In the Matter of:

Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board

May 11, 2017 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 PROCEEDINGS
2		
3		3 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Good morning. I am Sean
4		4 Sullivan, I am the Chairman of the Defense Nuclear
5		5 Facilities Safety Board, I will preside over today's
6		6 public business meeting. I would like to introduce my
7	DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD	7 colleagues on the board. To my right is Vice Chairman
8		8 Bruce Hamilton and Board Members Jessie Roberson and
9		9 Daniel Santos; to my left is Board Member Joyce Connery.
10	PUBLIC BUSINESS MEETING:	10 We five constitute the board.
11	DNFSB BUSINESS OF THE BOARD	11 Having established a quorum of the Board
12		12 members, this public business meeting will now come to
13		13 order. Mr. James Biggins, the Board's general counsel,
14	May 11, 2017	14 will serve as the executive secretary for the meeting.
15		15 The public business meeting was announced on
16		16 April 19th, 2017 on the Board's public website. It was
17	625 Indiana Avenue, NW	17 also subsequently noticed in the Federal Register on
18	Washington, DC 20004	18 April 24th, 2017. The Board has voted to hold this
19		19 public business meeting pursuant to the Government in
20		20 the Sunshine Act, the Board's implementing regulations
21		21 for the Government in the Sunshine Act and the Board's
22		22 operating procedures. The Board is recording this
23		23 proceeding through a verbatim transcript.
24		24 This public business meeting concerns member
25		25 deliberations pertaining to the business of the Board.
	2	4
1	2 A P P E A R A N C E S	4 1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review
1 2	_	·
	_	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review
2	APPEARANCES	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard
2 3	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD:	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear
2 3 4	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities.
2 3 4 5	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will
2 3 4 5 6	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member	Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear facilities. After opening remarks by Board members, I will recognize members of the public for their comments in the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear facilities. After opening remarks by Board members, I will recognize members of the public for their comments in the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the development of the systematic safety oversight process. After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This concludes the opening statement. I have no individual statement as a Board member, so I will turn to my other Board members.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear facilities. After opening remarks by Board members, I will recognize members of the public for their comments in the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the development of the systematic safety oversight process. After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This concludes the opening statement. I have no individual statement as a Board member, so I will turn to my other Board members. Mr. Hamilton?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear facilities. After opening remarks by Board members, I will recognize members of the public for their comments in the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the development of the systematic safety oversight process. After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This concludes the opening statement. I have no individual statement as a Board member, so I will turn to my other Board members. Mr. Hamilton? MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks,
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board 14 member, so I will turn to my other Board members. 15 Mr. Hamilton? 16 MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, 17 Mr. Chairman.
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member JAMES BIGGINS, General Counsel	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board 14 member, so I will turn to my other Board members. 15 Mr. Hamilton? 16 MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson?
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member JAMES BIGGINS, General Counsel REPORTED BY:	Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear facilities. After opening remarks by Board members, I will recognize members of the public for their comments in the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the development of the systematic safety oversight process. After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This concludes the opening statement. I have no individual statement as a Board member, so I will turn to my other Board members. Mr. Hamilton? MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson? MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do have a short
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member JAMES BIGGINS, General Counsel	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board 14 member, so I will turn to my other Board members. 15 Mr. Hamilton? 16 MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson? 19 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do have a short 20 statement I would like to make, if that's okay. First
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member JAMES BIGGINS, General Counsel REPORTED BY:	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board 14 member, so I will turn to my other Board members. 15 Mr. Hamilton? 16 MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson? 19 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do have a short 20 statement I would like to make, if that's okay. First 21 of all, I would like to thank my fellow Board members
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member JAMES BIGGINS, General Counsel REPORTED BY:	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board 14 member, so I will turn to my other Board members. 15 Mr. Hamilton? 16 MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson? 19 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do have a short 20 statement I would like to make, if that's okay. First 21 of all, I would like to thank my fellow Board members 22 for being open to these types of discussions, and I
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member JAMES BIGGINS, General Counsel REPORTED BY:	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board 14 member, so I will turn to my other Board members. 15 Mr. Hamilton? 16 MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson? 19 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do have a short 20 statement I would like to make, if that's okay. First 21 of all, I would like to thank my fellow Board members 22 for being open to these types of discussions, and I 23 would like to acknowledge the efforts of the Board staff
2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22	A P P E A R A N C E S DEFENSE NUCLEAR FACILITIES SAFETY BOARD: SEAN SULLIVAN, Chairman BRUCE HAMILTON, Vice Chairman JESSIE H. ROBERSON, Board Member DANIEL J. SANTOS, Board Member JOYCE L. CONNERY, Board Member JAMES BIGGINS, General Counsel REPORTED BY:	1 Pursuant to the specific agenda, the Board will review 2 the staff effort to develop a potential scorecard 3 regarding safety oversight of defense nuclear 4 facilities. 5 After opening remarks by Board members, I will 6 recognize members of the public for their comments in 7 the time allotted. The Board will then discuss the 8 development of the systematic safety oversight process. 9 After the Board's discussion, I will summarize the 10 outcome of the discussion in conjunction with a summary 11 of any staff tasking by the general counsel. This 12 concludes the opening statement. 13 I have no individual statement as a Board 14 member, so I will turn to my other Board members. 15 Mr. Hamilton? 16 MR. HAMILTON: No introductory remarks, 17 Mr. Chairman. 18 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson? 19 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I do have a short 20 statement I would like to make, if that's okay. First 21 of all, I would like to thank my fellow Board members 22 for being open to these types of discussions, and I

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

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

8

5

The Board is considering action on the need of a scorecard through an amendment to the staff's proposed FY 2017 work plan and it is a unique request for board action. And while I greatly respect my peers' efforts to identify initiatives to improve our oversight, I have consistently voted against these specific actions. I believe the resource investment now and later may overwhelm the conduct of actual independent oversight at DOE and NNSA's defense nuclear facilities, and because of that, I believe the most the Board can expect to result is a reformatting of DOE and its contractors own analysis, and I just don't see a balance between the value added and the resources invested.

I believe this could diminish the extended quality of specific technical insights the Congress, the public and DOE have recognized as the Board's added value in providing independent analysis, advice and recommendations to the Secretary of Energy. The Congress imposed a limit of 130 Board employees for good reason. The Board is approximately 118 employees and currently more than 35 percent of current staffing is nontechnical resources. The Board does not, in my view, have the capability to credibly normalize meaningful technical insights across all of DOE and NNSA's defense nuclear facilities or even the 61 Hazard Category 2

to support this scorecard shall be the result of the independent oversight work of the DNFSB only. Proof of this amendment provided by the Office of the Technical Director states that significant DOE action will likely be required. We have no authority over DOE, Department of Energy, and this is not a collaborative task."

While the Board did not provide specific goals in approving the subject request for Board action, Document 2017-300-004, it included direction that I supported. The technical director will present the developing product to Board members and senior agency staff at each weekly gathering for technical issues, i.e., Tech Tuesdays, beginning November 15, 2016, such that continuous ideas, suggestions and challenges can facilitate an iterative development process throughout the course of fiscal year 2017.

Suffice to say that this iterative development development process did not work for me as uncertainty only grew with time. Uncertainty regarding goals, intended audience, scope of the effort, final product, roles and responsibilities and potential impacts both internally and externally.

The result is that we have today in front of the Board what I consider a premature proposal that not only deviates from the original request for Board action, in

6

facilities, varied and distinct as each defense nuclear facilities.

The staff is currently pursuing pilot stoplight assessments at five facilities and I am anxious to review the usefulness of the outcome. The Board members who by law are respected experts in the field of nuclear safety, already can shape the focus and priorities of the technical work of the agency. So after months of resource investment, my initial concerns remain unchanged; however, I am open to the decisions of the Board.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you.

Mr. Santos? MR. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have some short opening remarks. When the concept of developing a nuclear safety scorecard for the defense nuclear facilities was first presented to the Board by Board Member Hamilton as a special project to the proposed FY 2017 technical work plan, and then as a separate request for Board action, I supported the project with the following comment and continued understanding, and I quote, "the development and implementation of this scorecard, as well as the efforts to obtain consistent, reliable and accurate information

certain key points, but also now deviates from the underlying concept I originally supported, a concept that I envisioned was supposed to be commensurate with our capabilities, resources and authority.

It is clear through this process that we have work to do to improve our internal execution of work. While some internal improvement initiatives are already under way, additional improvements will be necessary to ensure we do not reroute external confidence in accomplishment of our mission.

This concludes my opening remarks. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you.

Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I am going to truncate my remarks a little bit so they don't repeat what was already said, but I just want to talk about what I hope to get out of this meeting today. I want to talk about the original proposal that was already discussed that Mr. Hamilton put toward, and in particular, there was a part of it that we deferred a decision on, which was the designing the scorecard for publication.

I am hoping that we can discuss the drivers behind the proposal, the cost benefit of designing and

2 (Pages 5 to 8)

executing such a program, as weighed against the relatively small size of our technical staff was already discussed, and the mission-related work that it could displace.

If you read the trade press, you know that I was opposed to this action from the beginning due to the different roles of the DNFSB and the NRC, to which this was prepared at the beginning and the differences between commercial nuclear sites and defense nuclear facilities. I'm also deeply concerned with the notion that we as an oversight agency could collect the necessary data complex-wide to draw conclusions and present them to the public, representing the overall safety of a facility or site in any comprehensive way.

I also hope that we can discuss the good work that the staff has done in taking what I had seen as a flawed premise and coming up with a methodology that would not necessarily lend itself to drawing such conclusions, but could, however, be useful in harmonizing some of the information that we collect across its sites and highlight where more resources could be applied.

I also pushed very hard to make sure that this meeting would have an opportunity for public comment, and I know that some of you are here from DOE and

proposal before the Board that the Board will ultimately discuss and perhaps act on here today, as well as one amendment to that proposal that was put forward by Mr. Santos, so hopefully all of that information was available to anybody who might wish to speak to it. Hopefully any comments that we have will be relevant to those issues that are before the Board today.

With that, I ask that any member of the public that wishes to speak, please identify yourself.

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, I am not seeing anyone, so at this time, we will conclude the public comment period and we will begin with the order of business on the agenda. So, we have one agenda item, and that is to review the scorecard proposal that is before the Board. There is also one amendment.

Prior to taking up the amendment, I would just like to throw this meeting open to anybody who wants to speak further. I know the Board members have made some opening statements, but anybody who wishes to speak further on the proposal -- the original proposal as it stands, and then we'll deal with the amendment. In other words, we can talk about the basic proposal, deliberate on the basic proposal, but we're not voting on it, we will vote on the amendment first and then we

outside agencies, and I would hope that you, and maybe our own staff, as stakeholders in this process, will take the opportunity to speak and let us know your thoughts on this effort, because they will have an effect on what I do going forward.

I did not come to this meeting with any preconceived notions and I want to weigh stakeholder interest as well as the input from my colleagues on the Board. My considerations will be the size and scope of the effort, the administrative burden to the Department of Energy, the potential for our oversight to slip into a checklist mentality or subjugate professional judgment to compliance-based oversight, the potential information for the scorecard to be misinterpreted or misunderstood by the public, and most importantly, the appropriate use of scarce agency and taxpayer resources.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay, this concludes the opening remarks of the Board. At this time, per the agenda, we will provide an opportunity for public comment. I will point out before any member of the public does get up to speak that on our website we have already published and made available here as handouts the original action last October by Mr. Hamilton that started the effort that we're talking about. There is a

will vote on the proposal either as-is or as amended.

Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: So, just as a point of clarification. So, when you say the original, you mean the staff-produced documents that resulted from their work that they have done on the original Mr. Hamilton proposal?

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Yes, that is the action, the basic action that is before the Board, with one amendment to it. Yes.

Mr. Hamilton?

MR. HAMILTON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

As background, in October of 2016, the Board approved action directing the technical director to develop and implement a comprehensive and integrated scorecard of nuclear safety for defense nuclear facilities. What we now have before us today is a staff-requested Board action which would replace the October Board action with a refined set of parameters for the project. Key changes from the Board -- from the original Board action include designing the process only for internal communications, limiting the scope to hazardous -- Hazard Category 2 facilities, and crafting the program as an instruction rather than a directive, meaning that the Board does not have to approve the

3 (Pages 9 to 12)

final product.

First, let me state my unambiguous praise for our staff in developing this project to date. When the Board first directed this action in October, there was a general understanding that the end state was not fully defined. The Board action was fashioned to allow the staff sufficient flexibility to use the Nuclear Regulatory Commission's reactor oversight process as a template and to see how a similar process might become a useful tool for defense nuclear facilities.

An iterative process with weekly Board involvement during the past six months has led us to where we now are, a tailored and systematic way of evaluating Hazard Category 2 facilities in order to optimize the allocation of our limited resources.

As it has evolved, the term "scorecard" has become a misnomer. Systematic safety oversight as we now see it is not a scorecard and it is not a mechanism by which we would inform the Secretary of Energy or the public of relative safety rankings. Instead, it has taken the shape of a resource allocation tool for our internal use.

This is certainly different than what we might have envisioned last fall when we began this journey, but that does not make the effort less successful or the Consequently, I endorse the staff request before us today and I encourage you to support it as well. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you. Let me -- since I haven't weighed in yet, let me just take a few minutes to add some things. I recall when I first came to the Board, that there was no system of planning work at all, and no summary method of trying to inform Board members where the problems might exist throughout the complex, and it was very difficult for me as an individual Board member to figure out where I should focus my efforts.

Now, over time, I was able to develop my own sense of where I needed to focus my efforts, but it did take me quite some time. It took pretty much a calendar year to get around and visit the various sites around the complex to even see them all.

So it was quite an effort. We also did no sort of work planning back at that time, and so as a result, as a Board member, there was no way for me to look at anything and figure out what I might expect to have to deal with in terms of what was coming down the road in the next month, two months, in terms of what was the staff working on, and what might I expect so that I could prepare to respond appropriately when the staff brought an issue to the Board.

current product any less valuable. Indeed, we now have a structure for systematic evaluation, which will inform the application of our limited staff resources in order to achieve the optimal outcome of our independent oversight.

In the absence of such a systematic approach, we will continue to allocate resources based on the more subjective instincts of our technical staff's leadership, or through the cruder method of proportional allocation of resources across the entire complex.

What the staff have proposed as the path forward is neither perfect nor complete. Should we expand the process beyond Hazard Category 2 facilities? How should we address design and new construction? How do we obtain the appropriate data for input into the process without exceeding reasonable number of requests for information? How do we prevent influencing systematic safety oversight outcomes through selection of performance indicators or through our own assessments?

These and other matters will need to be addressed as the process is tested during implementation, but better is the enemy of good enough. The staff have provided us with a good path forward, and we can address shortcomings and make it better over time.

So, I found that whole time to be difficult for me individually. Now, over time, we have actually developed a work planning process here at the Board, which has had a lot of value, but it's been a work-in-progress in terms of trying to make it be something that fully informs the Board members about priorities. And I think we're -- we've still been working on that with perhaps soon we will begin, absent this effort, we would begin an effort to plan work for FY '18, and I think the process that we would use this year will actually have some changes to it from last year.

Again, it's a continuing, evolving process, but the whole point of that is how do we decide, as a Board, where we act essentially as a board of directors for this agency, decide what the priorities are so we can focus the staff efforts in the appropriate places, so that we can do our mission, which is to appropriately advise the Secretary of Energy on issues related to adequate protection of the public health and safety.

So, as this has developed, and as the proposal before the Board from the staff is in terms of where the staff is recommending -- I mean, I read the proposal before the Board as the staff's recommendation of how we should shape this effort going forward. And I find

4 (Pages 13 to 16)

anything that would help us provide something where we can establish what we think internally are the agency's priorities, would be helpful. And if it is a work planning tool, then -- and it would be better than the one that we've had, which we've had some difficulties with, then I also think it would be very helpful.

So, with that, other Board members?

Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: So, thanks. So, I don't disagree with anything you said, Mr. Chairman. Last year we also started a process of doing deep dives to understand what was going on within sites and not just look at individual reviews, and this year we're looking at cross-cutting issues in that same methodology, which I think lends itself both to helping on the work plan as well as helping with the methodology that's been developed by the staff, which I think is now hopefully a staff tool that it will use going forward, regardless of any decisions that we are taking today. It's their prerogative to organize their own work.

I have a question specifically for Mr. Hamilton, because when you envisioned this at the beginning, and a lot of the first conversations we had about this, one of the things that you emphasized was the fact that you wanted to have this out in the public for transparency's

MS. CONNERY: Okay, but my follow-up on that was, because we keep saying it, it's obviously not a scorecard anymore. My orange folder comments, which I think were adopted by the staff and presumably by the Board because nobody amended them, were to change this from a product to a methodology in which we use the cornerstone idealogy that came from the NRC and use that to evaluate.

So, I don't particularly perceive that there will be a product outcome that would then necessarily be published, but obviously it would be used to inform what it is that the staff is working on.

I also just want to put a note of caution in, you know, the work plan and the tools and all of those ideas that we've all come up with collectively and individually to help shape what the staff does to reemphasize what our role is as the DNFSB. We are the oversight of DOE. They are the regulators. So I want to make sure that we avoid the tendency to go after the shiny balls of things that, you know, oh, there's a collapse at Hanford, so we better put all of our resources there, or we're going to whiplash, no pun intended, when something happens at WIPP. That was a joke.

