:11 79:12 82:11,23 85:21 86:1,4,12,16 88:3 94:9,11 95:5 96:2,11,17 97:8,14 97:17 99:8,15,21 99:22 102:25 103:1,6,16,20,22 104:1,2,3 106:15 106:17 107:9,12 107:15 111:21,22 112:3,5 115:17,21 116:25 117:1,4,6 117:14 118:13 119:9,15 120:1,5,7 120:10 122:4 123:2,11,24 124:1 124:6,14,17,21,23 125:1,7,10,13,16 125:18,24 126:2,8 126:9,16 127:1,2,9 127:15 128:1,21 129:2,4,18,24 130:18,20,25 131:1,7,12 132:6 132:21,23,25 133:4,13,23 134:8 134:13,15 135:2 136:1,18 137:9,13 137:15,18 138:14 140:5,6,21 141:3,6 141:7,11,13,14,23 141:24 142:4

[224]

				[224]
145.17 10 146.1	105.21 120.15	150.2 160.15	anding 17.7 22.5	100.7 10
145:17,18 146:1 147:14 148:4,24	105:21 128:15 144:1 147:5 153:8	158:2 160:15 176:3 178:20	<b>sending</b> 17:7 33:5 34:24 114:20	180:7,18
•	158:14 163:12	184:10 186:15	135:15 173:6	setting 168:13 seven 19:25 60:17
149:15,19,22	scenario 71:11	Section 142:21	sends 18:2	seven 19:23 60:17 seventh 29:9
150:2,4,10,13,16	161:5			
150:20 151:4,6,10		sections 166:1	senior 17:14 45:23	several-step 87:16
151:12,15,20	scenarios 81:12	security 52:5 63:3	70:9,13 90:19 91:2	shape 148:12 149:3
152:2,14,24 153:5	schedule 25:19	see 5:21 6:3 15:19	98:10 101:4	152:18 153:21
153:10,13,18 154:7,25 155:1,15	116:17 183:5	18:18 19:10 21:6	143:25	shaped 149:17
	scheduled 88:6 190:1	35:15 38:7 39:11 39:11 42:15 43:7	sense 14:5 42:5	share 113:6
155:17,21 156:13			64:20 97:19,20	shared 51:17
156:22,23 157:2	scheme 49:5,6	47:19 60:23,24	153:23 179:21	sharing 28:12 sheet 70:3 104:12
158:23 159:5,18	scientific 19:20 60:6	61:10 63:11,12	sensitivities 62:14	
162:11,13,23 165:23 166:8	<b>scope</b> 52:22,23 53:14,16 116:17	65:14 67:23 80:10 85:16 87:24	sensitivity 62:19,21 132:1	sheets 197:25
	<i>'</i>		sensitized 188:20	ship 16:19
167:7,8 168:3,7	screening 81:20	101:20 106:3,12		ship's 16:21
169:2,3 171:10,11	Sean 3:11 38:21	107:13 108:15	sent 10:7 19:7,16,24	shoe 191:5
173:10,20 175:9	42:21 43:10 64:21	110:8 111:5,13 114:13 115:10	20:4,4 33:12 34:9	short 4:23 33:7
176:25 179:25	112:22 119:12,19		38:23 160:15 183:18 184:9	62:25 179:19
184:11,12,16 185:17 186:24	142:8 157:5 seat 12:23	116:2,15 132:17		187:10 188:12
		135:12 136:2	sentence 168:7	<b>short-staffed</b> 173:15 174:6
189:23,24 190:10	seated 3:10,11,13 second 11:25 19:12	137:11 140:17	separate 46:4 89:16	short-term 88:21
190:16,19,24 191:2 193:8,9	25:8 49:3 50:25	146:8 148:18,21 161:20 162:6	123:4 125:14,20 160:4	91:4 92:17
,	87:18 90:3 105:25	166:14 169:11		shorten 115:11
196:16,17 197:19 197:20	119:11 122:14	175:22 182:12,15	<b>September</b> 190:2,9 190:10	shortly 160:1
satisfied 25:14 85:6	125:21 131:7,8,9	185:14,24 186:16	series 85:4 115:12	shouldn't 57:25
192:18	133:6 135:23	190:11,12,14	serious 101:20	102:15
satisfy 118:9 150:13	136:20 137:3,4	193:22,23 195:24	171:19	show 93:6 117:18
<b>Savannah</b> 29:13	138:24 139:10	195.22,23 195.24	seriously 97:21	197:23
70:25	141:2 152:24	seeing 64:12	seriousness 96:15	showed 90:3
saw 33:11,18 37:3	154:20,21 158:23	seek 138:15 154:16	serve 3:15 26:5	showing 92:15
147:15 194:25	163:12 164:2	158:17	27:22 94:5 105:9	showing 52.13 shown 9:5
saying 77:7 81:21	187:2 191:5	seeking 137:10	serves 25:8 160:5,16	shown 9.3 shows 9:10,12 69:18
83:22 84:18 85:12	second- 48:17	169:25	service 8:12 92:4	shut 196:22
85:25 106:23	second-order 43:19	seen 21:15 33:20	94:24 97:14 98:20	shut 170.22 shy 72:3 77:6
107:22 109:14	44:1 48:17	49:11 76:23 79:19	Services 113:9	side 110:3,11
116:8,10 129:19	Secondly 169:20	136:9 144:6	session 89:11 105:17	sides 109:16
133:21 134:5	secretarial 143:17	170:17	116:15 119:1	sign- 63:4
137:3 138:19,20	146:5	sees 20:19	169:12,15,20	sign-up 104:11
139:3,11,21	Secretary 3:15	selected 29:14	176:21	signal 99:24
149:14 186:15	16:13 17:8 23:2,8	self-example 42:21	sessions 92:12	signature 69:23
189:4 193:18	24:5,8 25:3 26:2	self-filter 109:2	187:10	signed 19:23,24
197:6	26:11,13 27:15	send 20:6 32:10	set 8:8 21:3 25:4,12	60:24 62:10 104:8
sayings 110:18	28:3,6 30:9 31:2	34:10,18 57:18	46:12 49:22 71:18	104:14 105:2,3
says 32:9 36:11	32:10 40:24 41:7	65:8 143:9,14	86:25 94:13,23	184:20
57:24 60:19 76:5	43:25 66:19	146:18 147:6	95:2 100:13	significance 79:22
78:6 100:18	112:22 157:17	166:22	109:25 115:24	significant 10:21
				8

[225]