And we have to be able to make sure that we're

sake. And I know you were new to the Board at the time, you've had a lot of experience in commercial reactors and that was kind of the driver for you saying, hey, it looks like this would be something, a best practice that perhaps we could adopt for the agency.

And I just want to understand whether or not now that the staff has proposed that this be done for internal purposes, but I would like to be able to foreshadow down the line whether or not this is going to be something that you think you would at some point in the future propose to be a public document for people to look at in the public sphere.

MR. HAMILTON: Thank you for the question. I think it's a fair question, and I'll tell you that my view on this has evolved over the past six months. The staff is proposing that we do it inside the lifelines right now and I think that's an appropriate thing to do. I don't have any currently preconceived notions that we need to make it public, but I also don't want to say that we would never do that.

So, I'm kind of agnostic at this point, which is not where I was six months ago, but my point right now is that I think what the staff wants to do is work it inside the lifelines, use it as a work planning tool to help us focus, and let's see what happens later on.

also providing oversight across the complex to understand even when things are green or look good, to make sure that we're not missing anything and that we can be somewhat predictive and make sure that the department is doing its role as a regulator over the contractors and the sites across the board.

So, it's just a cautionary tale that if you put something like this into place, the natural tendency is to go where the problems are, and that's not really our job. Our job is also to be predictive of problems that could come and it's actually okay to go some place and conduct a review and find no issues and I'm sure the department would love to see some communications along those lines as well to make sure they know where they're doing good things, as well as where things are going wrong.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Any other Board member want to speak -- still speaking on the original proposal?

19 MS. ROBERSON: Yes.

 $CHAIRMAN\ SULLIVAN:\ And\ then\ we'll\ take\ up\ the\ amendment.$

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I know it's probably a surprise to my peers, but

I am a cautious engineer, and so for me, in regard to the original proposal, there are two concerns. One is 5 (Pages 17 to 20)

sanctioning a whole bite rather than understanding the cause and effect to a change in how we do business. There is no doubt we have room to improve. Every organization does, and I think we have made some improvements in how we do our work in alignment with the staff.

I think we certainly have room to go, but my concern on the original proposal is the extent, and I think as I've communicated it along the way over the months of development, that I believe we should pick a subset, and the staff is doing that in the pilot. And my own view is I believe the Board should not sanction a 180-degree change in work until it understands the cause and effect. That's what I would add.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mr. Santos?
MR. SANTOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.
Again, I agree with the statements by Mr.
Hamilton and by you, Mr. Chairman. My issue is that the staff did such a good job when they were given the guidance of try to model following the NRC oversight process, that that gave me -- that's what gave me concern. Having worked at the NRC, I can tell you the amount of effort and work that it takes, for example, if

reviews, because we don't seem to -- we don't track that level of detail.

For example, I cannot tell you how much FTE we even spent during this six months, and how many staff was engaged. I cannot tell you that. I cannot tell you the cost to the Department of Energy associated with all the requests for information that went out with the pilots of five facilities. There's like ten different information requests with multiple items. If you take that and extrapolate it to 61, I don't know where that leaves us.

So, again, I supported the original concept, but it should be commensurate with our capabilities and what can we do, and in the mean time we should be looking at other right-sized improvements to our work planning process.

So, again, my concern is that they were doing such a good job that following the NRC model that we don't have the size or the breadth to be able to execute that.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson, did you want to speak?

MS. ROBERSON: No, I was just playing with the microphone. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Any other Board member?

purpose.

We're talking about 61 sites and facilities for Hazard Category 2 facilities. It happens to be coincident with the number of sites, the NRC has 61. They -- the number of resident inspectors that the NRC have for those 61 sites exceeds the size of our agency.

we even use this as a work planning tool, I'm concerned

of our own internal cost to even execute that for that

So, my concern is that the staff was doing such a good job following the development of a model following the NRC, developing performance indicators, the NRC has like 17, the staff came up with like 15, to apply to 61 sites, for the -- even for the use of work planning purposes, is very concerning to me.

The NRC has very detailed inspection procedures that goes along with it, I think around 40 procedures. We haven't even developed procedures to apply how some of the assessments are going to be performed. There's a lot of discussion of what the right thresholds are for the performance indicators.

So we are going to be spending so much effort in finishing this framework to then apply it as a work planning tool, when today, as the Chairman alluded to, we don't have a good job of developing the plan itself in the beginning. We don't even know or have good visibility and fidelity of some of the efforts and resources that we are spending in some of our own

1 (No response.)

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Let me add that one of the other benefits I saw of the way the proposal was developing with respect to internal work planning is that it is facility-focused. And to date, since we've started work planning, a few years back, which I alluded to earlier, we have had work planning for specific facility issues, but we've also had work planning for what Ms. Connery has already referred to as cross-cutting issues, and those are things such as how maintenance is conducted across the complex. That's an example. Criticality safety across the complex would be another example.

And one of the problems that I found as a Board member dealing with cross-cutting issues, is first of all, we tend -- those sort of things tend to end up being Forrestal, all building focused, so you're one level removed from where the actual problem might be out in the complex.

And that presents a couple of difficulties.

Specifically when the Board does speak and has spoken on some of those issues, where we are to a certain extent then telling -- advising the Secretary how the Secretary should run the Secretary's own department as opposed to advising the Secretary that you have -- you, the

6 (Pages 21 to 24)

specific location.

Secretary, may have a problem at a specific place, a

So, there is a difference there. And then, some of these problems, which the Board has planned out, we've had difficulty tracking how successful those efforts of the Board have been at the actual locations, out in the complex. And again, one of my experiences is when the Board has pointed out what the Board considered to be a cross-cutting deficiency that impacted nuclear safety, I could then go around the complex and at any one place the individuals who were responsible for that activity would give me a typical response that says, yes, we agree, across the complex, this is not good, and it needs to get better. But here, it's fine. And then you would get that response everywhere.

So, there might be general consensus from the Department of Energy staff in the Forrestal Building that yes, they need to improve, but no consensus on where there was an actual problem, what members of the public in an actual place would be at risk because of this problem.

So my point of all this discussion is I have -while there is benefit to looking at issues in a cross-cutting manner, and I won't dispute that, but I found a lot of problems in application as a Board member issues, we should be looking at the issues at the sites, but we absolutely have to go to the root cause, which often takes place in the Forrestal Building, and be able to analyze how orders and directives are impacting safety at sites.

So it's not just about the sites, and I understand things happen at places that affect people's lives, but you can also correct some of those issues at the headquarters level, and indeed that's part of our mandate through Congress to do so.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you, and I'll respond to that. So, while I appreciate that, again, my point is simply how as a Board member, one-fifth of this Board, what's the best way to approach a circumstance which is exactly as you said, we'll take the hypothetical that there is a problem across the complex with a certain type of issue and you could trace that problem back to a lack of proper direction out of the Forrestal Building.

And my point was that my own assessment of this agency's ability to impact that scenario has not had really good results. And there's an alternative method that I'm just -- that I would propose the Board consider for these sort of things, and it's facility-centric or site-specific centric. That is if you -- if you point

trying to have the Board address those. And at the current process, as it's been developed, would take those cross-cutting issues and try to assess how those issues are done at each specific facility or at each specific site as the case may be, which I would find more useful input into our work planning process. That's my point.

Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: So, I just want to follow up on that, because I think I've shared your frustration, but not your outlook with regards to the cross-cutting issues. I think it's important to look at sites to get information and evaluate it in a consistent manner so that you can see if there are trends cross-cutting. A lot of times the solution set to problems at sites don't come at sites, they come at headquarters, either because the orders are inadequate or the oversight isn't there. And I believe it is our responsibility as the Board to point out those things just as much as it is our responsibility to point out issues that are happening at sites.

So, I take your point, and I do believe that the methodology developed and a shout out to the team who is sitting here today who have actually done the work of putting together a consistent way to look at these

something out to the Secretary, at a particular place, and then you point out a similar issue, you know, it's basically the same issue, but suppose it was criticality safety, for example.

If you went to Los Alamos and said criticality safety here is not very good and you need to do these specific things to fix it. Well then if you went to Y-12 and said criticality safety at Y-12 is not very good, you would need to fix it. I would assume the Secretary or some of his folks that work for him would say, how come we keep getting this issue from the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board? Why can't we, in the Forrestal Building, fix it? It's just a different way to approach the exact same thing, and in the mean time, there might be specific action taken at the specific place, having pointed out the deficiency.

So that's all I'm suggesting. I'm not disputing that your assessment, if I understood it, Ms. Connery, about, you know, there might be problems that can be traced to the Forrestal Building, I'm just talking about the best way for this agency to address that, if that's the case. And my personal opinion, again, this is just one opinion of one Board member, is that that would be the ability of this agency to address those sort of issues would be enhanced with a facility-centric

7 (Pages 25 to 28)

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

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

31

29

approach, and I see the scorecard as it's being developed, or I'm sorry, I'm using the term that I'm not supposed to use, the systematic safety oversight process, as it's being proposed, as being facility-centric, and that would be helpful. Thank you.

Any other Board member before we move to the amendment?

MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, thank you, sir. I think, I'm just processing. Listen, I don't think I disagree with what either you, Mr. Chairman, or Ms. Connery said, and I think the organization was intended to be agile, and, frankly, I think what we recommend to the Secretary has to be founded in specific elements, cannot be generic. So I don't disagree with you.

And bringing it back around to this proposal, my concern, and maybe I'm wrong, but what I see is a more generic assessment, and my concern is we don't have the resources to go both ways on everything. That's -- I mean, that's really my concern on the proposal.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mr. Santos?

MR. SANTOS: Thank you. One more item I forgot to mention, going back to the NRC ROP process. In that case when it comes to the performance indicators, it is the licensee that they voluntarily collect and transmit their data on a quarterly basis to the NRC. So I'm very

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Any other Board members on 1 2 the initial proposal before we turn to the amendment? 3 (No response.)

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Seeing none, we do have an amendment that was put forward by Mr. Santos, so I would ask him to present -- I'm sorry, you're looking at me with a question.

MR. SANTOS: Sorry to interrupt. Can we have the general counsel introduce the amendment first, please?

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We can. General counsel, would you introduce the amendment?

MR. BIGGINS: Amendment A by Board member Daniel J. Santos to Yellow Folder Docket 2017-300-061, Systematic Safety Oversight. This request for Board action, RFBA, directs the technical director to not proceed to final design and implementation of the proposed scorecard process and cease all related activities (e.g. pilot programs). Also this RFBA replaces the previous Board direction contained in the October 11, 2016 RFBA 2017-300-004. In addition, as part of the development of the

FY 2018 technical work plan, the technical director is directed to leverage lessons learned from the

development to date of the proposed scorecard process to

30

concerned here in the model, even if it's used for work planning tools, that instead of really relying on what I call our organic oversight, where the staff can actually use the information that is already available to them, we're going to be de facto imposing reporting requirements or just a mountain of requests through the Department of Energy to their contractor for data, and not on a voluntary basis, but kind of on a more, you know, using in explicit the authority of the Board, kind of in an implicit way to collect this data.

Also it's not clear what the frequency will be, and so it is very troublesome to me to support a blanket approval that will never come back to the Board, that could have tremendous transformational impact, not only internally, but to the department and its contractor.

So that's just a small clarification of I think an important difference, also. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I would simply respond to that by saying nothing we do today, even if we approve the staff proposal, is the final word on anything. Nothing would say we couldn't have the staff develop this and then decide, well, this is -- this is no good, we can make that decision at some later date. So, nothing today is final.

MR. SANTOS: No disagreement. Thank you.

identify and institutionalize improvements to the technical independent oversight work of the Office of the Technical Director.

This effort should satisfy the following goals: One, improve the information sharing, evaluation of cross-cutting safety issues, and standardization (to the extent possible) of risk ranking for safety issues across all technical groups; two, improve the technical work planning measurement and execution process; three, improve the timing and quality of information provided to the Board for the Board to be able to more efficiently and effectively establish safety oversight priorities and understand resource allocations and needs for the Office of the Technical Director; and four, maximize the use of technical information generated by the DNFSB staff independent evaluations.

Finally, the technical director is directed to brief the Board on the specific actions taken on this RFBA, including but not limited to those actions incorporated into the proposed FY 2018 technical work plan by September 30, 2017.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mr. Santos? MR. SANTOS: Thank you. Just a quick clarification. September 30th?

MR. BIGGINS: September 30th, 2017.

32

8 (Pages 29 to 32)

MR. SANTOS: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My proposed amendment is consistent with my opening remarks. While my proposed amendment is self-explanatory, I would like to note that my proposed action doesn't require any new work, compliments other improvement initiatives already under way, demonstrates that we can be a learning organization, and more importantly, utilizes existing agency process, specifically the review and Board approval of the technical work plan.

My amendment empowers the Office of the Technical Director to identify and institutionalize improvements to our oversight work by not only leveraging all efforts incurred by the agency and lessons learned to date on development of the scorecard process, but by also using an explicit list of specific goals, improvements, initiatives that the Board considers important.

This amendment does not dictate a process to the Office of the Technical Director, it is simply a summary of expectations, goals, guidance, to be used by the Office of the Technical Director. Again, that it be part of the established technical work plan review and approval process.

Finally, it is important to note that the

have the pilots done and have us be able to assess those? I just don't know why you would remove those as well as the other larger activities, if we are going to be able to assess whether or not this is going to -- would be a helpful tool in the future.

MR. SANTOS: Again, I kind of explained myself a little bit. I think the staff did such a good job of modeling the NRC reactor oversight, I think even on the pilots we need to have a discussion or even if we want to modify, that I think the scope is too big even for the pilots. So that's why I wasn't even supportive of the pilots, because I think it's going too far, in my own personal opinion. Even for the pilots.

MS. CONNERY: So we have already requested the information in the pilots?

MR. SANTOS: Yes.

MS. CONNERY: The pilots are almost done and I'm looking at staff to give me a number here. Fifty percent.

MR. SANTOS: So, 50 percent, I think they can leverage efforts from that 50 percent. That's my opinion.

MS. CONNERY: So you don't even want to finish the pilot to see what it would look like?

MR. SANTOS: I have a good idea of where he's

assessment being performed by all office directors for this proposed amendment demonstrates that the amendment was understood, and their conclusions were that there will be no technical issues raised by the amendment; that there are no administrative issues with the amendment; that there are no legal objections to the amendment; and that there are no staff impact issues raised by the amendment. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Other Board members? Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: So, a couple of questions, Mr. Santos. One, I understand what you're trying to do in terms of using the methodology developed to inform the work plan, which I think everybody around the table that I've heard so far has said that would be a good thing, regardless of which version of this you support. But my question is, why would you not complete the pilots?

In other words, you know, if Mr. Sullivan said, we can agree to anything today and then further on down the road change it. And it's obviously less impactful -- your amendment is less impactful to staff time and effort than the staff plan, but if we did want to incrementally move towards something like this if we thought it was useful, wouldn't it be informative to

1 going.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Are you done with the questions?

MS. CONNERY: Well, the first one, yeah.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I understand. Okay, any other Board member?

MR. HAMILTON: I do.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mr. Hamilton?

MR. HAMILTON: I do have some prepared remarks on the amendment. The amendment before us proposes to cancel the project just as its scope has become well defined and just at the point where implementation can begin. Absent a trial period of implementation, there's really no way to understand the extent to which systematic safety oversight will improve board activities. The staff, with our help, have given us a thoughtful design of a functional program. We can't possibly know if that program will bear fruit unless we try it out.

Further, though, this amendment would redirect the technical staff to "leverage lessons learned from the development to date of the proposed scorecard process; to identify and naturalize improvements to the independent technical oversight work of the Office of the Technical Director."

9 (Pages 33 to 36)

It goes on to say that it should improve information sharing, evaluate cross-cutting safety issues, conduct risk ranking, improve technical work planning, improve quality and type of information, maximize use of technical information and so forth, the general counsel already read the details of it.

This language is so expansive that I have no idea how the technical director can possibly satisfy it. On the surface, it sounds like the direct -- it sounds like direction to conduct systematic safety oversight, without implementing systematic safety oversight, with an assortment of other management objectives thrown in for good measure.

If the Board decides to cancel this project, then we should simply cancel it. We shouldn't offset the cancellation with tasking of the technical director to do the same thing as systematic safety oversight, but in a different way and more broadly.

So let me summarize. The staff have done what we asked and they have done it well. The systemic safety oversight process as imposed would be an improvement over our current less structured and more subjective approach to resource allocation.

The project has evolved from a scorecard type ranking system into a resource allocation tool. They

Would that be acceptable in accordance with the language of the amendment as you have it here, and if not, why not?

MR. SANTOS: I can't discuss -- I don't know how -- I always leave it to the office director to describe what he will do with that. We have to speculate on that.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, I guess my point is as I read the language, you said, one the Board says cease all activities, but then it says, essentially, go figure out how to do better work planning, take the lessons learned and try to do better work planning.

As part of that, if I was the technical director, or since the technical director works for the Chairman, the Chairman might unilaterally say to the technical director, hey, just go keep doing what you proposed to do, the and that should inform the board on these four things.

So there's a potential conflict between paragraph 1 and paragraph 2 which would give unilateral -- gives direction, but unilateral authority from the Board to in the normal executive chain to go figure out how best to meet those things. I guess that's my point. I'm trying to resolve whether it was your expectation between those two things and would that

have now placed before us a request for board action which would replace the original board action with a refined set of parameters, which I support.

The language in the amendment would stop this clearly-defined path ahead, the systematic safety oversight process, and would replace it with an -- with expansive language, which would only instruct the technical director to do the same thing, but in a broader and different way.

If the Board chooses to cancel this project, we should cancel it, not replace it with a new effort included in this amendment. And so consequently, I do not support the amendment. So, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you. Mr. Santos, did you care to respond to that before I move on to other Board member comments?

MR. SANTOS: No, thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay. So, let me say with regard to the amendment -- well, let me actually ask a question of Mr. Santos. Under this amendment, hypothetically, is the technical director were to decide that the best way for him to achieve the four goals in the work planning process was to essentially move forward with the project under his own direction as was -- as the staff had proposed.

be a -- would that be a problem for you as the person who forward the amendment, and any other Board member could speak on it. Do they see a potential conflict if that were to happen?

MS. ROBERSON: You want to wait until I comment? MR. SANTOS: Yeah, go head.

MS. ROBERSON: I have one comment on that and then I have another question, I'd like to make sure I ask the Chairman to get an answer for my question on the record. The question on the record I would like to get an answer for is will the pilots be completed in time to factor into the FY 2018 work plan? That's point one I wanted to make. I'm looking for an answer for it.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Does any Board member know that or do I have to turn to the staff to get that input? Is there somebody sitting in the audience? The technical director says he can, can you, Technical Director Steve Stokes, can you tell us when you expect the pilots to be done?

MR. STOKES: The pilots will be concluded in time to reflect on the FY 2018 work plan.

MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, sir. So the other point I wanted to make, and I don't want to speak for Mr. Sullivan or Mr. Santos, I will just say what I considered when I looked at the amendment, was a

10 (Pages 37 to 40)

difference between the Board sanctioning thou shalt do it this way, versus giving the technical director the ability to experiment and the Board seeing it and how it plays out in the work plan.

That doesn't prevent down the road the Board taking another action, but I think it is a significant statement to the staff to direct that everything be done in this way. I just don't feel that I know enough about what to expect in the results to do that. So, that would be my comment, relative to yours.

MR. SANTOS: No, thank you, Ms. Roberson. Again, very similar, my role in this will be as part of the agency process that involves the Board, the whole Board, which is the review and approval of the technical work plan. It's not my job to manage or micromanage how the Office of the Technical Director wants to develop process and provide their work, but at some point it will come back to the Board.

I have repeated my concerns, since last October to today, of what are my issues with how they're proceeding. They can take them into consideration, or not, and that's what I will continue to provide the same feedback and we will have another opportunity as part of the work plan approval process.

And I wanted to identify what are some of the

us was generated by the staff that said, well, this is how they would like to proceed. So it would seem to me as a possible outcome. I'm just speculating.

It's a possible outcome that they would look at the process that they -- that the technical staff developed that said, well, let's move forward this way, and then decide, okay, now we -- we were told not to proceed, but we were also told to go change how we do our work planning and meet all these goals. And so we decide proceeding the way we thought we should proceed would be the right way.

It seems to me like a logical outcome, and I just want to figure out from this discussion if Board members thought that approval of this amendment would basically mean they would cry foul on that outcome, if that's the way it went. That's what I was trying to find out, and I'm hearing no is what I'm hearing.

MR. SANTOS: And you're also hearing -- I'm sorry. And there's many possibilities, that's why I didn't want to come here and speculate. I look forward to what the technical director will propose as part of the work plan, but I take this as an opportunity to more clearly and transparently communicate my concerns, and through what I've seen today, my expectations. And I will get another opportunity when the work plan comes.

key expectations and goals we should all achieve as we try to improve our work.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Roberson?

MS. ROBERSON: So, I'm not -- maybe I'm responding again to the same thing I just responded to. And I'm not sure I was clear. I guess what I'm saying is, I think there's a huge difference between the Board holding the management chain responsible for making adjustments in the utilization of resources. And, technical director, I'll just, since he's standing here looking at us, we will just talk about him a lot, if he can only do -- if he thinks ten, we do a pilot and he thinks, I'm going to try this method with ten, and we offer RFBAs for all other things and it affects the workload, he didn't -- it's a difference between the Board mandating a process and allowing management of the resources. I guess that's what I'm saying.

Is that -- I mean, you guys understand what I'm saving?

MR. SANTOS: I do.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I understand, I think, what you're saying. I think what I've heard was a response that said, yes, it would be okay if the technical director essentially just finished the current process. I mean, I'll simply point out that the proposal before

Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: I don't think that you are hearing we will cry foul. I think what Ms. Roberson is trying to say is that if we took Mr. Hamilton's black and white view, either kill it or do what the staff has proposed, right? No repeal and replace. We're done.

If that's the course of action, I think the concern is, and my understanding from having discussed with Mr. Santos the reason why he's proposing this is because sometimes our technical staff takes a decision not to go forward on something that we must never, ever even look in that direction again. It's a very literal staff, and we may end up throwing out a very good baby with the bathwater if that's the interpretation that the staff takes.

I'm not saying that that's necessarily my view. I would hope that the staff, having gone through this process themselves, whether or not we vote for or against any of these proposals would continue to use the methodologies that they've developed if they find them useful going forward.

The other thing that I heard disturbed me that I want to address is the Chairman said that if this goes forward, I can just direct the technical directors to do

11 (Pages 41 to 44)

this anyway as proposed in the orange folder. And if that's the case, I don't quite understand why we're having a public meeting on this if that's the intent of the Chairman.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Oh, I never said it was. What I was trying to figure out is that okay under this language. I mean, the language says the technical director should have an effort -- should do an effort that meets these goals. And I'm simply pointing out that on a day-to-day basis, he works for me.

So what if he and I were to converse at some point in the future -- again this is all hypothetical -- about what he's doing to do to meet these goals, and then whether it was just through my feedback or influence or a direct -- or a specific direction to them, I just said, well, go finish this. I was trying to figure out if that conflicted with the express language of this amendment, because I see a scenario that presents a conflict between paragraph 1 and paragraph 2.

So, if everybody is following me, I'm not trying to telegraph what I would do. I don't know what I would do. The Board hasn't even acted on this proposal yet. I don't even know what the technical director thinks he might do if this passes. All I'm saying is I'm reading

day, and I am hoping that there is enough collaboration among the Board and the leadership, technical leadership, that all of the Board members will at the end of the day be able to support a work plan that they believe will meet their balanced needs, recognizing that each of us have different interests.

So, that's what I'm hoping for, out of whatever process we take.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay. So, let me amend what I said before. What I think I just heard was a foul in that your expectation of this language is the technical director now has to go off and talk to five different Board members and find out what their inputs are or make some proposals and get their feedback, which I understand.

My point would be, I think going back to something similar to what Mr. Hamilton said when he read his prepared remarks, that means we are taking a -- instead of providing a defined process, we are now essentially mandating that the technical director, and I hope you don't take this wrong, but, you know, basically goes solve world hunger with respect to our world work planning process, without giving any other direction.

And as we've shown in the past, it's difficult for five different people -- when the technical director

this language and it's not clear to me in the particular hypothetical which I have given, which I think is a logical hypothetical, and again, a logical hypothetical was at the staff level they looked at this and they thought that just continuing the way they were going was the right way, and I only took off another extrapolation of that, which was since the staff works for me on a day-to-day basis, what if I were to just tell them that that's their opinion, whether they had it or not. That's all I was asking.

Other Board members?

MS. ROBERSON: So, the thing I think I would like to add to that conversation, I understand what you're saying, you're saying if the technical director -- I'm just going to stick with the technical director because I don't -- I mean, the technical staff is there to meet the information needs of the entire Board. I think we're all clear on that.

I assume the technical director is going to talk to all the Board members as they put together a work plan. We don't have an approved work plan. I would like for us to have one so that every Board member, just as you started out talking about how we don't know what to expect. That's the whole reason we put it in place. The Board gets a say on that work plan at the end of the

talks to five different people, to come up with a consensus. That's kind of why we have a -- I mean, that's why we have a meeting to see if we can talk to each other here, and the law requires us to do it in public, and see if we can create a consensus.

That's what I'm trying to figure out. So I am concerned that we have a proposal that is fairly specific, and we can decide either yes/no, but this is a proposal to replace that with something that is undefined in terms of what the output -- what output we expect it to be, and instead we put it on the technical director to just come work with five Board members individually, and hopefully he will come up with a consensus. And I think we've proven in the past that that might be an unreasonable expectation to place upon the technical director.

MS. ROBERSON: So, Mr. Chairman, no offense taken. I would say world peace more than world hunger, but I think that's the technical director's job anyway is to work with the Board, because the Board has already put into place a requirement that the Board approve the work plan.

So, I'm not saying he has to work with the five Board members to interpret this, I'm assuming he already has when he did his assessment. But I am saying just

12 (Pages 45 to 48)

like with any other correspondence, the Board is not a rubber stamp, so the technical director does have to collaborate with the other Board members. He can't satisfy them all, I'm not saying that. I understand that, but that's the way we do our job, and I guess beyond this element, if we're changing that way, that's a whole different conversation.

I mean, I am confused. I think the technical director's job is to ensure that when they develop a work plan, to the maximum extent they can, they meet the needs of all the Board members. That doesn't mean every Board member gets everything, trust me, I don't get a lot of mine met, but I appreciate the effort and that's what I would expect.

MR. SANTOS: I just want to comment real quick that when I have proposed similar improvement initiatives to our work, that have not been approved, comments provided by some of my fellow Board members indicate that that is the role of the technical director as senior, senior executive and a member of the SES that is capable and should be doing that effort without being told exactly what to do.

Again, my proposed amendment does not direct any process and relies on his expertise as a member of the SES to actually come up with this. Thank you.

So I think that if you wanted to meet the goals of all of the Board members, which is to make sure that we are not overloaded on resources, to make sure that we have the ability to do our regularly mission-focused oversight capabilities without being diluted, but also to understand whether or not this process could be something that could be worked into our work plan without causing disruptions, then my -- and I'm not putting an amendment out, I'm putting it out for discussion, my proposal would be, then, let's just move forward with the pilot without any expectation of what else will happen and see if we can integrate that pilot into the FY '18 work plan.

And the other effort, I think of Mr. Santos' proposal, is to basically give some goals and guidance to the staff to understand where it is the Board feels that they should focus their energies in a global sense. Basically good practices that the Board would like to see the technical staff engage in.

So, I just throw that out there because I think that may meet the needs of the majority of the Board members, because if nobody leaves happy, then that's probably a good outcome.

MR. SANTOS: Mr. Chairman, I think as part of the process, I look forward, since you are chairing

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: Senior, senior, you're getting really old there, Steve. I think we were talking past each other a little bit, maybe somewhat willfully, but when Ms. Roberson was talking about the technical director talking to each of us, she was talking about not on this proposal, but in the development of the technical work plan, and my understanding of this amendment is it's only about the technical work plan and making sure that we have lessons learned.

But I would like to put aside both the staff proposal and the amendments, because I think what we are engaged in is basically position-based discussions right now and not interest-based discussions. I think the issue that Mr. Santos was trying to address in his amendment, whether he did successfully or not is to be determined, was to address the issues of some of the Board members that as proposed the staff's proposal on SSO is very resource-intensive, we don't know necessarily what the results are going to be and whether or not it's going to be useful.

I understand the notion from Mr. Hamilton and Mr. Sullivan that if you don't try it out, you don't know whether it's not going to be helpful to the work or not.

this. Meeting, at some point maybe I could entertain friendly amendments, so I want to make sure we get back to the process where we are so we can move forward. I'm looking at the time, too.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I'm sure if anybody has a friendly amendment, they might raise it.

MR. SANTOS: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Let me just point out, I already talked about one hypothetical which was on one extreme, and the other hypothetical on the other extreme, and that, of course, is the technical director decides essentially what Mr. Hamilton suggested, which was we'll cancel the whole thing. And he will go back to doing whatever he was going to do before this came ever came up.

So, again, my point was we're having a meeting for the Board to deliberate and perhaps make a decision whether as a board of directors, acting as a board, acting like a of directors, would we want to give guidance. And if the answer is no, we don't want to give guidance and we just want to let the technical director go back to figuring this out, then okay.

But that's the way I read this is what I'm saying. I'm reading this as, approximately, we don't know what we're going to get out of this. We don't know

13 (Pages 49 to 52)

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

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

53

55

56

what the technical director might do. And the all options would be available to the technical director.

MR. SANTOS: I respect your interpretation, you know, but similar to other efforts that I've seen tasked to the officer or the technical director, they've laid out on expectations or goals, whether it's to create a challenged culture or improve timing of correspondence. So what I did was lay out a series of goals and rely on his expertise to actually come up with a path forward.

Ms. Connerv?

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

11 12

13 14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Connery? MS. CONNERY: We have established that I am Ms. Connery. So, again, since we keep taking his name in vein, and we keep talking about hypotheticals in which the technical director tells us to pound sand in one direction or the other, I think it would be prudent

to hear from the technical director if he's willing to give us any thoughts.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, let me just interject. I mean, this is a meeting of the Board and I don't think that's necessary, because, you know, we have language in front of us and I think the language either is going to -- I mean, what I'm trying to determine is what do we see as what this language means? That's been the point of my questions. I raised the technical director

explanation. I guess my question is, where are we in this process, then, now?

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We are deliberating on the amendment presented by Mr. Santos and when we appear to be done with deliberations, we will take a vote.

MS. ROBERSON: And before we take a vote, we'll consider friendly amendments maybe?

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Before there's a vote, all the options are open and that's one of them.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Thank you, sir. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Is there any other discussion on the amendment?

(No response.)

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Hearing none, I'm going to ask the executive secretary to call for a vote.

MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Well, then I'm back to friendly amendment.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay.

19 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm not 20 done.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then we're not done. MS. ROBERSON: I guess I do have a question, I'm going to push on Mr. Santos again. Recognizing, I mean, I have looked at the document requests for the five

pilots, but I guess I still wonder, I ask the same

54

because he's in this language. But the question is what do we see as what this language isn't, and I personally don't think it's fair to put him on the spot in a public meeting. This is the Board's meeting and I'm just trying to figure out what we see in this language. If we see -- well, here's what I'm trying to avoid. I'm trying to avoid where we approve this language, and then six months from now, we find out the technical director 9 took a path and the technical director who worked for 10 the Chairman, and the Chairman said, well, I read this

> language as giving you full direction, full authority to go whichever way you thought was best. And then some other Board member said, well, I didn't see that -- I didn't think we read it that way. You know, the other Board member didn't think that that's what was approved. That's all I'm trying to ascertain here. And I think as a Board, we can do that. I don't think trying

to get a sense from the technical director on the spot in a public meeting what he's actually going to do, would necessarily be helpful, and it may, in fact, be unfair to the technical director.

MS. CONNERY: He clearly hasn't gotten his instruction yet.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Anybody else? MS. ROBERSON: So, I appreciate that

question, would you not support completing those so we have that base of knowledge?

MR. SANTOS: I was concerned about this status of those pilots, since little information was getting to me. Earlier the technical director clarified that those pilots can be completed in a timely manner and that their requests are out. Again, you already heard my concerns, I don't have to repeat them, but it sounds like the amount of effort left is small relative to the entire effort to completing the pilot, so I can entertain a friendly amendment along those lines. Would you like to propose one?

MS. ROBERSON: So, I am proposing a friendly amendment to strike the prohibition and add the language that requires completion of the five pilot assessments and brief the Board on the process and the conclusions so that the Board can at that time determine its usefulness in a broader context.

MR. SANTOS: Could I add to that cost, both internal and external in terms of resources and time?

MS. ROBERSON: So you're doing a friendly amendment to my friendly amendment?

MR. SANTOS: I'm just adding to yours.