				[223]
11:2 12:1 14:20	129:12 131:21,25	147:23 178:25,25	166:21 192:13	80:24,25 81:4,21
23:16 31:24 58:10	134:24 139:9,12	183:14,15 192:20	193:22	82:5,17 83:4,21
59:3 173:14 188:4	144:8	somewhat 5:24	specifically 28:21	84:9,15 85:7,8,12
significantly 41:22	sites 29:7 55:6	18:24 33:7 181:18	30:13 31:8 115:4,8	85:17 86:23 87:7
signs 61:18,18	sits 193:8	soon 77:11 161:23	163:13 175:6	87:23 94:12,19,25
<b>silent</b> 5:9	sitting 147:22 184:2	185:5	specificity 101:23	95:8,12 96:12,14
similar 21:14 54:14	six 9:23 20:7 21:22	sophisticated 59:6	specifics 39:22	97:17,19 98:2,13
60:5 145:3	24:22 99:18	sorry 48:24 60:20	58:22 61:15	98:18 100:16,18
Similarly 41:15	111:12 136:9	76:21 120:3 134:8	100:20 101:11,12	100:21,22 101:1,3
simple 51:21 55:15	195:19	137:15 154:7	101:12,14 102:15	101:4,24 105:12
64:3 68:5 144:19	size 46:19 48:15	157:9 174:2	<b>speed</b> 20:25 36:13	105:13,19,19,22
145:8,14,14	skill 46:12 180:17	191:22 197:25	60:1 64:9 147:25	106:1,2,6,20,22
161:21 186:6,10	skills 46:5 51:1	sort 16:7 18:4 35:5	speeding 36:14	107:1,24,24 108:1
simpler 74:21 75:8	180:7	36:11 40:10 44:24	spend 28:17 38:16	108:4,17,24 109:1
simplify 122:24	skipped 23:9	45:2,8 48:11,12	66:4,5 68:17	109:3,8,15,15,25
simplistic 82:22	slate 178:19	49:4,10 70:5 81:20	spending 8:18	110:7,24 111:3
simply 30:18 42:14	slide 6:17,25 8:3,19	101:18 103:3	112:19	114:21 115:10
59:17 67:7,10	9:5,6,10,12,12,14	108:20 114:15	spends 66:6	119:9,13,13,20,24
115:10 133:25	10:12 11:8,20	133:25 146:5,6	<b>spent</b> 161:17 171:14	120:11,18,18
138:16 141:1	22:20 23:15 26:8	161:2 170:21	<b>split</b> 123:3,20 124:2	121:7,10,24 122:1
144:25 145:23	28:17 30:5 51:3,3	179:24 186:21	125:10,18 126:21	122:11 134:3
146:13,23 162:6	51:20 52:12,15,15	187:22	126:21 127:6	135:9 137:22
164:23	53:8,8 54:3 56:17	sorts 151:13	<b>spoke</b> 115:8	138:7 139:12
single 51:17 52:24	69:18 88:16,23	sounds 186:4 195:7	Stabilization 51:7	142:8,9,15,15,16
68:15 76:10 136:9	89:20 91:7,12	source 41:17,19	52:4 55:4 57:5	142:17,20,24
singular 50:18	92:17 93:13	101:15	105:10	143:2,4,6,18,22
58:14	slides 91:3	<b>sources</b> 122:16	<b>staff</b> 2:13 4:22 6:16	144:7,13,20,23
sir 12:24 85:20	slow 162:2	148:21	10:2,13,23,24 14:9	146:16,17,19
110:22 111:19	small 35:25 53:13	<b>span</b> 51:13	19:7,9,23 20:3,6	147:1,2,3,19 148:9
113:17	55:11 73:5 100:19	spanning 25:23	20:13,17,19 21:19	148:18,19,21,25
sit 73:1,19 101:17	101:13 174:3	speak 21:9 22:18	21:19 23:20 27:6	149:2,12,16,19
154:13	<b>smooth</b> 29:25	61:14,15 115:7	27:12,21,23 29:20	155:10,10 156:7
site 10:13 11:22	174:19	120:4	30:19 32:23 35:10	157:6,15 158:1,1,5
19:15 27:4,11,15	soft 47:14,14	speaker 104:18	36:5,7,7 37:3,4,4	158:7,14 160:19
27:18 29:8,13,13	<b>sole</b> 75:3	<b>speakers</b> 104:8,9,17	37:14 38:22 39:12	160:21 161:3,5,7,7
36:8 44:23 48:7	solicit 120:20	105:2,3	45:17,23 51:16,20	161:9,14,15,22
51:25 52:2,13,18	131:20 146:22	speaking 90:13	52:22 53:1,2,11,16	162:13,19 163:13
54:4,4,9,10,13,14	soliciting 153:7	148:2 186:25	53:17 54:1,7,22	163:15,20 164:2
54:24 55:1,19	<b>solid</b> 64:23 97:24	speaks 128:7	55:12 58:16 60:12	165:3,19,24
57:10 62:12,13,16	<b>solution</b> 98:11,13	special 44:10 92:3	63:8,15 65:3,9	167:10 168:7
63:11,15 64:4	195:3	specialized 101:13	66:6,11,15 67:1,16	169:21,24 170:9
68:11,12,15 69:7,8	solutions 99:3	<b>specific</b> 13:11 14:9	68:9,23 69:24 70:6	170:16,24 172:6
119:10,25 120:16	solve 89:8 197:8	15:20 18:21,23	70:12 71:23 73:5	173:6 174:3,13
120:19 121:2,11	somebody 56:5 64:8	25:9 31:5 44:23	73:10 74:7 75:13	175:12 178:25
121:13,19,20	72:10 104:25	60:15 61:8 102:16	75:17,18,24 76:4,5	179:3 180:23
122:1,10,17	112:23 139:18	102:17 114:16	76:10 77:2,6,19,22	182:11,15 183:4
123:15 127:20	140:1 146:14	123:19 157:11	77:23 78:11 79:14	183:15,16,19
	1	1	1	

[226]