MS. ROBERSON: So, I don't have a problem with it. I guess I would like to have discussion on my

14 (Pages 53 to 56)

friendly amendment and your amendment. I think. I think. I MR. SANTOS: Okay. MR. SANTOS: Okay. MS. CONNERY: Clarification. What are you Striking? The whole middle paragraph? MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition to work on the pilots. MR. SANTOS: So basically put a period after the words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words "and cease all related activities," with the parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBERSON: Way. MR. SANTOS: Coan we do one at a time first? So, MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, MR. SANTOS: Coan we do one at a time first? So, MR. SANTOS: Coan we do one at a time first? So, MR. SANTOS: Coansel, I'm looking at you to make sure we CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mell, so under our process, are said of that experience to change, and realty in our work planning process and how we manage our work parentheeses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment it so add— MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment it to add— MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment it to add— MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment it to add— MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment it to add— MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: In plust trying to figure to utif we can say it so that it's pretty MR. ROBERSON: Um-humm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: In might process? MR. ROBERSON:
2 I think. 3 MR. SANTOS: Okay. 4 MS. CONNERY: Clarification. What are you striking? The whole middle paragraph? 5 striking? The whole middle paragraph? 6 MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition to work on the pilots. 7 to work on the pilots. 8 MR. SANTOS: So basically put a period after the words "and cease all related activities," with the paragraph? 9 words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words "and cease all related activities," with the paragraph? 10 parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? 11 parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Un-hmm. 13 MR. SANTOS: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal to add the language. 15 to add the language. 16 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, and the scope of the efforts, his assessment of the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the Board on the scope of the efforts, his and price the scope of the efforts, and price the scope of the efforts, his and price
MR. SANTOS: Okay, MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition to work on the pilots. MR. SANTOS: So basically put a period after the words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words "acaesa all related activities," with the parenthetical "eg. pilot programs." Is that correct? MR. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MR. SANTOS: Okay, MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure were. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mal right. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I'm just trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheese. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Clay, Let's see if I can keep track. So the second friendly amendment is to add— Well, let's bust any another paragraph before finally, utrack. So the second friendly amendment is to add— MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. Ado what with that? As he proceeds, and or the efforts, his and price the five five, so his going to them -so he's going to complete the five pilots? MS. ROBERSON: Well
striking? The whole middle paragraph? MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition to work on the pilots. MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition to work on the pilots. MR. SANTOS: So basically put a period after the words "and cease all related activities," with the parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MR. SANTOS: Okay. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MR. SANTOS: Okay. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MR. SANTOS: Okay. MR. SANT
5 MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition 6 MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition 7 to work on the pilots. 8 MR, SANTOS: So basically put a period after the 9 words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words 10 "and cease all related activities," with the 11 parenthetical "eg. pilot programs." Is that correct? 11 MR. SANTOS: Okay. 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 MR. SANTOS: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal to add the language. 15 MS. ROBERSON: Right. 16 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 18 I am okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a period after "process" on that first sentence. 19 MS. ROBERSON: Can we do one at a time first? So, 17 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 20 MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in on other Board member raises an objection, then we are 10 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 11 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 10 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 11 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 12 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 14 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 15 MS. ROBERSON: He's supposed to conclude them, and brief the Board on the efforts, and whit way. To do more. 16 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 17 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 18 mandement were trying to figure of the complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 18 mandement were trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty we'll figure it out
6 MS. ROBERSON: No, I'm striking the prohibition 7 to work on the pilots. 8 MR. SANTOS: So basically put a period after the 9 words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words 10 "and cease all related activities," with the 11 parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 MR. SANTOS: Okay, 14 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal 15 to add the language. 16 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, 18 I am okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 21 MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make 22 sure we 23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and 25 no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 18 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 21 amending the amendment. 22 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 33 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 4 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 5 sentence, of the first sentence. 6 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 8 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a 9 second friendly amendment is to add 10 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 11 that requires the technical director to specifically 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 All right. So, we'll see if 14 that requires the technical director to specifically 15 that requires the technical director to specifically 16 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 17 All right. So, we'll see if
to work on the pilots. MR. SANTOS: So basically put a period after the words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words "and cease all related activities," with the parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MR. SANTOS: Okay. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal to add the language. MR. SANTOS: Oxay. MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, Imake was also proposal to add the language. MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, Imake was also proposal to add the language. MR. SANTOS: Con we do one at a time first? So, Imake was also proposal to add the language. MR. SANTOS: Con we do one at a time first? So, Imake was also proposal to add the language. MR. SANTOS: Con we do one at a time first? So, Imake was also proposal to add the language. MR. SANTOS: Con we do one at a time first? So, Imake was also proposal to add the language. MR. SANTOS: Con we do one at a time first? So, Imake was also proposal to the was also proposal to them was period after 'process' on that first sentence. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then whether or not he recommend that he do any more pilots? MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. MR. SANTOS: Yes. MR. SANTOS: Yes. MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBER
MR. SANTOS: So basically put a period after the words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words of "and cease all related activities," with the parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 MR. SANTOS: Cokay. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal to add the language. 15 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 16 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 18 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 19 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 21 GHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: My would be amendment is proposed, you accept it and 25 no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 25 MR. SANTOS: Okay. thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 25 MR. SANTOS: Ves. 21 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 25 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on 25 second friendly amendment: 10 MS. ROBERSON: Ves. 21 MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in 21 our work planning process and how we manage our work planning process and how we manage our work planning process and how we manage our work planning process that make sense? 25 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: My would the manage of the 32 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director is being directed to 25 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that work 21 manufall of the theory of the five pilots. 22 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director is being directed to 25 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 19 clear. So the technical director is being directed to 25 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 19 resources that we complete the five pilots, then brief the board on
words "scorecard process," period. And delete the words "and cease all related activities," with the "and cease all related activities, or in the protest of the the so of optical to the new so long if reflet board on the Board resources required to do those pilots? MS. ROBERSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then whether or not he recommends that he do any more pilots? MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I'm just trying to figure out if we can say it so that it's pretty and clarector to the board on the Board resources and how we manage our work p
10 "and cease all related activities," with the 11 parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 MR. SANTOS: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal 15 to add the language. 16 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 18 I am okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 21 MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make 22 sure we 23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 58 10 amending the amendment. 21 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 22 sure we 23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, after the word process? 24 of MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 25 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, after the word process? 3 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, after the word process? 4 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, after the word process? 4 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, after the word process? 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 6 MR. SANTOS: Okay, Let's see if I can keep 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And the results. The villot fer results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SU
11 parenthetical "e.g. pilot programs." Is that correct? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 MR. SANTOS: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal 15 to add the language. 16 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 18 I am okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 21 MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make 22 sure we 23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 25 no there are a sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 26 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 27 cHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 28 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. 38 ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep track. So the second friendly amendment is to add - well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically 30 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically 31 data requires the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 4 MR. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 4 MR. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. 4 MR. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 12 MS. ROBERSON: Right. 13 MR. SANTOS: Okay. 14 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then he is being directed to brief the Board on the Board resources required to do those pilots? 15 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 16 MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. 17 MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, 17 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then whether or not he recommends that he do any more pilots? 18 I am okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a period after "process" on that first sentence. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 21 MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we 22 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 28 MS. ROBERSON: Yes. 29 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and 25 mo other Board member raises an objection, then we are 29 MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and 25 mo other Board member raises an objection, then we are 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 30 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 4 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 4 Clear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 4 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work pilot efforts. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHA
MR. SANTOS: Okay. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal to add the language. MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, I am okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a period after "process" on that first sentence. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then whether or not he recommends that he do any more pilots? MS. ROBERSON: Yea. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then whether or not he recommends that he do any more pilots? MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process, and how we manage our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are To amending the amendment. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we
CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Then there was also proposal to add the language. MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, If CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then whether or not he recommends that he do any more pilots? MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process and how we manage our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are Selection of the first sentence, after the word process? MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? MR. SANTOS: Veah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: In just trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty MS. ROBERSON: Veah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: In just trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty MS. ROBERSON: Un-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilots. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Un-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
to add the language. MS. ROBERSON: To add the language. MS. ROBERSON: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then whether or not he recommends that he do any more pilots? Period after "process" on that first sentence. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are To amending the amendment. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Pin just trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty celear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. As ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process, and how we manage our work planning process, so. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if I can keep track. So the second friendly amendment is to add— MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
17 MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, 18 Iam okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 21 MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make 22 sure we 23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and 25 no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 26 amending the amendment. 27 amendment we are striking the remainder of the 28 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 29 sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 30 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 31 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 32 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 33 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 44 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 55 sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 56 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 57 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 58 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a 59 second friendly amendment. 50 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The 50 validity of the results of the assessments. 51 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 52 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work 53 Planting process, yes. Does that make sense? 54 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: and any recommendations the 55 technical director is being directed to 56 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 57 cHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the 58 centence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 59 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the 50 technical director has based on his review of the five 51 pilot efforts. 50 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The 51 validity of the results of the assessments. 51 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work 51 planning process? 51 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
17 MR. SANTOS: Can we do one at a time first? So, 18 Iam okay, I can accept that deletion. So putting a 19 period after "process" on that first sentence. 20 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 21 MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make 22 sure we 23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and 25 no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 26 amending the amendment. 27 amendment we are striking the remainder of the 28 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 29 sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 30 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 31 Sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 42 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. 43 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. 44 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process, and how we manage our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? 4 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I'm just trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure
period after "process" on that first sentence. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are To mending the amendment. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Yeah, and what does he recommend as a result of that experience to change, and really in our work planning process and how we manage our work planning process and ho
CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I'm just trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from Ayour amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in AR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in AR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in AR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in AR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in AR. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process and how we manage our work planning process, and really in our work planning process and how we manage our work planning process, yes. Does that make sense? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: In gust trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 60 1 amending the amendment. 2 we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 60 1 clear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
MR. SANTOS: Counsel, I'm looking at you to make sure we CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are To amending the amendment. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep MR. SO the second friendly amendment is to add well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, well figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty clear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the complete five pilots, then brief the board on the MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
22 sure we 23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, 24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and 25 no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 26 amending the amendment. 27
CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, so under our process, if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are The sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the second friendly amendment. The sentences. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep that requires the technical director to specifically MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: The just trying to figure out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from a resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot from a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The solidity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The solidity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
24 if a friendly amendment is proposed, you accept it and no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 25 vell figure it out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 26 vell figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 27 out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 28 out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 29 out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 40 out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 40 out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 40 out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 41 clear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 42 out if we agree on what we're trying to say and then we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 43 clear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 44 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 45 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. 46 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. 47 OHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? 48 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 49 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if the acceptance of the intervent in the work planning process? 40 OHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if the pilots.
25 no other Board member raises an objection, then we are 26 we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 27 memory of the first sendence, after the word process? 28 descendence of the first sentence, after the word process? 39 chalk man SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. 20 we'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty 30 clear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. 6 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? 8 We'll figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty of the seeing directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 8 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 9 Well figure it out if we can say it so that it's pretty of the seeing directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 8 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. 9 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? 10 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 11 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
1 amending the amendment. 2 MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. 3 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 4 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 5 sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 6 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 8 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep 11 track. So the second friendly amendment is to add 12 well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, 13 that requires the technical director to specifically 1 clear. So the technical director is being directed to 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 3 resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. 8 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. 9 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? 10 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 11 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
amending the amendment. MR. SANTOS: Okay, thank you. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically clear. So the technical director is being directed to complete five pilots, then brief the board on the resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
2 Complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 3 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 4 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 5 sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 6 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 8 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep 11 track. So the second friendly amendment is to add 12 well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, 13 that requires the technical director to specifically 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 13 resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot second friendly and the results of the assessments. 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? 11 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
2 Complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 3 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from 4 your amendment we are striking the remainder of the 5 sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 6 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 8 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep 11 track. So the second friendly amendment is to add 12 well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, 13 that requires the technical director to specifically 2 complete five pilots, then brief the board on the 13 resources that were necessary to do those five pilots. 4 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot second friendly and the results of the assessments. 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? 11 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, what I have heard from your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. Parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? Well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically Tesources that were necessary to do those five pilots. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
your amendment we are striking the remainder of the sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? MR. SANTOS: Yes. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five pilot efforts. Parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep track. So the second friendly amendment is to add well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
5 sentence, of the first sentence, after the word process? 6 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 8 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep 11 track. So the second friendly amendment is to add 12 well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, 13 that requires the technical director to specifically 5 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And any recommendations the technical director has based on his review of the five 16 technical director has based on his review of the five 17 pilot efforts. 18 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The 19 validity of the results of the assessments. 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work 11 planning process? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
6 MR. SANTOS: Yes. 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in 8 parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a 9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep 11 track. So the second friendly amendment is to add 12 well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, 13 that requires the technical director to specifically 6 technical director has based on his review of the five 7 pilot efforts. 8 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The 9 validity of the results of the assessments. 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work 11 planning process? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Including the words in parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep track. So the second friendly amendment is to add well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically 7 pilot efforts. 8 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? 11 planning process? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
parentheses. All right, now, there's discussion on a second friendly amendment. MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep track. So the second friendly amendment is to add well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work planning process? MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. And the results. The validity of the results of the assessments. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
9 second friendly amendment. 10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep 11 track. So the second friendly amendment is to add 12 well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, 13 that requires the technical director to specifically 9 validity of the results of the assessments. 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work 11 planning process? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
10 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. Let's see if I can keep 11 track. So the second friendly amendment is to add 12 well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, 13 that requires the technical director to specifically 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: To make changes in the work 11 planning process? 12 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
well, let's just say another paragraph before finally, that requires the technical director to specifically 13 MS. ROBERSON: Um-hmm. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
that requires the technical director to specifically 13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. So, we'll see if
brief the Board on the scope involved in those five 14 the general counsel, who I'm sure is scribbling like
pilots, the result of those, and, frankly, his 15 crazy, can come up with language that he thinks that
recommendation as a result of that knowledge at the 16 this friendly amendment is and then we will go through
17 time. 17 the process to try to figure out if we have that in a
18 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, if I can ask for 18 form that we can vote on.
19 clarification, is this language intended to direct the 19 MR BIGGINS: So the first friendly amendment was
20 technical director to proceed with the five pilots, or 20 strike prohibition to cease work on the pilots; require
21 not? I'm a bit confused as to whether 21 completion of the five pilots; brief the Board on the
MS. ROBERSON: Yes. 22 process and conclusions, so that the Board can at that
23 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, you're suggesting that 23 time determine its usefulness in a broader context. And
24 this be language that directs the technical director to 24 the second friendly amendment is to add a paragraph
proceed with the five pilots? 25 requiring to brief the Board on the scope involved in

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay, Mr. Executive

61 63 those five pilots, the result of those five pilots, the secretary, have you massaged the words in the end of 1 1 2 2 resources necessary, and allow the Board to make changes your new paragraph 3? 3 in the work planning process. 3 MR. BIGGINS: Brief the Board on the scope 4 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, I thought we were 4 involved in those five pilots, the results of those five 5 5 going to have one paragraph, but what I understood you pilots, the resources necessary, and to make 6 to say is your -- your understanding of the second recommendation for changes in the work planning process. 6 7 7 friendly amendment would do two things, it would add CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Does that do it? 8 some language back into the first paragraph. Is that 8 MS. ROBERSON: It's clunky, but that's what I 9 9 correct? was going for as a proposal. 10 MR. BIGGINS: No, the second friendly amendment 10 MS. CONNERY: You were going for clunky? 11 was stated as adding a paragraph. 11 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, let me suggest that we 12 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay, where is the language 12 change "those five pilots" to either "the five pilots" 13 going to go that would direct the technical director to 13 or "the five pilot programs referred to in the first finish the five-pilot programs? 14 14 paragraph," or something of that nature. I find the 15 MR. BIGGINS: It wasn't specified in the 15 final words "those five pilots" to be a little bit 16 friendly amendment. 16 confusing. 17 MR. SANTOS: I think I heard prior to the 17 MR. SANTOS: And I would like to add in 18 18 final -- prior to the last paragraph. parentheses, after "resource necessary," to say "both 19 19 MS. ROBERSON: It would be part of the internal and external." 20 20 MS. CONNERY: For the pilot? paragraph. 21 21 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: It could either be part of MR. SANTOS: Yeah, the pilots, we should know 22 the paragraph, or it could be part -- in other words, we 22 what it cost, both internally and externally. 23 23 could change the first paragraph, where it says, "do not CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, I sense that 24 proceed to final design and implementation of the 24 he's -- you're asking for what it would -- so, in other 25 proposed scorecard process, or the technical director 25 words, you're looking for how many resources the 62 64 shall proceed with the five pilot programs? 1 Department of Energy might need to expend in our pilot 1 2 MS. ROBERSON: It could be there. 2 process? 3 MR. SANTOS: That could work. 3 MR. SANTOS: Correct. 4 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right. 4 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And then we end that there, Ms. Connery, do you have a comment or are you 5 5 no where written, the amendment had three paragraphs, so 6 waiting for counsel to read this again? 6 we are going to add a new paragraph 3 and push existing 7 7 paragraph 3 to paragraph 4, and the new paragraph 3 will MS. CONNERY: I have a second friendly amendment 8 8 say -- please read it again. when you're done. 9 9 MR. BIGGINS: Brief the Board on the scope CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We're already way past two 10 involved in those five pilots, the results of those five 10 friendly amendments. 11 pilots, the resources necessary, and to allow the Board 11 MS. CONNERY: A third friendly amendment. 12 to make changes in the work planning process. 12 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Mr. General counsel? 13 13 MR. BIGGINS: Okay, so I am going to try to add MR. SANTOS: Yeah, I'm not clear on the last 14 part. To make changes to the work planning process. If 14 this all together. Direct the technical director to not 15 we can make any recommendations to the, you know, 15 proceed to final design and implementation of the proposed scorecard process. Require the completion of 16 technical work plan -- you have different words 16 17 regarding -- I just want to not necessarily make -- I 17 the five pilots. Brief the Board on the process and want to hear the recommendations to the technical work 18 conclusions so the Board can at that time determine its 18 19 planning process. 19 usefulness in a broader context. 20 MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, I would say I 20 Also, this RFBA replaces the previous Board 21 agree. I was actually going to say the same thing. 21 direction contained in the October 11, 2016 RFBA 22 It's comma, make the -- I would like for the technical 22 2017-300-004. In addition, as part of the development 23 23 director to make his recommendations to the Board in of the FY 2018 technical work plan, the technical 24 that paragraph as well, too, of changes he believes. 24 director is directed to leverage lessons learned from

16 (Pages 61 to 64)

the development to date of the proposed scorecard

25

65

previous board direction contained in the October 11,

process to identify and institutionalize improvements to the independent technical oversight work of the Office of the Technical Director. This effort should satisfy the following goals: One, improve the information sharing, evaluation of cross-cutting safety issues and standardization to the extent possible of risk ranking or safety issues across all technical groups; two, improve the technical work planning measurement and execution process; three, improve the timing and quality of information provided to the Board for the Board to be able to more efficiently and effectively establish safety oversight priorities and understand resource allocations and needs for the Office of the Technical Director; and four, maximize the use of technical information generated by the DNFSB staff independent evaluations.