184:14 189:5	state 27:7 30:1,2	78:22 109:9	9:23 10:4,4,10,15	134:6 176:24
190:7 193:18,23	62:17 104:9	163:21	10:19 11:1,6,8,9	<b>submarine</b> 16:17,18
194:3 195:14	stated 104:5,21	stay 106:13,14	11:11,15,20 12:10	submit 4:6 7:6,20
196:24 198:6	statement 22:15,21	stayed 121:13	13:23 14:18,23	15:20 156:11
staff-to-staff 185:4	22:25 23:3,6,10,19	step 94:22 99:7	51:15	<b>submits</b> 144:23
staff's 50:16 53:9	23:25 24:15 25:7,8	106:20 116:10	strategies 11:16	<b>submitted</b> 5:3 7:10
54:19 79:21 81:9	25:15,25 26:3,9,16	164:2,4 167:12	strategy 93:24	8:2 12:5 25:17
89:22 105:20	26:23 27:4 28:9,13	191:15,25	streaming 4:6	104:15 119:5
173:22 189:12	28:18 29:1,19,23	stepped 87:1	streamline 75:9	submitting 143:24
190:14	30:6,17,22 31:10	steps 63:10 68:10	86:22 87:2,22	subparagraph
staffed 50:18 71:2	31:12,24 32:2,8	74:18,24 163:10	strength 90:10	157:25 158:5,14
staffer 113:9	33:8 34:13 39:25	Steve 50:10 80:15	strengthen 8:24,25	158:19 164:13,14
staffing 65:12 87:21	40:9,10,13,20 41:6	187:2	strengthening 91:13	subparagraphs
staffperson 75:1	42:6,19,25 43:13	<b>Steven</b> 50:14	92:13	157:11
stage 72:6 91:10	45:1,7 48:13,20	stifle 75:24	strengths 89:21	subsequent 23:21
182:21	49:15 87:6 104:10	stimulate 35:20	90:17 93:20	124:18
stages 91:9	104:16,23 105:6	stimulates 39:4	stretching 179:17	subsequently 24:8
stakeholders 6:4 9:1	112:18,22 114:6,8	<b>Stokes</b> 39:1 45:20	strictly 100:7	25:22
13:2 38:3 122:12	114:11,13 173:2,2	46:17 47:20 48:23	174:21	substance 159:23
197:24	173:4 174:11	50:10,11,13,14	strikes 40:10	substantial 192:10
stand 98:2 169:22	175:24 177:8,22	56:10,15 58:5	strives 93:9	substantially 29:19
standalone 57:7	179:5 186:11	61:14,17 63:18	strong 54:8	substantive 25:9,12
<b>standard</b> 166:20	189:6 191:5,19	64:25 68:1,3 69:22	strongly 75:25	181:14
167:15 168:5	192:12	70:1,12 71:22	<b>structure</b> 2:14 4:22	success 90:2 92:8
standardize 35:6	statement-like	72:25 74:14 77:3,5	14:10 37:19,23	93:11,11
standardized 134:1	185:13	78:24 79:1,23	49:1,20 50:1,12,16	<b>successes</b> 13:15 91:8
standards 8:24	statements 22:18,21	80:17,22 82:24	50:22 51:11,21,22	successful 17:23
41:22 114:10	23:14,16 40:6	86:6,14,18 88:5	56:21 57:14,21,21	195:25
180:25	104:20 113:23	176:5 177:7	68:5 116:3 148:17	successfully 29:7
standing 12:22	172:25	180:15,16 182:16	149:10 163:6	<b>suffer</b> 72:3 79:5
13:22 86:6 97:1	states 29:10 142:15	182:18,21 183:9	165:14,25 168:4,8	<b>sufficient</b> 30:13,23
99:25 107:21	<b>statistic</b> 55:15,19	184:15,18,23	185:19	48:5,16 178:9
109:21 115:3	statistically 97:24	187:4,7 189:2,15	structures 177:21	<b>suggest</b> 101:8 111:3
196:24	98:24	189:18 190:1,12	structuring 23:23	172:25 183:13
standpoint 171:3	<b>statistics</b> 48:3 63:14	191:1,8 193:7,12	<b>struggle</b> 18:13 172:3	suggesting 49:19
173:13 179:21	status 12:1 25:21	<b>stood</b> 23:11	struggled 16:10	64:10 139:24
start 17:7 19:25	<b>statute</b> 20:9 24:5,9	<b>stop</b> 33:13 133:18	<b>studied</b> 60:5 62:3	suggestion 110:25
56:1,5,6 64:3	28:8 30:22 31:3	136:17,22,24	<b>studies</b> 175:19	165:23
66:20 75:2 83:23	32:12,21 40:8	stopped 34:24	<b>study</b> 59:10 80:1,4	suggestions 38:11
94:9 116:3 117:24	41:17 42:14,16,17	172:22	147:16	166:6
132:15,16 150:25	42:20 43:7 79:22	straight 97:22	<b>stuff</b> 16:24 34:18	<b>Sullivan</b> 3:11,13
173:17 197:12	79:23 83:13 108:1	straightforward	38:23,24 57:25	5:13,14,15 12:15
<b>started</b> 13:22 56:10	115:24 145:4	47:11	135:17 188:11	12:17,21 16:1,2,3
83:16,17 99:4	160:15 173:11,12	<b>strategic</b> 6:18,22,23	<b>stumble</b> 67:19	16:6 18:22 19:14
195:9	175:9,22	7:1,13 8:19,22,23	style 66:12,25	21:11 22:13 32:7,8
starting 186:21	<b>statutory</b> 8:16 25:18	9:2,5,7,7,8,9,10,10	stylistic 66:14	33:3,10 35:4,11,13
187:1 194:19	29:3 30:16 42:25	9:11,12,13,16,22	<b>subject</b> 104:21	35:17,20 38:18,19
	I	1	I	1

[227]

				[/]
29.22 20.2 40.2 5	167.21 25 169.6	gramm and g 10-2 0 14	62.19.21.62.12	40 dr 52,22 55,19
38:22 39:3 40:3,5 43:4,11,12 47:6,23	167:21,25 168:6 168:10,11,13,17	<b>supports</b> 10:3,9,14 10:18,25 11:5	62:18,21 63:13 64:10 82:1,9 96:15	task 53:22 55:18 tasked 85:12
48:11,22 50:3,4	168:19,24,25	93:22	97:20 99:16,17	tasking 39:23 102:9
55:24 56:1,5,9	169:1,13,14,19	suppose 16:14	100:9 114:17,22	103:14
57:14 60:7 61:16	171:9 172:13,15	179:15	115:9 118:3	tasks 86:19
63:9,19 64:16	171.9 172.13,13	supposed 40:21	122:13 126:4,20	taxpayer 39:16
74:15 76:17,18	174:18,23 176:6	44:11,18 165:3,11	126:23 129:9	team 45:23,25 53:24
80:13,15,19,23	174:13,23 170.0	sure 17:4 18:1 20:17	140:15 145:8	53:25 54:5,13,13
83:1,8,11 84:12,25	183:12,13 185:24	21:5 34:20 35:21	147:9,17 148:16	54:24,25,25 64:23
86:2,8,9 95:6,7,20	186:3 188:17	39:9 40:5 41:9	148:20 156:18	65:11,15,20 67:10
95:21,22,24 96:20	189:3,13,20 191:4	48:12 49:17 66:18	171:18 173:16	69:7 71:2,2,5,9,12
96:21,23,25 97:3,6	192:17,25 193:10	66:22 68:18 77:13	174:5 178:16,23	72:7,14 73:17,22
99:23,24 102:1,4,8	193:11,13,17	78:16 97:20 98:4,9	174.3 178.10,23	teams 55:16 57:10
102:22,24 106:15	194:1 195:7	102:19,22 103:1	186:10 188:15	67:8
107:20,21 112:6,7	196:10,14 197:15	105:23 107:3,7	190:3,5 191:25	tech 174:13
112:24 113:3,25	190.10,14 197.13	113:19 114:3	taken 71:5 122:6	technical 2:13,13
112.24 113.5,23	Sullivan's 112:13	122:10 128:18	199:4,10	4:21,22 9:3 10:2
117:15,23 118:11	116:1 150:14	129:9 130:5 133:5	takes 21:15 36:3	10:13,23 12:2 14:9
119:12,19 124:4,7	163:8,12	133:11 135:14	54:7 57:17 58:3,6	28:3 45:12 46:5
124:15,22,24	summarized 33:17	138:25 147:22,23	62:22 68:25 79:4	47:23 50:10,11,15
125:4,15,21,25	summarizing 12:8	151:12 152:18	talented 55:12	50:16,17 51:1,4,6
126:6,7,14,24,25	summary 79:17	151:12 152:18	talk 12:19 16:7	51:12,17 52:16,16
127:10,11,22	114:5	172:4 194:1	17:13 76:20,22	52:19,22 53:2,7,8
128:2,9,13 129:1,6	summer 62:4 92:18	surprised 78:11	95:9 96:1 100:20	53:10,11,13 54:1,7
130:1,2,14,17,23	sunset 111:15 112:9	survey 19:21 20:25	101:21,22 102:11	54:18 55:8,9,12
130:24 134:21,22	Sunshine 3:21,21,22	88:25 89:3,15 97:9	102:15 103:14	56:19,19 58:15
135:7 136:14,19	5:23 100:6	110:14 176:17	108:24 140:1	61:19,20,21,22,22
137:12,14,16	supervise 108:4	surveys 97:18	143:5 158:9,11	62:6,10 64:14 65:3
138:19 139:4,5,7	supervision 108:1	175:19	170:8 176:15	65:4,6,9,13 66:22
140:11,12,14,24	supervisor 52:24	symptom 194:20	177:7 178:13	67:3,6 68:21 69:2
140:25 141:5,21	100:23	system 11:18 57:18	193:18	69:9,9,14,23 70:4
141:22 142:8,9,12	supervisors 90:12	systemic 82:7	talked 64:13 97:19	70:14,14,15 71:11
142:14 145:25	90:15	systems 177:20	114:2,11,13,17,22	73:9,11,18,24 74:2
146:3 147:20	supervisory 54:9		115:3,22 137:20	77:9,15 78:15,20
149:6,16,24	supplement 178:11	T	148:12 171:18,21	79:5 87:7 108:13
150:19,23 151:3	supplementary	table 140:10 153:23	176:1 194:15	110:13 113:12
151:25 152:3,25	93:25	154:16,18 155:7	talking 17:14 47:25	115:9 143:20,23
153:2,3,6,11,14,19	supplementation	198:14	49:3 56:11 83:25	144:5 145:1
153:25 154:13,20	28:16	tabled 155:5,11	105:12 112:19	157:22 170:14
154:23,24 155:6,9	support 6:3,24 9:4	176:11,12 198:11	137:14 138:9	176:7 177:18,20
156:16,20,21	9:16,23 11:9 53:1	tabling 140:8	139:8,20 148:9	177:24 178:15
157:6,9,10 158:12	53:3,9 77:12 91:11	tackling 58:19 188:9	149:8 165:8,25	179:3,3,6 186:6
158:25 159:11,14	103:23 116:5	tag 76:19	166:11 175:3	189:4
159:19,21,23	138:21 155:23	<b>tail</b> 66:3	183:16 186:17	technically 79:3
162:17 164:7,11	156:17 171:6	take 4:23 12:23 23:6	195:10	techniques 46:8
164:17,19 165:1,8	supporting 30:20	30:8 40:1 41:12	talks 17:5 36:7	technologies 59:9
166:5,9,24 167:6,9	47:18 51:18	44:25 60:14 62:17	target 96:9	technology 28:11
		<u> </u>		<u> </u>

[228]

		ĺ		
59:19,20	198:1,2,3,7	196:18	123:20 125:5	46:21,22,23,24,25
tell 17:9 48:8 57:20	<b>Thanks</b> 107:21	theme 18:24	128:14 136:15,20	47:1,8 49:20 58:5
58:3 68:13 94:19	Thanksgiving 20:1	there's 12:18 17:22	140:16 145:14	64:13 68:13 70:16
101:3,5 105:13,20	<b>that's</b> 13:10 17:19	17:25 18:7,20 22:9	146:7,21 147:6	72:4 74:15,18,23
192:8 193:1	17:20 18:11 19:18	42:6 43:20,21	149:6 158:12	75:9,15 76:20
194:17	19:18 20:24 21:21	44:21 56:18 58:8	161:22 162:16	81:24 82:1 83:25
<b>telling</b> 83:6 150:25	21:24 31:10 33:10	58:14 59:23 62:14	163:25 170:23	84:5,20,25 85:1,11
192:7	34:23 38:4,25 39:1	63:10 65:1 68:24	178:1 195:8	85:13,14 86:2
template 134:17	39:9,17 40:1 43:24	69:4,6,7 71:19	things 16:4,23 17:3	94:16 95:2,11
temporary 111:4	46:21 47:19 48:4	72:8 74:4,5 75:13	18:7 20:25 24:15	96:13 97:11 98:7
ten 143:19	48:10,11 49:7,12	75:17,20,24,25	34:11,21 36:14	98:10,11 99:5
tend 22:6 110:17	49:20,22 57:8 61:1	76:11 79:16 80:5	40:8,21 41:5,14	100:8 102:5,9,9
<b>tends</b> 66:3	63:24 66:22 69:10	81:20 85:24 90:13	43:12 44:5,7 47:14	103:13,23 105:4
term 7:2 69:15	72:12 73:11 76:7,7	91:1 95:11,12 96:3	47:14 58:7 59:1,5	106:1,10,18,24
178:5	77:19 78:6 80:18	100:13,14 108:5	59:10,11,14,16,20	107:5,13 108:20
terminology 184:13	85:19,19 86:2	109:16 110:9	59:24 60:4 61:24	109:23,25 110:3
terms 16:20 21:15	94:14,18 96:7	124:12 135:25	62:2 64:9 65:15	110:10,14,16
21:18 25:1,4 45:1	98:13 99:1,1,24	137:5 145:19	66:2,3,17 67:14,20	112:14 113:11
82:2 90:23 101:23	100:9,10,10	147:20 151:17	68:9,22 72:14 76:3	114:5 115:8,13
114:3,19 179:21	101:19 103:21,23	152:25 159:15	77:21 78:4,9 79:25	116:18 117:16
<b>testimony</b> 199:4,7	104:1 107:5,9,25	160:3 174:19	79:25 80:6 83:12	118:3 127:23
<b>testing</b> 180:4,9	108:3,10,14 109:9	178:18,18 179:10	83:17,23 84:2 87:3	128:5,18 130:14
thank 5:15,17 6:6,7	109:12,12,21	179:20,20 180:11	95:7 96:6,6,14	137:3,23,24 138:2
6:15 12:12,24	110:9 112:10	183:1 187:10	99:12 105:13	138:18,18 140:10
13:20 15:22,23	113:13 115:13	196:18,23,23	108:6 109:10	140:19 141:9
18:22 21:10,11	116:21 118:1	thereof 83:16	110:8 111:5,12,14	142:4 145:14
22:2,12 32:6,8	122:3,18 124:23	157:20	114:2,15,19,20	147:9 148:19
37:19 39:20,24	124:24 130:14	<b>they'll</b> 98:6 99:16,17	115:12,15 135:22	150:13 152:10,14
46:15 50:7 63:9	132:15,19,23	166:21 183:16	136:11 144:2	152:17,18,25
64:15,16 74:10,11	133:23 136:22,22	196:4	147:25 166:21	153:22 158:14,15
74:12 82:23 88:3,5	137:23 139:10,24	<b>they're</b> 16:7 18:1	171:14,20 179:20	159:14 160:1,6
88:15 94:8 95:4,5	141:10 145:5,13	19:1,2 47:18 64:25	180:11 181:23	161:23 163:3,4
95:7,20 96:11,16	145:13 148:19,22	77:20 78:4,23	183:1 187:8,9,11	166:12,15 169:16
99:21,22 102:24	149:18,23 150:3,9	87:25 94:13	187:14,18 193:24	170:1,8,18 171:2,3
106:10 107:19	150:11,17 151:4	100:24 105:14	194:18,24	171:14,20 172:15
109:18,19,20	152:14,17 153:10	135:11 143:20	think 5:10 12:18	174:12,25 175:2
110:19,21 111:19	153:12,15 154:11	153:16 165:11	14:24 15:2 17:2,25	176:9,12,25 179:4
112:5,11,12,15,16	156:12 159:14	167:15 170:24	18:12,17,18,25	179:23 180:2,11
113:16,17,17,21	164:16 165:25	182:14 193:18	19:1,2 21:8 22:3,7	181:14 182:9
114:1 118:15	167:14 170:10	194:18,23 195:24	32:10,12,13,15,19	183:16,25 184:2
122:4 148:4 152:2	171:5 172:8 175:7	196:3,13 197:6	32:20,21,22 34:17	184:14 185:23,25
162:23 169:14	175:12 176:3,3	they've 48:15 144:6	35:13 36:19 37:12	186:3,6,20,21,24
171:8,9,12,13	177:18 178:24	<b>thing</b> 36:13 48:12	37:13,15,17,22	187:10 188:19
172:7,10 177:5,6	179:17 182:6,18	84:5,6 96:10	38:1,1,6 39:25	191:22,22,25
189:21 191:2	184:19 185:14	100:12 101:18	40:5,6 41:23 42:12	192:1,2,4,8 193:14
193:5,6,9,12	186:11,19,21,22	102:9 105:25	42:17,20,21,23	194:8,8,12,18,24
196:15 197:11,16	189:2 195:5 196:3	106:5 108:20	43:2,5,6,8,18 45:1	195:3,19,25 197:6