Brief the Board on the scope involved in the five pilots, the results of the five pilots, the resources necessary, both internally and externally, and make recommendations for changes in the work planning process.

Finally, the technical director is directed to brief the board on the specific actions taken on this RFBA included but not limited to those actions incorporated into the proposed FY 2018 technical work

2 2016 RFBA, 2017-300-004.
 3 And then the additional paragraph, the technical
 4 director shall brief the Board on the scope involved in
 5 the five pilot programs, the results of the five pilot
 6 programs, the resources necessary both internally and

externally, and make recommendations for changes in the work planning process.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Is there any objection to -- by any Board member to those friendly amendments?

(No response.)

13 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Seeing none, I think the 14 amendment is amended, as read.

MR. SANTOS: Thank you.MS. ROBERSON: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Connery?

MR. SANTOS: Sorry, so this is now the amendment in front of us?

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: This is now the amendment.
 MR. SANTOS: Thank you.

22 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Which we haven't voted on yet. Ms. Connery?

MS. CONNERY: So, I would like to introduce a friendly amendment, and that would be the deletion of

plan by September 30, 2017.

MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman, if I can make one modification to that? The modification in the first paragraph, really all that we need to say is complete the five -- the pilot program, period.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: As a further modification, I suggest that we -- that that second -- that new second sentence in the first paragraph, and for the new paragraph 3, just begin those both with the words "the technical director shall."

MR. SANTOS: Since this is a friendly amendment, I accept the friendly amendment.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, I'm going to wait until the executive secretary catches up, I'm going to ask him to read just the first and new third paragraphs again, and then we will see if there's any objection from the Board members, and I know that Ms. Connery has already indicated she has yet another friendly amendment in the offing.

Okay, Executive Secretary?

MR. BIGGINS: Direct the technical director to not proceed to final design and implementation of the proposed scorecard process. The technical director shall complete the five pilot programs, and then it goes into the next sentence. Also this RFBA replaces the

the sentence, very long sentence that starts, "this effort," and ends in "evaluation." And it's the one that talks about the goals, and I don't find anything objectionable about the goals put forward, I just don't see them directly relevant to just the scorecard process. They are goals that I would see for the planning process or how we would do our technical work plan, but I just don't think that they're necessary to put here.

And in particular, number 3 about improved timing and quality of information has nothing really to do with the SSO implementation. Again, they are goals I support, I just don't know that they necessarily need to be in this action, and it would make it easier for me to support this action if that chunk of the paragraph weren't there.

MR. SANTOS: I appreciate your perspective on that. Part of the reason I added specific goals is based on feedback from other Board members, and including staff in the past that if we even go back to the original RFBA package in October proposed for Mr. Hamilton, one of the things we didn't do was to write down specific goals or provide some sort of, you know, strategic guidance for the staff to then have some guidance to go with.

17 (Pages 65 to 68)

So that's why I felt very strongly that was important to be explicit, you know, about it. So my preference is that we do that. The staff already assessed the RFBA, they understood it, they provided that there's no impact. So my strong preference is that we keep that. It doesn't hurt to have explicit expectations.

So, respectfully, I'm not accepting the friendly amendment. But I understand what you're saying. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, so I will point out procedurally, if he's not going to accept it, then the amendment is not amended, but our executive secretary will correct me if I'm wrong.

Our procedures would allow you, Ms. Connery, to introduce what you just suggested as a new amendment before we have a final vote, and if you get a second, then we can entertain and discuss what you have just proposed.

MS. CONNERY: Okay, seeing no agreement from the proposer of the amendment, then I will propose that we remove that paragraph, that part of the paragraph starting with "this effort." And my reasoning for it is, again, these are lofty goals, they are great goals, they are not specific to the SSO process. They are

allow them to own it, to allow them to develop it, and to give them as much flexibility as we can, telling them, bring us a system, and trying to avoid telling them how to design it. That's what I believe the original Board -- request for Board action did. It gave some broad parameters about looking for NRC process oversight and so forth and allowed them the flexibility.

The RFBA, upon which this amendment is being proposed, contains similar sorts of flexibility. For example, the fourth bullet says, "the systematic system oversight scope will begin with operating Hazardous Category 2 defense nuclear facilities. It doesn't say it begins with all Hazardous Category 2 facilities, certainly you could say that's inferred, but the reality is the technical staff have the ability to get started and if it turns out that their data collection process, which is something that I have been hearing is a concern here, is overwhelming, they have the flexibility to say, hang on, we can stop and re-evaluate this. The third from the bottom, it says, "Technical staff will brief the Board biannually on the results, effectiveness of process and any adjustments that were made and/or envisioned." That combined with the fact that the technical staff is being allowed to write the instruction already gives the staff enough flexibility

general goals for the staff that we can entertain putting forward in some other manner, but I don't think it does anything to add to the discussion of the scorecard process in specific. And there's, again, part of these do not directly reflect what it is that we're trying to do here with the scorecard effort, and some of them do, so rather than apply, I'd just rather pull them out and remove them from the amendment.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I understand, and just to review procedurally, we have an amendment which is now four paragraphs long. The amendment replaces, by its own language, it replaces in total the original staff proposal that we had, so if this amendment is adopted, then this is now where we are heading, but we can entertain further amendments to it prior to a final vote. And Ms. Connery has already indicated that she will propose a further amendment.

So, is there any other discussion on the amendment by Mr. Santos as modified by two friendly amendments that have been made? Mr. Hamilton?

MR. HAMILTON: I don't disagree with the sentiment of Ms. Roberson about wanting to look at the pilot in advance. What I would say is that from the very beginning, we've defined or we've intentionally defined the task of the staff in very loose terms, to

to adapt in the event that it turns out that data extraction is a big problem, like we've heard described by Mr. Santos.

So, while I don't disagree with your desire to say, hang on, let's look at it, in my view, the ability for the technical director to do that is already embedded in his RFBA, and it allows him that flexibility. So I really don't think the amendment as amended is necessary. That's all.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Any further discussion? MS. ROBERSON: And I appreciate your feedback, Mr. Hamilton. The one thing I'd say is the staff has told us that they're doing 61, and I believe by virtue of the Board debating and we can say making a nondecision decision, we are mandating to the staff the scope of that effort. You're right, their proposal would allow them to come and push back. But I think if we walk away from this meeting, and this is what I wish is a shift. And I'm concerned about that. I mean you captured my concern exactly right.

CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Connery?
MS. CONNERY: I would say the other challenge that I have is the staff does not look at these things -- they don't look at resource constraints. They were told this is what we're looking for in terms of a

18 (Pages 69 to 72)

	73		75
1	technical proposal. We didn't give them any resource	1	now the focus is the technical work plan. So we were
2	constraints and so that's our job as the Board to	2	originally on the scorecard. We are now talking about
3	recognize what resources are being used, what they	3	the technical work plan.
4	can tell us what is not getting done, but we make the	4	So given that that is the subject, how to review
5	decision as to whether or not we want those resources	5	and approve the technical work plan, what are the
6	applied to developing a safety oversight system or	6	expectations and guidance we want to provide to the
7	whether we actually want those resources to be applied	7	technical director and the Office of the Technical
8	to actually doing oversight in the field.	8	Director regarding the technical work plan? And I
9	And so from my view, that's the challenge with	9	believe those items one through 4 are guidance
10	the staff proposal is, again, they are trying to meet	10	associated to improve the technical work planning
11	our needs, but our needs also have to include making	11	process, and they're all there's a connection of each
12	rational decisions based on knowing what our constraints	12	one to the work planning process.
13	are and knowing what our budget is going to be next year	13	So I understand your concern that this has
14	and knowing the number of bodies we're limited to.	14	nothing to do with the scorecard, and literally you're
15	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Any further discussion?	15	correct. This is associated with the technical work
16	(No response.)	16	plan. And that's how it flows. But I welcome your
17	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: The question on the board is	17	amendment.
18	the amendment by the amendment and the two friendly	18	MS. CONNERY: But given that, again, this came
19	amendments. Executive Secretary, please call the roll.	19	to us as an amendment to a Board action, it came to us
20	MR. BIGGINS: Chairman Sullivan?	20	in whole cloth with no ability to discuss or deliberate.
21	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: No.	21	You know, we have 15 minutes left of a meeting on those
22	MR. BIGGINS: Vice Chairman Hamilton?	22	particular issues because we were talking about other
23	MR. HAMILTON: No.	23	things. Again, I think that that's more appropriate to
24	MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Roberson?	24 25	discuss later on when we're having a conversation about
25	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.	25	the work planning process and have the Board actually
	74		76
1	MR. BIGGINS: Mr. Santos?	1	come up with something that we could all agree on that
2	MR. SANTOS: Yes.	2	we are all authorize and have authorship of and
3	MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Connery?	3	ownership of. And I believe if you introduce goals as
4	MS. CONNERY: Yes.	4	an individual Board member, even if I agree with all of
5	MR. BIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, three votes in	5	them, I just don't think that that's an appropriate
6	favor, two opposed; the amendment is approved.	6	process for us to set goals for the technical director
7	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you. So, the	7	and his staff, nor for the whole agency.
8	amendment is now the proposal in total. Are there any	8	You know, we've had other processes where we've
9	other further efforts by Board members to amend the	9	been able to come up collaboratively with goals for the
10	proposal? Ms. Connery?	10	organization, and that I think that's what we should try
11	MS. CONNERY: Yes, I would like to repeat my	11	to do and not try to shoehorn them into an amendment.
12	amendment that we strip out the last long sentence in	12	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, while I didn't support
13	the second paragraph of the existing proposal.	13	Mr. Santos' amendment, I support this amendment to it
14 15	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, Ms. Connery has moved to further amend the proposal by deleting the sentence in	14 15	for the reasons stated by Ms. Connery.
16	the second paragraph that begins with "this effort," and	16	Is there any further discussion?
17	then ends with "DNFSB staff independent evaluations."	17	(No response.)
18	And I will second that motion.	18	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, Mr. Executive Secretary, if you would call the roll on Ms. Connery's
19	So, we have a proposed amendment with a second.	19	amendment.
20	Is there further discussion on the proposed amendment?	20	MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Connery's motion is to amend
21	Mr. Santos?	21	the amendment to strike the sentence describing four
22	MR. SANTOS: Again, I understand the description	22	goals starting with "this effort should satisfy the
23	by Ms. Connery, all I want to offer is, since I am	23	following goals." Vice Chairman Hamilton?
24	the approved amendment has to do with the technical work	24	MR. HAMILTON: Yes.
25	plan, that's taking us away now from the scorecard. So	25	MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Roberson?

	77		79
1	MS. ROBERSON: No.	1	and I don't see any reason why we can't after almost an
2	MR. BIGGINS: Mr. Santos?	2	hour and 45 minutes. We invite the public to the
3	MR. SANTOS: No. Can I make a comment? Or can	3	meeting, and then it seems like we take the climax away.
4	I	4	If we just then all retire to our offices to produce
5	MS. ROBERSON: Too late.	5	something on a piece of paper at some further time.
6	MR. SANTOS: No, no, to the vote? How will that	6	That's my comment.
7	work?	7	MS. CONNERY: I like cliffhangers and I want to
8	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We are voting. We will	8	drive them to our website. There is a method behind my
9	provide opportunity if you want to make there's final	9	madness, because I have another motion after that, but
10	comments and then you can make a written comment.	10	there's a reason, I believe that I would like to be able
11	MR. SANTOS: Thank you. The vote is no.	11	to take the time to perhaps have conversations with the
12	MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Connery?	12	staff to determine what my final vote will be, and maybe
13	MS. CONNERY: Yes. Yes.	13	have offline conversations with other Board members to
14	MR. BIGGINS: And Chairman Sullivan?	14	further refine thinking on this as I'm not quite sure
15	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Yes.	15	how I'm going to vote even at this moment. So that's
16	MR. BIGGINS: Chairman, it is three votes in	16	why I'm proposing that we revert to notational voting.
17	favor, two opposed; the motion to amend the matter is	17	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: I understand. Is there a
18	approved.	18	second on the motion to table?
19	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you. So, again,	19	MS. ROBERSON: I'll second the motion. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Then without further
20 21	procedurally, we had a proposal from the staff that was replaced in total by Mr. Santos' amendment, as further	20 21	discussion, I ask the Executive Secretary to call the
22	modified by friendly amendments, and then an amendment	22	roll on the motion to table.
23	by Ms. Connery made further changes to it. Are there	23	MR. BIGGINS: On the motion to table,
24	any other proposals before the Board? If not, it may	24	Ms. Roberson?
25	sound like it's redundant, we've been amending, and so	25	MS. ROBERSON: Yes.
	78		80
1	we will take a final vote on the actual proposal.	1	MR. BIGGINS: Mr. Santos?
2	MS. CONNERY: Mr. Chairman? I move to table the	2	MR. SANTOS: Yes.
3	vote on the final action and revert to notational voting	3	MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Connery?
4	procedures and allow three days for Board members to	4	MS. CONNERY: Yes.
5	vote and provide comments on this matter. If I have a	5	MR. BIGGINS: Chairman Sullivan? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: No.
6 7	second. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, so by our	7	MR. BIGGINS: Vice Chairman Hamilton?
8	procedures, we've had a motion to table. If there is a	8	MR. HAMILTON: No.
9	second, then we will immediately move to, without any	9	MR. BIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, three votes in favor
10	further discussion on the motion to table. If there	10	of tabling, two opposed; the motion is tabled.
11	is if there is no second, then the motion to table	11	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay, the motion is tabled,
12	will automatically fail. Let me point out, before we	12	and we currently have no further business in front of
13	ask if there is a second, once there is a second, we	13	the Board.
14	can't make any further comments. So, by our procedures	14	Ms. Connery?
15	we will immediately vote on the motion to table.	15	MS. CONNERY: I have a motion. I move to leave
16	So, if there is any Board members who wishes to	16	the record of the meeting open for two business days and
17	comment on whether it's appropriate to table at this	17	instruct the general counsel to accept public comments
18	point, if it's okay, if we can just have that have	18	through the website during that period.
19	the Board members give an opportunity to comment before	19	MS. ROBERSON: Mr. Chairman?
20	we before we look for a second.	20	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We have a motion, we need a
21	MS. ROBERSON: I didn't have any comment on	21 22	second if we're going to deliberate on the motion.
22 23	that, Mr. Chairman. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay. Well, I have a	22 23	MS. ROBERSON: I want to make a clarification to the reading of the previous motion.
24	comment. Personally, I would be disappointed if we	24	CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Okay.
25	can't have a meeting and reach finality in a meeting,	25	MS. ROBERSON: I thought there was a
	,		

to reread the next to the last motion.