[229]

100.1	4: - 11.12.04.12	120.20 121.20	115.5 102.21	4 17.25 10.2 24.19
198:1 <b>thinking</b> 35:5 37:9	tied 11:13 94:13	120:20 131:20	115:5 193:21 194:10	<b>try</b> 17:25 19:3 34:18 36:13 38:6 39:12
O	tier 37:9 46:24,25	134:23 181:10,24 times 22:5 26:17	track 89:8 185:7	67:2 72:7 76:3
40:14 48:17,18 136:13 186:8	47:7,11,18 48:1,18	27:25 34:8 66:24		
	114:16 173:21,22	75:13 80:24 95:10	<b>tracked</b> 78:4,9 79:16	84:5 100:4 101:25
thinks 37:11 75:16	173:23 188:10			106:5 111:11,15
81:4 95:12 109:4	191:12,12	109:8	train 136:17,24	136:17 139:5
third 9:13 12:7	tiered 116:4 173:21	timing 176:16	trained 77:9	169:25 172:16
26:15 58:16 90:10	173:23	179:13	training 44:5,21	176:13 179:5,18
119:14 155:13,13	tiers 49:3 time 6:9 12:16 20:5	title 104:9 titles 56:22	45:17,25 46:1,2 52:23 92:9 180:22	179:19 184:4 195:13 196:21
thought 3:5 15:4				
21:8 34:25 36:21	20:12,18,19,20	to-do 138:3	trainings 92:23	trying 16:11 17:12
44:25 49:16,18	21:15 22:9 27:3	today 22:17 26:4	transcript 4:5,10	18:1,4,5,6 21:5
80:25 84:7 87:5	33:5,13 34:9 38:17	27:11,18 28:10	115:17	35:15,20 47:3
97:12 101:20,21	39:19 40:11,22	29:18 45:8,14	transition 29:25	60:10,11 68:18
109:1 111:18	41:24 56:10 57:5	48:13 49:6 57:11	translate 186:10	74:23 84:4 95:15
152:4 160:10	58:8 60:16 61:9,13	57:17 58:9,19 59:5	<b>transmission</b> 26:25 27:18	108:10,21 114:12
166:17 192:20	62:7,12,18,22 63:1	60:6 84:25 85:3,11	· · · -	134:22 136:10
<b>thoughts</b> 35:1 43:10 105:11 122:22	63:4,13 64:6 65:17	98:14 108:25	<b>transmit</b> 25:3 27:13 31:1	145:6,6 176:12,19
	66:4,5,6,19 67:11	122:6,17 136:2,3	transmittal 22:25	183:19 184:8
174:9	67:24 68:17,25	136:11 137:11,11	26:10	186:22 188:6 tune 64:18
thousand-person	72:13 78:10 79:19	148:24 169:21		
179:16	83:2,2 84:15,25	170:13 171:14	transmitted 25:6 26:2	turn 5:9,12 26:8
thread 194:25	87:8,11 94:9,10	172:8,10 197:17		101:1 119:4 141:12
threat 75:20 81:1	99:9,10 104:5,20 107:3 110:19	today's 198:9	transmitting 28:2	
179:10,11 <b>threaten</b> 44:11 45:4	112:19 113:22	<b>told</b> 68:15 95:8,10 95:11 97:13	<b>transparency</b> 39:16 148:13	turning 43:13 175:20
76:1	115:11 117:10,12	161:17 194:22	transparent 5:22	twice 124:9
three 3:12,16 9:2,8,9	113.11 117.10,12	tone 90:23	treat 123:4 125:13	twice 124.9 two 9:8,11 19:19
9:22,24,24 11:9,21	129:14,15 130:9	tonight 176:11	132:21,22	29:6 42:22 43:3
17:21 20:9 29:13	131:25 138:10	Tontodonato 192:11	tremendous 66:4	45:22,22 46:23,25
31:8 36:2 54:12	141:2 142:19	tool 6:4 134:10,14	68:17 69:4	47:11 48:1 49:3,10
77:20 79:15 87:11	143:11 144:5,25	toolkit 6:4	trends 88:19 89:19	58:16 59:3 62:5
87:24 88:2 89:16	147:19 148:2	tools 45:17 88:17,20	91:5	63:12 70:16 71:22
89:20 90:20,24	149:15 150:7	92:24 191:16	tried 43:14 74:6	72:18 77:20 79:15
91:3,5,9 93:18	151:23 159:5	top 37:6 70:4 92:16	trigger 170:19	83:12 109:16
116:4 126:12	160:7,18 161:7,7	166:6,6	trip 23:1 26:10	116:4 123:3,4,21
131:5 139:21	161:14,16,16	topic 2:3 12:19 21:9	33:11,17 34:24	124:15 125:14,19
141:12 142:3	162:4 171:4,11,15	41:10 50:3 98:4	149:8	127:6 131:6
143:8 152:5,6,12	173:14 176:18	103:2 105:12	trouble 130:12	132:17 133:9
157:11 158:5,15	178:3,7,8 179:12	161:15	true 17:16 27:11	140:22 141:11
158:19 164:20	179:19 181:16	topics 59:13 191:12	57:21 151:3 199:7	140.22 141.11
167:21 175:7,9,10	183:10 187:20	total 65:18 160:21	trust 90:14 91:1	157:25 160:3
179:16 184:2	188:12,14 191:9	touched 191:24	105:16,21 107:24	161:11 164:14
195:11,23	195:9,12 197:14	touches 174:8	103.10,21 107.24	165:2 173:22
throw 16:4 161:1	timeliness 37:21	toured 27:9	169:24 170:9,10	174:4 175:6,16
Tibideau 105:2	90:23	Towers 89:14 94:2	170:22 171:8	174.4 173.0,10
tick 69:6	timely 92:1,11	95:8,17 96:3 99:9	truth 83:7	188:8 191:12
HCN U.J.U	J2.1,11	75.0,17 70.5 77.7	uuii 03.7	100.0 171.12

6/3/2015

194:10
<b>two-</b> 191:14
two-paragraph
20:15
<b>twofold</b> 50:23
<b>type</b> 39:6 45:6 94:18
122:8 151:7,21
163:18 165:18
types 24:18 156:6
typewriting 199:6
typical 65:11
typically 52:9 62:25
72:5 81:12 121:3
143:8,19
U

ultimate 69:19,22 70:2 ultimately 135:13 160:19 183:18 186:22 192:21 **unable** 78:11 **unanimous** 117:9,13 163:15,24 164:6 167:14 unclear 194:16 uncomfortable 193:24 unconditional 25:3 underlying 2:11 4:20 22:19 50:12 understand 18:5 20:11 38:4 47:6 49:2 60:11 75:12 102:8,20 109:13 124:25 125:15,22 129:10,18,20 130:5,13 134:5,22 136:1,25 137:9 138:7,19,20,25 149:14,25 150:23 154:19 165:1 166:15 174:6 181:14 187:8 189:3,20 191:15 196:10 understanding 22:1

45:11 103:9 104:24 105:1 122:6 129:25 139:3 195:17 196:7 understands 172:5 understood 77:1 102:19 133:3,11 undertake 190:18 unfilled 11:19 unfortunately 193:3 unilaterally 70:21 unintended 21:1 147:18,21 unique 11:10 52:8 69:13,14 89:17 177:18 178:10 180:2 uniquely 82:17 universe 135:8 **unkind** 41:23 **unquote** 66:20 unresolved 12:2 unscientific 20:25 33:25 57:16 unusual 36:6 update 14:5 updated 13:23 190:6 updates 32:1 **upset** 81:7 upsetting 83:21 urgency 59:23 use 24:11 37:10 42:16 43:14 44:23 53:14 54:14 61:2 70:5 91:20 92:24 92:25 110:17 180:21 186:1,25 195:3 useful 27:25 32:10 37:21 uses 9:24 51:10 53:11

usually 67:5 68:21

utilization 179:22

 $\mathbf{V}$ validation 180:5 validity 26:4 valuable 49:21 98:24 177:22 value 87:4 110:11 122:15,16 170:11 182:12,12 valued 105:14 values 91:15.17 92:4 92:20 94:13,24 96:13 99:4 106:1 106:18 109:25 110:19 variation 33:4 variety 182:25 various 24:18 42:20 122:15 175:19 vast 109:7 vehicle 27:23 182:3 vein 170:21,22 171:7,7 veins 188:21 veracity 83:11 verbatim 4:5 versa 137:23 version 19:9 versus 58:9 138:6 148:9 175:13 180:21,23 182:5 vibrate 5:9 **vice** 3:6 5:17 6:15 22:13 50:13 88:15 104:18 108:3 137:22 video 4:5,6,10,13 view 33:1 37:3 44:14 71:16 72:24 85:19 139:16 146:21 170:4 178:6 179:7 viewed 17:16 19:2 viewers 104:15 **viewing** 4:6,11 viewpoint 88:24 175:19 176:17 views 15:1 22:6

46:18 69:13,13 72:4,8 98:7 **virtual** 95:12 virtually 56:16 170:7 **visible** 60:13 visit 196:21 **visitors** 117:11 visits 27:4,7,11 voice 3:5 72:19 74:22 **volume** 80:3 vote 4:2 5:4 85:10 116:20 123:7,18 123:20,21 124:2,8 124:9,11,11,12,13 124:18,19 125:16 125:20,23,23,25 126:2,17,21,23 127:5,7 128:6,8 130:17,22 131:5 134:7,12 140:7,10 140:11,12,15,20 140:23 141:2,11 141:19 142:2 154:22 156:19 157:18,19 159:5 163:19 192:22 197:25 voted 119:22 138:21 157:12 votes 5:25 123:4 124:22 125:2 126:1,3,12 134:16 140:14 168:23 198:10 voting 20:10 61:2 124:8 125:5 126:14 127:12 141:1 157:21 198:12 W

wait 12:23 45:14

107:13 195:11

196:11

**waited** 79:13

waive 120:15 122:9 123:14 127:19 129:17,22 136:5,8 138:22 **waiving** 121:15 walk 42:14 47:25 53:20,20 56:12 61:12 95:13 170:6 wall 67:24 Walter 113:6,8,8,19 want 5:18 16:10 17:6 18:9 20:25 21:12,13 32:14 34:22 37:13 38:10 38:16 39:5,6,21 40:3 48:1,25 49:5 49:9 56:1,6 60:1,9 62:15 64:21 66:19 75:6,6,11 76:19 83:22 84:14 85:25 86:9 90:2 94:14,18 96:16 97:17,18,20 98:3,9,17 100:23 100:25 102:19 103:1,13 106:12 106:17 109:20 110:24 113:10,21 113:23 117:21 122:8,10 124:4 126:2 127:22 128:13,23 129:8 130:4 133:11,19 134:24,25 136:12 137:19 138:13,14 140:5 141:15 142:10 143:13,14 145:16 146:15,25 148:18 151:6 154:3 162:10 165:5,19,20 166:5 166:18,24 167:2 168:6 169:20,24 171:15 172:2,10 173:25 174:20,23