81 83 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: We have a motion. Can we MR. BIGGINS: Yes, ma'am. I notated it as a 1 1 2 2 motion to table, but the motion was to table it to allow decide if we have a second, or do you -- we can as part 3 3 of deliberations, if there's a question, we can find for notational vote by the Board. 4 that out. 4 MS. ROBERSON: That was my question. I thought 5 MS. ROBERSON: Okay. No, my question is on the 5 there was a time frame associated with the proposal. 6 motion we think we just closed the book on, but I can 6 MS. CONNERY: It was just the regular notational 7 7 wait until after this process. voting time, which is three business days, is what I 8 MR. SANTOS: I'll second the latest motion. 8 intended. 9 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, we have a motion and a 9 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, unless there's an 10 second on the question of holding the record open for 10 objection, then for clarity, since we tabled it, the Board members would get the proposal -- would get what 11 two business days. 11 12 MS. CONNERY: Two business days and to instruct 12 the current proposal is, with all the amendments, as 13 the general counsel to accept public comments through 13 we've done it, in a blue folder, and we would vote on the website, or if you have an email address, 14 14 them under the timelines in our procedures, which 15 Mr. General Counsel. 15 generally allows us three days to vote on something once 16 MR. BIGGINS: For clarification, what we would 16 we actually receive the folder. 17 do is we would provide an email address on the public 17 MS. ROBERSON: Yes, sir. I just wanted to website for this public meeting page, to allow people to 18 18 understand that. Thank you. 19 email comments and then we would collect those and 19 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Without objection, that is 20 provide them to the Board. 20 what -- that is the Board's understanding of what we 21 21 approved in the motion to table. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Is there any other comment 22 22 All right, Mr. Santos? or discussion on this motion to leave the record open 23 23 MR. SANTOS: Since we're going to be moving to for two days and take comment from the public? 24 (No response.) 24 the final blue folder on the proposal, I just wanted to 25 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: If not, I ask the executive 25 make a very quick comment on the final amendment. Is 82 84 1 this the time to make that? It's very brief. 1 secretary to call the roll on Ms. Connery's motion. 2 MR. BIGGINS: The motion is to move to hold the 2 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Well, as part of our normal 3 3 meeting procedures, I was going to give all Board record open for two business days and direct the general 4 counsel to collect public comments. members an opportunity to comment before we adjourn the 4 5 5 Mr. Santos? meeting. 6 MR. SANTOS: Yes. MR. SANTOS: Okay. 6 7 7 MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Connery? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, right at the moment, 8 MS. CONNERY: Yes. 8 we're almost there. I know of no further business 9 9 MR. BIGGINS: Chairman Sullivan? before the Board. 10 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Yes. 10 MR. SANTOS: Yeah, my comment was very specific MR. BIGGINS: Vice Chairman Hamilton? 11 to the approved final amendment to delete the goals. 11 12 MR. HAMILTON: Yes. 12 That's all. 13 13 MR. BIGGINS: Ms. Roberson? CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: All right, so --14 MS. ROBERSON: Yes. 14 MR. SANTOS: As opposed to a general comment. CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: So, we have no further 15 MS. CONNERY: I got five yeses, that's the first 15 16 business before the Board at this point, and if no Board 16 time. MR. BIGGINS: Mr. Chairman, there are five votes 17 member is going to try to raise any business related to 17 18 the proposal, then I will call for Board member 18 in favor, none opposed; the motion passes. 19 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Let it never be said we 19 comments. So, I will start with vice Chairman Hamilton. 20 can't reach something unanimously. 20 MR. HAMILTON: I have no closing comments, 21 Ms. Roberson, you had some question for 21 Mr. Chairman. 22 clarification? 22 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you. Ms. Roberson? 23 MS. ROBERSON: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just 23 MS. ROBERSON: I did. Mr. Chairman, maybe it 24 was my misunderstanding. I'm asking the general counsel 24 briefly, I just want to thank the Board for hearing me.

21 (Pages 81 to 84)

I do feel like we had a good conversation, and I did

25

87 85 have some concerns and I feel those concerns were heard. 1 1 with each of you from the tech staff to our legal team 2 and although I know we all would like to have a 5-0 vote 2 to the folks in the office of the general manager. You 3 on everything, I respect the different perspectives and 3 uphold the mission of this agency regardless of who is 4 I feel like we can get something out of this process 4 sitting on the Board, you do the right thing for the 5 that will be beneficial. So thank you. 5 right reason and I am extremely proud to be part of your 6 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Thank you. Mr. Santos? 6 agency. Thank you. 7 MR. SANTOS: Again, I want to thank my fellow 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: And I have no final 8 Board members. It's good to be able to have a 8 comments. So, having concluded the business before the 9 professional deliberation on matters of the Board, so I 9 Board, the record of the meeting is open for two more 10 10 business days as indicated in the final motion that was look forward to this type of forum in the future. I 11 think to me it was very beneficial. 11 approved, and otherwise this meeting is adjourned. We 12 Regarding the final amendment or proposal that 12 are off the record. 13 got approved. My only comment is it will be good 13 (Whereupon, at 11:57 a.m., the meeting was 14 practice, one that will encourage that as we come up 14 adjourned.) 15 15 with future actions and tasking to the staff that we provide additional clarity from a strategic level and 16 16 17 provide our expectations and guidance in writing as much 17 18 as possible to avoid confusion as things get executed. 18 19 So I think that's a good practice that I encourage. 19 20 For closing, I want to just go back to my 20 21 opening statements, and basically say we have work to 21 22 do. All of us, to improve our internal execution of 22 23 work. There's a lot of improvements going under way, 23 24 but additional improvements are necessary to ensure we 24 25 don't erode external competence in our mission. That's 25 86 88 1 my mission, I look forward to continue to work with my 1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER 2 fellow Board members and the staff to continue to 2 3 improve. We are a learning organization, and, you know, 3 I, Sally Jo Quade, do hereby certify that the 4 I'm excited about improvement. 4 foregoing proceedings were recorded by me via stenotype 5 5 So, thank you again, and that concludes my and reduced to typewriting under my supervision; that I 6 6 closing remarks, thank you. am neither counsel for, related to, nor employed by any 7 CHAIRMAN SULLIVAN: Ms. Connery? 7 of the parties to the action in which these proceedings 8 MS. CONNERY: I would also like to thank the 8 were transcribed; and further, that I am not a relative 9 Board for this morning's conversation, and I would like 9 or employee of any attorney or counsel employed by the 10 to thank Mr. Hamilton for challenging us to take a look 10 parties hereto, nor financially or otherwise interested 11 at an outside practice and try to adapt it to our own 11 in the outcome of the action. 12 particular activities here. The team did a tremendous 12 13 13 job, and I will echo what Mr. Hamilton said earlier, 14 taking a very complex project and turning it into very 14 15 good things. But I would be remiss if I didn't take my 15 opportunity for closing to recognize on the record our 16 16 federal workers, because it is Public Service SALLY JO QUADE 17 17 18 Recognition Week. You are the unsung heroes of the 18 19 Government. We up here we're temps, we come to serve a 19 20 term and we leave, but you are the constant. And it's 20 21 not always easy, we give you a hard time, you are 21 22 denigrated in the press as bureaucrats, your family has 22 23 a hard time remembering the acronym DNFSB, let alone 23 24 describing what you do. And I understand that that can 24 25 be demoralizing, but I am so honored to be associated 25

[89]

A
a.m 87:13
ability 27:21 28:24
41:3 51:4 71:15
72:5 75:20
able 15:12 18:8
19:25 23:19 27:3
32:11 35:1,4 47:4
65:11 76:9 79:10
85:8
absence 14:6
absent 16:8 36:13
absolutely 27:2
accept 57:18,24
66:12 69:12 80:17
81:13
acceptable 39:1
accepting 69:8
accomplishment
8:10
accurate 6:25
achieve 14:4 38:22
42:1
acknowledge 4:23
acronym 86:23
act 3:20,21 11:2
16:15
acted 45:23
acting 52:18,19
action 5:1,4 6:21 7:4
7:8,25 9:6 10:24
12:8,9,14,18,19,21
13:4,6 28:15 31:16
33:5 38:1,2 41:6
44:8 68:14,15 71:5
75:19 78:3 88:7,11
actions 5:6 32:18,19
65:23,24 85:15
activities 31:19 35:3
36:16 39:10 57:10
86:12
activity 25:12
actual 5:8 24:18
25:6,19,20 78:1
adapt 72:1 86:11
add 15:6 21:14 24:2

46:13 56:14,19
57:15,16 58:11
60:24 61:7 62:6
63:17 64:13 70:3
added 5:13,16 68:18
adding 56:23 61:11
addition 31:22
64:22
additional 8:8 59:9
67:3 85:16,24
address 14:14,24
26:1 28:21,24
44:24 50:15,17
81:14,17
addressed 14:21
adequate 16:20
adjourn 84:4
adjourned 87:11,14
adjustments 42:9
71:22
administrative
10:10 34:5
adopt 18:5
adopted 19:4 70:13
advance 70:23
advice 5:17
advise 16:19
advising 24:23,25
affect 27:7
agencies 10:1
0
agency 6:8 7:11 9:11
10:16 16:16 18:5
22:6 28:21,24 33:8
33:14 41:13 76:7
87:3,6
agency's 17:2 27:21
agenda 4:1 10:20
11:14,14
agile 29:11
agnostic 18:21
ago 18:22
agree 21:17 25:13
34:20 59:24 62:21
76:1,4
agreement 69:20
ahead 38:5
Alamos 28:5

alignment 21:5
allocate 14:7
allocation 13:15,21
14:10 37:23,25
allocations 32:13
65:13
allotted 4:7
allow 13:6 61:2
62:11 69:15 71:1,1
72:17 78:4 81:18
83:2
allowed 71:7,24
allowing 42:16
allows 72:7 83:15
alluded 22:21 24:6
alternative 27:22
amend 47:9 74:9,15
76:20 77:17
amended 12:1 19:5
67:14 69:13 72:9
amending 58:1
77:25
amendment 5:2 7:3
11:3,16,17,22,25
12:10 20:21 29:7
31:2,5,9,12,13
33:2,3,11,19 34:2
34:2,4,6,7,8,22
36:10,10,20 38:4
38:12,13,19,20
39:2 40:2,25 43:14
45:18 49:23 50:9
50:16 51:9 52:6
55:4,12,17 56:11
56:14,22,22 57:1,1
57:1,24 58:1,4,9
58:11 60:16,19,24
61:7,10,16 62:5
64:7,11 66:11,12
66:18 67:14,18,20
67:25 69:9,13,16
69:21 70:8,10,11
70:13,17,19 71:8
72:8 73:18,18 74:6
74:8,12,19,20,24
75:17,19 76:11,13
76:13,19,21 77:21

77:22 83:25 84:11
85:12
amendments 50:12
52:2 55:7 64:10
67:11 70:15,20
73:19 77:22 83:12
amount 21:23 56:9
analysis 5:12,17
analyze 27:4
and/or 71:22
announced 3:15
answer 40:9,11,13
52:20
anxious 6:4 anybody 11:5,18,20
52:5 54:24
anymore 19:3
anyway 45:1 48:19
appear 55:4
application 14:3
25:25
applied 9:22 73:6,7
apply 22:11,15,20
70:7
appreciate 27:12
49:13 54:25 68:17
72:11
approach 14:6
27:14 28:14 29:1
37:23
appropriate 10:15
14:15 16:17 18:17
75:23 76:5 78:17
appropriately 15:24 16:18
approval 30:13 33:9
33:24 41:14,24
43:14
approve 12:25
30:19 48:21 54:7
75:5
approved 12:14
46:21 49:17 54:15
74:6,24 77:18
83:21 84:11 85:13
87:11
approving 7:8

[89]	
approximately 5:20 52:24	
April 3:16,18	
as-is 12:1	
ascertain 54:16	
aside 50:11	
asked 37:20	
asking 46:10 63:24	
82:24	
assess 26:3 35:1,4	
assessed 69:4	
assessment 27:20	
28:18 29:17 34:1	
48:25 59:7	
assessments 6:4 14:19 22:16 56:15	
59:1,2 60:9	
associated 23:6	
75:10,15 83:5	
86:25	
assortment 37:12	
assume 28:9 46:19	
assuming 48:24	
attorney 88:9	
audience 7:20 40:16	
authority 7:5 8:4	
30:9 39:21 54:11	
authorize 76:2	
authorship 76:2	
automatically 78:12	
available 10:23 11:5	
30:4 53:2	
Avenue 1:17	
avoid 19:19 54:6,7	
71:3 85:18	
B	
baby 44:14 back 15:18 24:6	
27:18 29:15,22 30:13 41:18 47:16	
52:2,13,22 55:16	
61:8 68:20 72:17	

85:20

balance 5:12 **balanced** 47:5

background 12:13

[90]

balls 19:20	ŀ
base 56:2	ŀ
based 14:7 60:6	ŀ
68:19 73:12	
basic 11:23,24 12:9	
basically 28:3 43:15	
47:21 50:13 51:15	
51:18 57:8 85:21	
basis 29:25 30:8	
45:10 46:8	
bathwater 44:15	
bear 36:18	
began 13:24	
beginning 7:13 9:6,8	
17:22 22:23 70:24	
begins 71:13 74:16	
believe 5:7,10,14	
21:10,12 26:18,22	
47:5 71:4 72:13	
75:9 76:3 79:10	
believes 62:24	
beneficial 85:5,11	
benefit 8:25 25:23	
benefits 24:3	
best 18:4 27:14	
28:21 38:22 39:23	
54:12	
better 14:22,24 17:4 19:21 25:14 39:11	
39:12	
beyond 14:13 49:6	
biannually 71:21	
big 35:10 72:2	
Biggins 2:9 3:13	
31:13 32:25 60:19	
61:10,15 62:9 63:3	
64:13 66:21 73:20	
73:22,24 74:1,3,5	
76:20,25 77:2,12	
77:14,16 79:23	
80:1,3,5,7,9 81:16	
82:2,7,9,11,13,17	
83:1	
bit 8:16 35:7 50:4	
58:21 63:15	
bite 21:1	
black 44:5	
	ı

blanket 30:12
blue 83:13,24
board 1:7,11 2:3,6,7
2:8 3:5,7,8,9,10,11
3:18,22,25 4:1,5,7
4:13,14,21,23 5:1
5:3,10,19,20,22
6:5,11,18,19,21
7:7,8,11,24,25
10:9,19 11:1,1,7
11:16,19 12:9,13
12:18,19,20,21,25
13:4,6,11 15:7,8
15:10,19,25 16:3,6
16:14,15,22,24
17:7 18:1 19:5
20:6,17 21:12
23:25 24:14,21
25:4,6,8,8,25 26:1
26:18 27:13,14,23
28:12,23 29:6 30:9
30:13 31:1,13,15
31:20 32:11,11,18
33:9,17 34:9 36:6
36:15 37:14 38:1,2
38:10,16 39:9,17
39:22 40:2,14 41:1
41:3,5,13,14,18
42:7,16 43:13
45:23 46:11,18,20
46:22,25 47:2,3,13
48:12,20,20,21,24
49:1,3,11,12,18
50:18 51:2,16,18
51:21 52:17,18,18
53:20 54:13,15,17
56:16,17 57:25
58:14 59:6,14,14
60:2,21,22,25 61:2
62:9,11,23 63:3
64:17,18,20 65:10
65:10,17,23 66:17
67:1,4,10 68:19
71:5,5,21 72:14
73:2,17 74:9 75:19
75:25 76:4 77:24
78:4,16,19 79:13

80:13 81:20 83:3
83:11 84:3,9,16,16
84:18,24 85:8,9
86:2,9 87:4,9
Board's 3:13,16,20
3:21 4:9 5:16 54:4
83:20
bodies 73:14
book 81:6
bottom 71:20
breadth 23:19 brief 32:18 56:16
58:14 59:6,14 60:2
60:21,25 62:9 63:3
64:17 65:17,23
67:4 71:20 84:1
briefly 84:24
bring 71:3
bringing 29:15
broad 71:6
broader 38:9 56:18
60:23 64:19
broadly 37:18
brought 15:25
Bruce 2:5 3:8
budget 73:13
building 24:17
25:17 27:3,19 28:13,20
bullet 71:10
burden 10:10
bureaucrats 86:22
business 1:10,11 3:6
3:12,15,19,24,25
11:14 21:2 80:12
80:16 81:11,12
82:3 83:7 84:8,16
84:17 87:8,10
C
C 2:1 3:1
1115-14

C 2:1 3:1 calendar 15:14 call 30:3 55:15 73:19 76:18 79:21 82:1 84:18 cancel 36:11 37:14 37:15 38:10,11

52:13	ļ
cancellation 37:16	
capabilities 8:4	
23:13 51:5	
capability 5:23	
capable 49:21	
captured 72:20	
care 38:15	
case 26:5 28:22	
29:23 45:2	
29.23 45.2 catches 66:14	
Category 5:25 12:23	
13:14 14:13 22:3	
71:12,13	
cause 21:2,13 27:2	
causing 51:8	
caution 19:13	
cautionary 20:7	
cautious 20:24	
cease 31:18 39:9	
57:10 60:20	
centric 27:25	
CERT 2:20	
certain 8:1 24:22	
27:17	
certainly 13:23 21:7	c
71:14	
CERTIFICATE	c
88:1	c
certify 88:3	c
chain 39:22 42:8	c
chairing 51:25	
Chairman 2:4,5 3:3	
3:4,7 4:17,18,19	c
6:12,13,15 8:12,13	
8:15 10:17,18	
11:11 12:8,12 15:4	
17:10 20:17,20,22	_
21:15,16,18 22:21	C
	C
23:21,25 24:2	C
27:11 29:10,20	C
30:18 31:1,4,11	C
32:22 33:2 34:9	c
36:2,5,8 38:13,14	
38:18 39:8,15,15	

40:9,14 42:3,21

44:2,24 45:4,5

```
47:9 48:17 50:1
 51:24 52:5,8 53:11
 53:19 54:10,10,24
 55:3,8,11,14,18,19
 55:21 57:14,20,23
 58:3,7,18,23 59:2
 59:10,13,17,23
 60:5,10,13 61:4,12
 61:21 62:4,20,25
 63:7,11,23 64:4,9
 64:12 66:2,6,13
 67:9,13,17,20,22
 69:11 70:9 72:10
 72:21 73:15,17,20
 73:21,22 74:5,7,14
 76:12,17,23 77:8
 77:14,15,16,19
 78:2,7,22,23 79:17
 79:20 80:5,6,7,9
 80:11,19,20,24
 81:1,9,21,25 82:9
 82:10,11,17,19,23
 83:9,19 84:2,7,13
 84:15,19,21,22,23
 85:6 86:7 87:7
challenge 72:22
 73:9
challenged 53:7
challenges 7:14
challenging 86:10
change 19:5 21:2,13
 34:21 43:8 59:20
 61:23 63:12
changes 12:20 16:11
 60:10 61:2 62:12
 62:14,24 63:6
 65:20 67:7 77:23
changing 49:6
checklist 10:12
chooses 38:10
chunk 68:15
circumstance 27:14
clarification 12:4
 30:16 32:24 57:4
 58:19 80:22 81:16
 82:22
clarified 56:5
```