176:7 178:13

179:25 182:7

184:12 188:24

[231]

				[231]
196:21,25 197:25	86:22 87:2 108:22	186:22 187:8,9,18	193:20 194:6	55:8,14,15,20
wanted 14:17 32:19	162:1	188:6 190:6	195:22 196:3	56:23,23 62:16,19
37:4 49:4 76:24	we'd 118:7 162:2	191:12	197:11	63:8 65:6 67:19
85:18 94:19 98:1	we'll 15:5 17:4,10	we've 14:2 15:1 20:4	welcome 35:2 47:21	68:24 69:19,20
100:2 103:20,22	21:4,8 32:10 36:22	20:4,8,9 35:22	49:8 88:10 104:6	70:6,10 73:9 75:4
105:23 117:23	38:9 42:16 45:13	36:20,20 41:5	119:3	83:18,19 85:7,13
124:24 127:24	96:20 111:11,15	43:13,18 46:8 60:3	went 33:14,18 34:1	85:17 90:22 94:15
133:2,5 147:13	118:14 123:8	60:5 62:12 65:23	44:23 46:1 57:25	96:4,12 98:14 99:9
171:20 176:8	126:6,23 136:6	72:11,18 79:2 83:5	58:7 66:9 68:4,6	100:14,16 101:1,3
198:6	141:20 145:11,12	85:13 86:25 87:17	71:1 85:8 171:16	100:14,10 101:1,3
wants 12:21 47:24	155:12 175:17,20	95:10 99:4 100:15	171:17 193:21	101.7,23 102.4,7
84:12 112:23	178:21,24 190:8,8	111:7 127:23	weren't 186:8	111:5,25 160:21
118:1 140:1	193:1,1 196:7	135:8 138:2,21	194:17	160:22 161:10
146:19 147:3	we're 5:20 13:4 14:7	153:8 138.2,21	what's 39:8 61:9,12	162:15 170:3,25
war 16:19	14:11 20:22 35:22	176:1 177:13	61:12 68:21,22	172:6,7 181:6,6,12
warrant 26:13	36:4,16 40:20 42:7	187:7,22 188:12	72:21,23 97:9 99:9	181:21 182:1,1,6
176:1 180:12	45:2 49:2 57:18	weapons 51:6 52:2	105:19 108:18	183:4 185:8,8,9
warrants 26:18	58:19 60:3 64:7	52:10,11 55:3 57:3	113:24 137:21	188:24 189:1,5,12
WASHINGTON	66:17 75:22 76:21	weave 195:4	145:1 148:8,8	189:15,16,18
1:20	77:13,16 81:14,23		•	
	· ·	website 4:12,13 5:7	179:22 183:22,23	190:1,15 192:11
wasn't 41:4,25	81:24 85:13 86:18	11:24 13:17,19	<b>who's</b> 108:3,8,9 139:1	192:19 193:1
44:18 57:6 62:20	87:1,12,15,15,17	60:23 118:4		194:19,23
153:6 182:16	87:19,20,21,23,24	198:10	widgets 64:20	worked 57:9 82:4
Waste 160:2	98:9 99:13,18	week 121:3 133:20	willingness 89:24	83:4 166:3 180:5
wasted 161:16	100:19 101:13	weekly 11:23 66:7	window 121:4	workers 31:22 75:4
watch 78:10	102:12 103:14	68:12 120:16	Winokur 34:7,8	workforce 89:7
water 17:13	105:4 107:13	122:2 123:16	WIPP 160:2	working 27:22 41:8
<b>Watson</b> 89:14 94:2	111:9 112:8,19	127:20 128:24	wishing 104:16	58:16 83:3 91:22
95:8,17 96:3 99:9	116:3 117:7,8,8	129:13 131:22	witnessed 38:5	94:12 105:19
115:5 193:21	124:8,8,21 125:1,5	135:4 139:9,12	wolf 77:14	106:1 170:16,24
194:11	126:14 127:7,12	weeks 19:19,25	won't 21:3 22:4 43:17 110:1	187:18 190:6
<b>way</b> 18:4,7 24:4 32:22 34:14 42:20	128:10 129:10	20:10,16,16 39:19		195:20 196:4
	130:21 132:9	60:17 61:5,8 70:16	wonderful 72:4	works 53:21 65:20
47:12,19 53:21	133:7 136:8,17,20	99:18 143:8	wondering 34:17	67:1,16 71:17,18
55:7 59:4 65:12,20	136:23 137:5	144:20 146:9	135:22,25	103:21 105:19
67:12,13,19 68:19	138:9 139:19	148:2 152:5,6,12	word 57:23 168:4	workshop 99:4
70:22 77:25,25	140:19,25 141:2	weigh 81:18	wording 121:23	workshops 95:17
82:7 84:4 87:25	148:9 150:23,24	weighed 81:6	words 75:24 131:12	96:7 99:5,14
103:21 110:9	153:3,7,8,21	weighing 161:14	144:14 145:20	194:13 196:5
111:17 124:21	154:14 155:6	Welch 6:11,13,15	166:13	world 43:17 140:17
135:17 136:6	164:13 165:8,25	12:12,18,22 13:7	work 14:3,8 21:8,18	153:8,15 154:11
140:18 148:19	166:9,11 167:16	13:18,24 14:4,14	21:24 29:6 37:23	168:13
150:4 170:9	168:13,18 171:18	14:17,20 15:4,17	38:7 40:17,18 44:5	worried 147:11
180:10 181:11,24	173:14,19,21	15:23 16:8 88:11	45:19 46:3 50:21	worse 80:16
183:21,24 195:4	175:3 178:17,19	88:15 94:8 95:16	50:24 51:1,24	worth 112:10
195:14,15 196:24	178:19 183:18	97:1,11,16 98:19	52:23 53:9,16,17	worthwhile 38:6
ways 44:2 74:4	184:6,8 186:12,17	99:13,16 171:17	53:22,25 54:20	42:13,23 85:23
	1	1	1	1

[232]

-				
115:23	9:17,19 10:12 13:8	<b>099</b> 155:21	<b>1993</b> 26:16	<b>2015-099</b> 119:14
worthy 84:7,16	13:9,9,15 14:3,5	099 133.21	<b>1996</b> 28:20	155:14 157:2
worthy 64.7,10 wouldn't 146:20	20:5 23:17 30:10	1	<b>1996-97</b> 33:12	<b>2015-101</b> 119:18
Wow 125:4	36:1 46:13 68:1,2	<b>1</b> 22:21 23:19 24:15	<b>1998</b> 129:11	157:5 168:23
wrap 86:6	86:13,23 89:5,14	25:8,15,25 26:3	<b>19th</b> 158:16,20	169:6
write 35:8 49:21	90:7 99:19 111:12	<b>1.1</b> 10:5,10,15	159:16 167:1,15	<b>2015-102</b> 119:11
81:23 84:13	111:16 159:24	<b>1.2</b> 10:5,10,15	137.10 107.1,13	142:7 155:8
122:11 143:23	165:6,12 189:1	<b>1:00</b> 117:3,7,10	2	<b>2016</b> 8:23 9:18
144:9 159:25	190:5	118:7,14	<b>2</b> 6:17 10:21 11:3	<b>2018</b> 8:20
writing 38:2 40:14	years 7:3 8:20,22	<b>1:01</b> 119:2	22:20,25 26:9,16	<b>21</b> 3:19 156:1
66:24 80:20 81:3	9:18 13:10 17:21	<b>1:30</b> 117:6,7,18,22	26:23 27:4 28:9,13	<b>22</b> 2:11
152:18	19:6 25:24 26:5	118:8	32:9 39:25 51:3	<b>22nd</b> 19:15
written 24:23 38:23	27:3 33:23 34:4	<b>10</b> 11:8 34:7 56:13	56:17 88:16	<b>23</b> 27:3 57:12
38:24 41:5 43:18	36:2 41:19 45:22	157:21	114:11 173:2	<b>23rd</b> 190:2,9,10
45:6,8 63:22 87:20	45:22 56:13,13	<b>100</b> 46:13 55:20	<b>2.1</b> 10:5,20	<b>24th</b> 19:15
115:14 122:20	57:12 58:20,24	74:20	<b>2.2</b> 10:5,10	<b>25</b> 25:23 26:5 41:19
132:2 133:17	59:6,12,14 88:2	<b>101</b> 168:21	<b>2:38</b> 198:19	<b>27th</b> 19:25
143:10 144:14	89:1 111:8 179:18	<b>104</b> 2:18	<b>20</b> 41:19 56:13	<b>29th</b> 19:16
159:17 162:18	186:17 195:11,12	<b>11</b> 11:20	58:20,24 59:6,14	
wrong 57:20 128:3	195:23	<b>11:15</b> 88:8	187:24	3
129:11 130:5	Yep 132:5	<b>119</b> 2:20	<b>20-plus</b> 59:11	<b>3</b> 1:14 2:5 6:25 23:3
132:18 139:6	yesteryear 58:9	<b>12</b> 88:18	<b>20004</b> 1:20	23:15 28:18 29:19
192:8	yield 64:14	<b>12th</b> 19:24 97:11	<b>2002</b> 19:19	29:23 40:10 51:20
wrote 19:10,15	you'll 189:4,4	98:21	<b>2007</b> 40:21 177:12	52:12 88:23
70:25 146:17	you're 13:22 17:8,9	<b>13</b> 121:25 143:3	177:14 178:5	<b>3.1</b> 11:1,7 142:21
	17:12 47:21 48:4	158:6	184:23 185:11,16	<b>3.2</b> 10:5,11
X	49:15 56:3 60:8	<b>134</b> 187:23	186:8	<b>3:00</b> 1:15
	62:7,8 64:11,22	<b>13th</b> 60:21 61:3	<b>2010</b> 6:20 85:1	<b>30</b> 198:13
Y	69:19 70:7 71:18	158:20 159:17	<b>2011</b> 8:22 85:1	<b>31</b> 26:9 156:8
<b>yeah</b> 13:1 16:10	79:21 83:25,25	163:24 164:8	<b>2012</b> 85:1	<b>35</b> 11:24 40:18
49:1,13 61:16 63:9	99:11 105:23	165:6,11 167:1	<b>2013</b> 23:11 30:7,10	<b>352</b> 1:19
69:23 76:19 80:19	106:23 109:13	<b>14</b> 4:2 89:5	83:13 90:7	<b>360-degree</b> 69:15
100:1 109:13	112:24 117:4,6	<b>14th</b> 160:4	<b>2014</b> 8:20,21 9:17	<b>3rd</b> 19:23 60:20
111:22 113:7	128:21 129:19	<b>15-minute</b> 88:7	13:23 88:23 89:10	
123:10 130:2	134:5 138:19	<b>150</b> 7:21	160:5	4
133:10 137:13	164:17 166:15,18	<b>16</b> 15:8 20:16 60:17	<b>2014-1</b> 31:11,15	<b>4</b> 8:3 11:8 14:23
138:11 145:18	174:24 175:5	61:8	43:16	23:10 26:8 52:15
149:21,23 150:20	181:13 187:5	<b>17</b> 15:6,8	<b>2015</b> 1:14 3:19 4:3	89:20
152:20 153:3,5,13	189:4,7 192:7	<b>1704.4(c)</b> 157:21	9:18 94:4 97:8	<b>4.1</b> 11:11
153:14,18 154:15	you've 56:10,11	<b>18th</b> 61:6	121:25 143:3	<b>4.2</b> 11:15
154:20 159:6	60:6 64:25 116:8	<b>19</b> 9:22 23:18	156:1,9 158:6	<b>4.3</b> 11:21
164:21 166:8	137:1 197:20	<b>197</b> 2:22	<b>2015-</b> 155:20 168:20	<b>45</b> 164:5 167:13,17
169:9 175:4 184:2		<b>1990</b> 23:18	<b>2015-098</b> 119:7	<b>45-minute</b> 71:3
184:12 186:3	Z	<b>1990s</b> 56:20	120:9 127:15	<b>4th</b> 19:18
187:7 189:14	zero 141:12 142:3	<b>1991</b> 24:21	130:22 131:4	5
193:20	Δ	<b>1992</b> 19:14 26:9	140:22 141:11	<b>5</b> 8:19 9:5 23:6
<b>year</b> 7:1,8,9,10,22	0	33:8 34:13	142:4	3 0.17 9.3 23:0

		[233]
28:17 30:6,17 31:10,12,24 32:2 43:13 45:1,7 48:13 53:8 69:18 91:7 114:13 173:4 191:5,19 192:12 50 2:14 26:1 97:12 5th 19:22 160:4  6 62:8 9:6,10 30:5 92:17 60 4:14 11:4 89:10 60-some- 160:24 60-some- 0dd 160:20 625 1:18 170:13 64 97:13 6th 61:7  7 79:12,12 66:22 93:13 73 89:2 74 89:15 76 55:16 7th 19:17,22  8 8 9:14 88 2:16  9 9 10:12 9:00 3:3 90 33:25 110:15 90s 19:9 34:24 96- 33:15 97 33:16 9th 61:4		[233]
7th 19:17,22  8 8 9:14 88 2:16  9 9 10:12 9:00 3:3 90 33:25 110:15 90s 19:9 34:24 96-33:15 97 33:16		