[91]

alassitus 92.10 95.16
clarity 83:10 85:16
clear 8:5 30:11 42:6
46:1,18 60:1 62:13
clearly 43:23 54:22
clearly-defined 38:5
cliffhangers 79:7
climax 79:3
closed 81:6
closing 84:20 85:20
86:6,16
cloth 75:20
clunky 63:8,10
coincident 22:4
collaborate 49:3
collaboration 47:1
collaborative 7:6
collaboratively 76:9
collapse 19:21
colleagues 3:7 10:8
collect 9:11,20 29:24
30:10 81:19 82:4
collection 71:16
collectively 19:15
combined 71:23
come 3:12 10:6
19:15 20:11 26:16
26:16 28:11 30:13
41:18 43:20 48:1
48:12,13 49:25
53:9 60:15 72:17
76:1,9 85:14 86:19
comes 29:23 43:25
coming 9:17 15:21
comma 62:22
commensurate 8:3
23:13
comment 6:22 9:24
10:21 11:13 40:5,7
41:10 49:15 64:5
77:3,10 78:17,19
78:21,24 79:6
81:21,23 83:25
84:4,10,14 85:13
comments 4:6 11:6
19:3 38:16 49:18
77:10 78:5,14
80:17 81:13,19

00 4 04 10 20 07 0
82:4 84:19,20 87:8
commercial 9:9
18:2
Commission's 13:8
communicate 43:23
communicated 21:9
communications
12:22 20:13
competence 85:25
complete 14:12
34:17 59:11 60:2
66:4,24
completed 40:11
56:6
completing 56:1,10
completion 56:15
60:21 64:16
complex 14:10 15:9
15:16 20:1 24:11
24:12,19 25:7,10
25:13 27:16 86:14
complex-wide 9:12
compliance-based
10:13
compliments 33:5
comprehensive 9:14
12:15
concept 6:16 8:2,2
23:12
concern 21:8,22
22:7 23:17 29:16
29:17,19 44:9
71:17 72:20 75:13
concerned 9:10
21:24 30:1 48:7
56:3 72:19
concerning 22:12
concerns 3:24 6:9
20:25 41:19 43:23
56:8 85:1,1
conclude 11:12 59:5
concluded 40:20
87:8
concludes 4:12 8:11
10:18 86:5
conclusions 9:12,19
34:3 56:16 60:22

64:18
conduct 5:8 20:12
37:3,10
conducted 24:11
confidence 8:9
conflict 39:19 40:3
45:19
conflicted 45:17
confused 49:8 58:21
confusing 63:16
confusion 85:18
Congress 5:15,19
27:10
conjunction 4:10 connection 75:11
Connery 2:8 3:9
8:14,15 12:2,3
17:8,9 19:1 24:9
26:8,9 28:18 29:10
34:10,11 35:14,17
35:23 36:4 44:2,3
50:1,2 53:10,11,12
53:13 54:22 57:4
63:10,20 64:5,7,11
66:17 67:17,23,24
69:15,20 70:16
72:21,22 74:3,4,10
74:11,14,23 75:18
76:14 77:12,13,23
78:2 79:7 80:3,4
80:14,15 81:12
82:7,8,15 83:6
86:7,8 Connery's 76:18,20
82:1
consensus 25:16,18
48:2,5,14
consequently 15:1
38:12
consider 7:24 27:23
55:7
consideration 41:21
considerations 10:9
considered 25:8
40:25
considering 5:1
considers 33:18

```
consistent 6:25
 26:13,25 33:2
consistently 5:6
constant 86:20
constitute 3:10
constraints 72:24
 73:2,12
construction 14:14
contained 31:20
 64:21 67:1
contains 71:9
context 56:18 60:23
 64:19
continue 14:7 41:22
 44:20 86:1,2
continued 6:22
continuing 16:13
 46:5
continuous 7:14
contractor 30:7,15
contractors 5:11
 20:6
conversation 46:13
 49:7 75:24 84:25
 86:9
conversations 17:23
 79:11,13
converse 45:11
cornerstone 19:7
correct 27:8 57:11
 61:9 64:3 69:14
 75:15
correspondence
 49:1 53:7
cost 8:25 21:25 23:6
 56:19 63:22
counsel 2:9 3:13
 4:11 31:9,11 37:6
 57:21 60:14 64:6
 64:12 80:17 81:13
 81:15 82:4,24 88:6
 88:9
couple 24:20 34:11
course 7:16 44:8
 52:11
crafting 12:23
crazy 60:15
```

create 48:5 53:6 credibly 5:23 criticality 24:12 28:3,5,8 cross-cutting 17:14 24:10,15 25:9,24 26:3,11,14 32:6 37:2 65:5 cruder 14:9 cry 43:15 44:4 culture 53:7 **current** 5:21 14:1 26:2 37:22 42:24 83:12 **currently** 5:21 6:3 18:18 80:12 D **D** 3:1 **Daniel** 2:7 3:9 31:13 data 9:12 14:15 29:25 30:7,10 71:16 72:1 date 13:3 24:5 30:23 31:25 33:15 36:22 64:25 day 47:1,4 day-to-day 45:10 46:8 days 78:4 80:16 81:11,12,23 82:3 83:7,15 87:10 **DC** 1:18 **de** 30:5 deal 11:22 15:21 dealing 24:15 debating 72:14 decide 16:14,16 30:22 38:21 43:7 43:10 48:8 81:2 decides 37:14 52:12 **decision** 8:22 30:23 44:11 52:17 72:15 73:5 decisions 6:10 17:19

73:12

deep 17:11

74:16 76:22

efforts 4:23 5:4 6:24

[92]

deeply 9:10	49:9 71:1
defense 1:7 2:3 3:4	developed 16:3,21
4:3 5:9,24 6:1,17	17:17 22:15 26:2
9:9 12:16 13:10	26:23 29:2 34:13
28:12 71:12	43:6 44:21
deferred 8:22	developing 6:17
deficiency 25:9	7:11 13:3 22:9,22
28:16	24:4 73:6
defined 13:6 36:12	development 4:8
47:19 70:24,25	6:23 7:15,17,18
delete 57:9 84:11	21:10 22:8 31:22
deleting 74:15	31:25 33:15 36:22
deletion 57:18 67:25	50:7 64:22,25
deliberate 11:24	deviates 7:25 8:1
52:17 75:20 80:21	dictate 33:19
deliberating 55:3	difference 25:3
deliberation 85:9	30:17 41:1 42:7,15
deliberations 3:25	differences 9:8
55:5 81:3	different 9:7 13:23
demonstrates 33:6	23:8 28:14 37:18
34:2	38:9 47:6,12,25
demoralizing 86:25	48:1 49:7 62:16
denigrated 86:22	85:3
department 7:5	difficult 15:10 16:1
10:10 20:5,13 23:6	47:24
24:24 25:17 30:7	difficulties 17:5
30:15 64:1	24:20
describe 39:6	difficulty 25:5
described 72:2	diluted 51:5
describing 76:21	diminish 5:14
86:24	direct 37:9 41:7
description 74:22	44:25 45:15 49:23
design 14:14 31:17	58:19 61:13 64:14
36:17 61:24 64:15	66:21 82:3
66:22 71:4	directed 13:4 31:24 32:17 59:13 60:1
designing 8:22,25 12:21	64:24 65:22
desire 72:4	directing 12:14
detail 23:2	directing 12.14 direction 7:9 27:18
detailed 22:13	31:20 37:10 38:24
details 37:6	39:21 44:13 45:15
determine 53:23	47:23 53:16 54:11
56:17 60:23 64:18	64:21 67:1
79:12	directive 12:24
determined 50:17	directives 27:4
develop 4:2 12:15	directly 68:5 70:5
15:12 30:21 41:16	director 7:4,10
	,

```
distinct 6:1
disturbed 44:23
dives 17:11
DNFSB 1:11 7:2 9:7
 19:17 32:16 65:15
 74:17 86:23
Docket 31:14
document 7:9 18:11
 55:24
documents 12:5
DOE 5:9,11,16,24
 7:4,5 9:25 19:18
doing 17:11 20:5,15
 21:11 22:7 23:17
 39:16 45:13 49:21
 52:14 56:21 72:13
 73:8
doubt 21:3
draw 9:12
drawing 9:18
drive 79:8
driver 18:3
drivers 8:24
due 9:6
         \mathbf{E}
```

E 2:1,1 3:1,1 e.g 31:19 57:11 earlier 24:7 56:5 86:13 **easier** 68:14 easy 86:21 echo 86:13 **effect** 10:5 21:2,14 effectively 32:12 65:11 effectiveness 71:21 efficiently 32:12 65:11 **effort** 4:2 7:20 10:4 10:10,25 13:25 15:17 16:9,9,25 21:23 22:19 32:4 34:23 38:11 45:8,8 49:13,21 51:14 56:9,10 65:3 68:2 69:23 70:6 72:16

15:11,13 16:17 22:24 25:6 33:14 35:21 53:4 59:6,7 59:9 60:7 74:9 either 12:1 26:16 29:10 44:6 48:8 53:22 61:21 63:12 element 49:6 elements 29:13 **email** 81:14,17,19 embedded 72:7 emphasized 17:24 **employed** 88:6,9 employee 88:9 **employees** 5:19,20 empowers 33:11 encourage 15:2 85:14,19 endorse 15:1 ends 68:2 74:17 enemy 14:22 energies 51:17 Energy 5:18 7:6 10:11 13:19 16:19 23:6 25:17 30:7 64:1 **engage** 51:19 engaged 23:5 50:13 engineer 20:24 enhanced 28:25 ensure 8:9 49:9 85:24 entertain 52:1 56:11 69:18 70:1,15 entire 14:10 46:17 56:10 envisioned 8:3 13:24 17:22 71:23 **erode** 85:25 essentially 16:15 38:23 39:10 42:24 47:20 52:12 **establish** 17:2 32:12 65:11 established 3:11

family 86:22

far 34:15 35:12

fashioned 13:6

favor 74:6 77:17

[93]

33:23 53:12
evaluate 19:8 26:13
37:2
evaluating 13:14
evaluation 14:2 32:5
65:5 68:2
evaluations 32:16
65:16 74:17
event 72:1
everybody 34:14
45:21
evolved 13:16 18:15
37:24
evolving 16:13
exact 28:14
exactly 27:15 49:22
72:20
example 21:23 23:3
24:12,13 28:4
71:10
exceeding 14:16
exceeds 22:6
excited 86:4
execute 21:25 23:19
executed 85:18
executing 9:1
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24 48:11 49:14
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24 48:11 49:14 expectation 39:25
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24 48:11 49:14 expectation 39:25 47:11 48:15 51:11
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24 48:11 49:14 expectation 39:25 47:11 48:15 51:11 expectations 33:21
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24 48:11 49:14 expectation 39:25 47:11 48:15 51:11 expectations 33:21 42:1 43:24 53:6
executing 9:1 execution 8:6 32:9 65:9 85:22 executive 3:14 39:22 49:20 55:15 62:25 66:14,20 69:13 73:19 76:17 79:21 81:25 exist 15:9 existing 33:8 62:6 74:13 expand 14:12 expansion 59:8 expansive 37:7 38:7 expect 5:10 15:20,23 40:18 41:9 46:24 48:11 49:14 expectation 39:25 47:11 48:15 51:11 expectations 33:21

expend 64:1 experience 18:2 59:20 experiences 25:7 experiment 41:3 **expertise** 49:24 53:9 experts 6:6 explained 35:6 explanation 55:1 **explicit** 30:9 33:16 69:2,6 **express** 45:17 extended 5:14 extent 21:8 24:22 32:7 36:14 49:10 65:6 external 8:9 56:20 63:19 85:25 externally 7:22 63:22 65:19 67:7 extraction 72:2 extrapolate 23:10 extrapolation 46:6

extreme 52:10,11

extremely 87:5

\mathbf{F} facilitate 7:15 **facilities** 1:7 2:3 3:5 4:4 5:9,25 6:1,2,4 6:18 9:10 12:17,23 13:10,14 14:13 22:2,3 23:8 28:12 71:12,13 **facility** 9:14 24:8 26:4 facility-centric 27:24 28:25 29:5 facility-focused 24:5 fact 17:24 54:20 71:23 **facto** 30:5 **factor** 40:12 fail 78:12 fair 18:14 54:3 fairly 48:7 **fall** 13:24

80:9 82:18 federal 3:17 86:17 feedback 41:23 45:14 47:14 68:19 72:11 feel 41:8 84:25 85:1 85:4 **feels** 51:16 fellow 4:21 49:18 85:7 86:2 felt 69:1 fidelity 22:24 field 6:6 73:8 Fifty 35:18 figure 15:11,20 39:10,23 43:13 45:6,17 48:6 54:5 59:23,25 60:17 figuring 52:22 **final** 7:20 13:1 30:20 30:24 31:17 61:18 61:24 63:15 64:15 66:22 69:17 70:15 77:9 78:1,3 79:12 83:24,25 84:11 85:12 87:7,10 **finality** 78:25 finally 32:17 33:25 58:12 65:22 financially 88:10 **find** 16:25 20:12 26:5 43:17 44:21 47:13 54:8 63:14 68:3 81:3 **fine** 25:14 finish 35:23 45:16 61:14 **finished** 42:24 finishing 22:20 first 4:20 6:18 11:25 13:2,4 15:6 17:23 24:15 31:9 36:4 57:17,19 58:5

60 10 61 0 22
60:19 61:8,23
63:13 66:3,8,15
82:15
fiscal 7:16
five 3:10 6:4 23:8
47:12,25 48:1,12
48:23 55:24 56:15
58:14,20,25 59:2 59:11 60:2,3,6,21
61:1,1 62:1,10,10 63:4,4,12,12,13,15
64:17 65:18,18
66:5,24 67:5,5 82:15,17
five-pilot 61:14 fix 28:7,9,13
flawed 9:17
flexibility 13:7 71:2
71:7,9,18,25 72:8
flows 75:16
focus 6:7 15:11,13
16:17 18:25 51:17
75:1
focused 24:17
folder 19:3 31:14
45:1 83:13,16,24
folks 28:10 87:2
follow 26:9
follow-up 19:1
following 6:22 21:20
22:8,9 23:18 32:4
45:21 65:4 76:23
foregoing 88:4
foreshadow 18:9
forgot 29:21
form 60:18
Forrestal 24:17
25:17 27:3,19
28:13,20
forth 37:5 71:7
forum 85:10
forward 10:5 11:3
14:11,23 16:25
17:18 31:5 38:24
40:2 43:6,20 44:12
44:22,25 51:11,25
52:3 53:9 68:4
5 <u>2.</u> 5 55.7 00.1

70:2 85:10 86:1 foul 43:15 44:4 47:10 found 16:1 24:14 25:25 **founded** 29:13 four 32:14 38:22 39:18 65:14 70:11 76:21 **fourth** 71:10 **frame** 83:5 framework 22:20 frankly 29:12 58:15 frequency 30:11 friendly 52:2,6 55:7 55:17 56:11,13,21 56:22 57:1,24 58:9 58:11 60:16,19,24 61:7,10,16 64:7,10 64:11 66:11,12,18 67:10,25 69:8 70:19 73:18 77:22 front 4:25 7:23 53:22 67:19 80:12 fruit 36:18 frustration 26:10 **FTE** 23:3 full 54:11,11 **fully** 13:5 16:6 functional 36:17 further 11:19,21 34:20 36:20 66:6 70:15,17 72:10 73:15 74:9,15,20 76:15 77:21,23 78:10,14 79:5,14 79:20 80:12 84:8 84:15 88:8 **future** 18:11 35:5 45:12 85:10,15 FY 5:3 6:20 16:10 31:23 32:20 40:12 40:21 51:13 64:23 65:25 G

G 3:1

[94]

gathering 7:12
general 2:9 3:13
4:11 13:5 25:16
31:9,11 37:6 60:14
64:12 70:1 80:17
81:13,15 82:3,24
84:14 87:2
generally 83:15
generate 4:24
0
generated 32:15
43:1 65:15
generic 29:14,17
getting 28:11 50:2
0 0
56:4 73:4
give 25:12 35:18
39:20 51:15 52:19
52:21 53:18 71:2
73:1 78:19 84:3
86:21
given 21:19 36:16
46:2 75:4,18
gives 39:21 71:25
giving 41:2 47:23
54:11
global 51:17
_
go 19:19 20:9,11
21:7 25:10 27:2
29:18 39:10,16,22
40:6 43:8 44:12
45:16 47:12 52:13
52:22 54:12 60:16
61:13 68:20,25
85:20
goals 7:7,19 32:4
33:17,21 38:22
42:1 43:9 45:9,13
51:1,15 53:6,8
65:4 68:3,4,6,12
68:18,23 69:24,24
70:1 76:3,6,9,22
76:23 84:11
goes 22:14 37:1
44:24 47:22 66:24
going 8:16 10:5
16:25 17:12,18
18:9 19:22 20:15
22:16,19 29:22

30:5 35:3,4,12 36:1 42:13 44:22 46:5,15,19 47:16 50:20,21,24 52:14 52:25 53:22 54:19 55:15,23 59:10,11 61:5,13 62:6,21 63:9,10 64:13 66:13,14 69:12 73:13 79:15 80:21 83:23 84:3,17 85:23
good 3:3 5:19 9:15
14:22,23 20:2,15
21:19 22:8,22,23
23:18 25:13 27:22
28:6,9 30:22 34:15
35:7,25 37:13
44:14 51:18,23
84:25 85:8,13,19
86:15
gotten 54:22
Government 3:19
3:21 86:19
great 69:24
greatly 5:4
green 20:2
grew 7:19
groups 32:8 65:7
guess 39:8,23 42:6
42:17 49:5 55:1,19
55:22,25 56:25
guidance 21:20
33:21 51:15 52:20
52:21 68:24,25
75:6,9 85:17
guys 42:18
Н

H 2:6 **Hamilton** 2:5 3:8 4:15,16 6:19 8:20 10:24 12:6,11,12 17:21 18:13 21:18 36:7,8,9 47:17 50:22 52:12 68:22 70:20,21 72:12

73:22,23 76:23,24
80:7,8 82:11,12
84:19,20 86:10,13
Hamilton's 44:5
handouts 10:23
Hanford 19:21
hang 71:19 72:5
happen 27:7 40:4
51:12
= :
happening 26:20
happens 18:25
19:23 22:3
happy 51:22
hard 9:23 86:21,23
harmonizing 9:20
Hazard 5:25 12:23
13:14 14:13 22:3
hazardous 12:23
71:11,13
•
head 40:6
heading 70:14
headquarters 26:16
27:9
health 16:20
hear 53:17 62:18
heard 34:15 42:22
44:23 47:10 56:7
58:3 61:17 72:2
85:1
hearing 43:17,17,18
44:3 55:14 71:17
84:24
help 17:1 18:25
19:16 36:16
helpful 17:3.6 29:5
helpful 17:3,6 29:5
35:5 50:24 54:20
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16
35:5 50:24 54:20
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21 hold 3:18 82:2
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21 hold 3:18 82:2 holding 42:8 81:10
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21 hold 3:18 82:2 holding 42:8 81:10 honored 86:25
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21 hold 3:18 82:2 holding 42:8 81:10 honored 86:25
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21 hold 3:18 82:2 holding 42:8 81:10 honored 86:25 hope 8:18 9:15 10:1
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21 hold 3:18 82:2 holding 42:8 81:10 honored 86:25 hope 8:18 9:15 10:1 44:18 47:21
35:5 50:24 54:20 helping 17:15,16 hereto 88:10 heroes 86:18 hey 18:3 39:16 highlight 9:21 hold 3:18 82:2 holding 42:8 81:10 honored 86:25 hope 8:18 9:15 10:1

17:17 48:13 **hoping** 8:24 47:1,7 hour 79:2 huge 42:7 hunger 47:22 48:18 hurt 69:6 hypothetical 27:16 45:12 46:2,3,3 52:9,10 hypothetically 38:21 hypotheticals 53:14

i.e 7:13 idea 35:25 37:8 idealogy 19:7 ideas 7:14 19:15 **identify** 5:5 11:9 32:1 33:12 36:23 41:25 65:1 immediately 78:9 78:15 impact 27:21 30:14 34:7 69:5 impacted 25:9 **impactful** 34:22,22 impacting 27:4 **impacts** 7:21 59:7 implement 12:15 implementation 6:24 14:22 31:17 36:12,13 61:24 64:15 66:22 68:12 implementing 3:20 37:11 **implicit** 30:10 important 26:12 30:17 33:18,25 69:2 importantly 10:15 33:8 **imposed** 5:19 37:21 imposing 30:5 **improve** 5:5 8:6 21:3 25:18 32:5,8

32:10 36:15 37:1,3

37:4 42:2 53:7 65:4,8,9 75:10 85:22 86:3 **improved** 68:10 improvement 8:7 33:6 37:22 49:16 86:4 improvements 8:8 21:5 23:15 32:1 33:13,17 36:23 65:1 85:23,24 inadequate 26:17 include 12:21 73:11 **included** 7:9 38:12 65:24 including 32:19 58:7 68:20 incorporated 32:20 65:25 incrementally 34:24 incurred 33:14 independent 5:8,17 7:2 14:4 32:2,16 36:24 65:2,15 74:17 Indiana 1:17 indicate 49:19 indicated 66:18 70:16 87:10 indicators 14:19 22:9,18 29:23 individual 4:13 15:10 17:13 76:4 individually 16:2 19:16 48:13 individuals 25:11 **inferred** 71:14 influence 45:15 influencing 14:17 **inform** 13:19 14:2 15:8 19:11 34:13 39:17 information 6:25 9:20 10:13 11:4 14:17 23:7,9 26:13 30:4 32:5,10,15

35:15 37:2,4,5

[95]

16.17 56.4 65.4 10	invested 5.12	11,10 10,1 10,14	land 0.19	71.6 70.25
46:17 56:4 65:4,10	invested 5:13	11:19 18:1 19:14	lend 9:18	71:6 72:25
65:15 68:11	investment 5:7 6:9	19:20 20:14,23	lends 17:15	looks 18:4
informative 34:25	invite 79:2	22:23 23:10 28:2	lessons 31:24 33:15	loose 70:25
informs 16:6	involved 58:14	28:19 30:9 34:19	36:21 39:11 50:10	Los 28:5
initial 6:9 31:2	60:25 62:10 63:4	35:2 36:18 39:4	64:24	lot 16:4 17:23 18:2
initiatives 5:5 8:7	65:17 67:4	40:14 41:8 45:22	let's 18:25 43:6	22:17 25:25 26:15
33:6,17 49:17	involvement 13:12	45:24 46:23 47:21	51:10 58:10,12	42:11 49:13 85:23
input 10:8 14:15	involves 41:13	50:19,24 52:25,25	72:5	love 20:13
26:6 40:16	issue 15:25 21:18	53:4,21 54:14	level 23:2 24:18 27:9	M
inputs 47:13	27:17 28:2,3,11	62:15 63:21 66:17	46:4 85:16	
inside 18:16,24	50:15	68:13,23 69:2	leverage 31:24	ma'am 83:1
insights 5:15,24	issues 7:12 11:7	75:21 76:8 84:8	35:21 36:21 64:24	madness 79:9
inspection 22:13	16:19 17:14 20:12	85:2 86:3	leveraging 33:14	maintenance 24:11
inspectors 22:5	24:8,10,15,22	knowing 73:12,13	licensee 29:24	majority 51:21
instincts 14:8	25:23 26:3,4,12,20	73:14	lifelines 18:16,24	making 42:8 50:10
institutionalize 32:1	27:1,1,8 28:25	knowledge 56:2	limit 5:19	72:14 73:11
33:12 65:1	32:6,7 34:4,5,7	58:16	limited 13:15 14:3	manage 41:15 59:21
instruct 38:7 80:17	37:3 41:20 50:17		32:19 65:24 73:14	management 37:12
81:12	65:5,7 75:22	<u> </u>	limiting 12:22	42:8,16
instruction 12:24	item 11:14 29:21	L 2:8	line 18:9	manager 87:2
54:23 71:25	items 23:9 75:9	lack 27:18	lines 20:14 56:11	mandate 27:10
integrate 51:12	iterative 7:15,17	laid 53:5	list 33:16	mandating 42:16
integrated 12:15	13:11	language 37:7 38:4	Listen 29:9	47:20 72:15
intended 7:20 19:23		38:7 39:2,9 45:7,7	literal 44:13	manner 25:24 26:13
29:11 58:19 83:8	J	45:18 46:1 47:11	literally 75:14	56:6 70:2
intent 45:3	J 2:7 31:14	53:21,22,24 54:1,2	little 8:16 35:7 50:4	massaged 63:1
intentionally 70:24	James 2:9 3:13	54:5,7,11 56:14	56:4 63:15	matter 77:17 78:5
interest 10:8	Jessie 2:6 3:8	57:15,16 58:19,24	lives 27:8	matters 14:20 85:9
interest-based 50:14	Jo 2:20 88:3,17	60:15 61:8,12	location 25:2	maximize 32:15
interested 88:10	job 20:10,10 21:19	70:12	locations 25:6	37:5 65:14
interests 47:6	22:8,22 23:18 35:7	larger 35:3	lofty 69:24	maximum 49:10
interject 53:19	41:15 48:19 49:5,9	late 77:5	logical 43:12 46:3,3	mean 12:4 16:23
internal 8:6,7 12:22	73:2 86:13	latest 81:8	long 68:1 70:11	23:14 28:15 29:19
13:22 18:8 21:25	joke 19:24	law 6:6 48:4	74:12	42:18,25 43:15
24:4 56:20 63:19	journey 13:24	lay 53:8	look 15:19 17:12	45:7 46:16 48:2
85:22	Joyce 2:8 3:9	leadership 14:9 47:2	18:12 20:2 26:12	49:8,11 53:20,23
internally 7:22 17:2	judgment 10:12	47:3	26:25 35:24 43:4	55:23 72:19
30:15 63:22 65:19		learned 31:24 33:15	43:20 44:13 51:25	meaning 12:25
67:6	K	36:21 39:12 50:10	70:22 72:5,23,24	meaningful 5:23
interpret 48:24	keep 19:2 28:11	64:24	78:20 85:10 86:1	means 47:18 53:24
interpretation 44:15	39:16 53:13,14	learning 33:7 86:3	86:10	measure 37:13
53:3	58:10 69:6	leave 39:5 80:15	looked 40:25 46:4	measurement 32:9
interrupt 31:8	key 8:1 12:20 42:1	81:22 86:20	55:24	65:8
introduce 3:6 31:9	kill 44:6	leaves 23:11 51:22	looking 17:13 23:14	mechanism 13:18
31:12 67:24 69:16	kind 18:3,21 30:8,9	led 13:12	25:23 27:1 31:6	meet 39:23 43:9
76:3	35:6 48:2	left 3:9 56:9 75:21	35:18 40:13 42:11	45:13 46:17 47:5
introductory 4:16	know 9:5,25 10:3	legal 34:6 87:1	52:4 57:21 63:25	49:10 51:1,21
				ĺ

[96]

73:10
meeting 1:10 3:6,12
3:14,15,19,24 8:19
9:24 10:6 11:18
45:3 48:3 52:1,16
53:20 54:4,4,19
72:18 75:21 78:25
78:25 79:3 80:16
81:18 84:3,5 87:9
87:11,13
meets 45:9
member 2:6,7,8 3:9
3:24 4:14 6:19
10:21 11:8 15:11
15:19 20:17 23:25
24:15 25:25 27:13
28:23 29:6 31:13
36:6 38:16 40:2,14
46:22 49:12,20,24
54:13,15 57:25
67:10 76:4 84:17
84:18
members 3:8,12 4:5
4:6,14,21 6:5 7:11
11:19 15:8 16:6
17:7 25:19 31:1
34:9 43:14 46:11
46:20 47:3,13
48:12,24 49:3,11
49:18 50:18 51:2
51:22 66:17 68:19
74:9 78:4,16,19
79:13 83:11 84:4
85:8 86:2
mentality 10:12
mention 29:22
met 49:13
method 14:9 15:8
27:22 42:13 79:8
methodologies
44:21
methodology 9:17
17:14,16 19:6
26:23 34:13
micromanage 41:15
microphone 23:24
middle 57:5

mine 49:13 minutes 15:5 75:21 79:2
misinterpreted 10:14
misnomer 13:17
missing 20:3 mission 8:10 16:18
85:25 86:1 87:3
mission-focused
51:4
mission-related 9:3
misunderstanding 82:24
misunderstood
10:14
model 21:20 22:8 23:18 30:1
25:18 50:1 modeling 35:8
modification 66:3,3
66:6
modified 70:19
77:22 modify 35:10
moment 79:15 84:7
month 15:22
months 4:24 6:8
13:12 15:22 18:15
18:22 21:10 23:4 54:8
morning 3:3
morning's 86:9
motion 74:18 76:20
77:17 78:8,10,11 78:15 79:9,18,19
79:22,23 80:10,11
80:15,20,21,23
81:1,6,8,9,22 82:1
82:2,18,25 83:2,2
83:21 87:10 mountain 30:6
move 29:6 34:24
38:15,23 43:6
51:10 52:3 78:2,9
80:15 82:2 moved 74:14
moving 83:23
,

multiple 23:9
N
N 2:1 3:1
name 53:13
natural 20:8
naturalize 36:23
nature 63:14
necessarily 9:18 19:10 44:17 50:20
54:20 62:17 68:13
necessary 8:8 9:12
53:21 60:3 61:2
62:11 63:5,18
65:19 67:6 68:8
72:9 85:24
need 5:1 14:20
18:19 25:18 28:6,9
35:9 64:1 66:4
68:13 80:20
needed 15:13
needs 25:14 32:13 46:17 47:5 49:11
51:21 65:13 73:11
73:11
neither 14:12 88:6
never 18:20 30:13
44:12 45:5 82:19
new 14:14 18:1 33:5
38:11 62:6,7 63:2
66:7,8,15 69:16
NNSA's 5:9,24
nondecision 72:15
nontechnical 5:22 normal 39:22 84:2
normalize 5:23
notated 83:1
notational 78:3
79:16 83:3,6
note 19:13 33:4,25
noticed 3:17
notion 9:10 50:22
notions 10:7 18:18
November 7:13
NRC 9:7 19:7 21:20
21:22 22:4,5,9,10
22:13 23:18 29:22

29:25 35:8 71:6 nuclear 1:7 2:3 3:4 4:3 5:9,25 6:1,6,17 6:18 9:9,9 12:16 12:16 13:7,10 25:9 28:12 71:12 number 14:16 22:4 22:5 35:18 68:10 73:14 **NW** 1:17 0 **O** 3:1 objection 57:25 66:16 67:10 83:10 83:19 objectionable 68:4 objections 34:6 objectives 37:12 obtain 6:25 14:15 **obviously** 19:2,11 34:21 **October** 10:24 12:13,19 13:4 31:21 41:19 64:21 67:1 68:21 **offense** 48:17 offer 42:14 74:23 **office** 7:3 32:2,14 33:11,20,22 34:1 36:24 39:5 41:16 65:2,13 75:7 87:2 officer 53:5 offices 79:4 offing 66:19 **offline** 79:13 **offset** 37:15 oh 19:20 45:5 okay 4:20 10:18 19:1 20:11 36:5 38:18 42:23 43:7 45:6 47:9 52:7,22 55:10,14,16,18 57:3,13,18 58:2,10 61:12 62:25 64:13 66:20 67:9 69:20 78:18,23 79:20

80:11,24 81:5 84:6 **old** 50:3 once 78:13 83:15 **one-fifth** 27:13 open 4:22 6:10 11:18 55:9 80:16 81:10,22 82:3 87:9 opening 4:5,12 6:16 8:11 10:19 11:20 33:3 85:21 operating 3:22 71:11 opinion 28:22,23 35:13,22 46:9 opportunity 9:24 10:3,20 41:23 43:22,25 77:9 78:19 84:4 86:16 **opposed** 9:6 24:24 74:6 77:17 80:10 82:18 84:14 optimal 14:4 optimize 13:15 options 53:2 55:9 orange 19:3 45:1 order 3:13 11:13 13:14 14:3 orders 26:17 27:4 organic 30:3 organization 21:4 29:11 33:7 76:10 86:3 organize 17:20 original 7:25 8:19 10:24 11:21 12:4,6 12:21 20:18,25 21:8 23:12 38:2 68:21 70:12 71:5 **originally** 8:2 75:2 outcome 4:10 6:5 14:4 19:10 43:3,4 43:12,15 51:23 88:11 outcomes 14:18 outlook 26:11 output 48:10,10 outside 10:1 86:11

[97]

overall 9:13
overloaded 51:3
oversight 4:3,8 5:5,8
7:2 9:11 10:11,13
13:8,17 14:5,18
19:18 20:1 21:20
26:17 29:3 30:3
31:15 32:2,12
33:13 35:8 36:15
36:24 37:10,11,17
37:21 38:6 51:5
65:2,12 71:7,11
73:6,8
overwhelm 5:8
overwhelming
71:18
ownership 76:3
F

P

P 2:1,1 3:1 package 68:21 page 81:18 **paper** 79:5 paragraph 39:20,20 45:19,20 57:5 58:12 60:24 61:5,8 61:11,18,20,22,23 62:6,7,7,7,24 63:2 63:14 66:4,8,9 67:3 68:15 69:22 69:22 74:13,16 paragraphs 62:5 66:15 70:11 parameters 12:19 38:3 71:6 parentheses 58:8 63:18 parenthetical 57:11 part 8:21 27:9 31:22 33:23 39:13 41:12 41:23 43:21 51:24 61:19,21,22 62:14 64:22 68:18 69:22 70:4 81:2 84:2 87:5 particular 8:21 28:1

46:1 68:10 75:22

86:12 particularly 19:9 parties 88:7,10 passes 45:25 82:18 path 14:11,23 38:5 53:9 54:9 **peace** 48:18 peers 20:23 **peers'** 5:4 people 18:11 47:25 48:1 81:18 people's 27:7 perceive 19:9 percent 5:21 35:19 35:20,21 **perfect** 14:12 performance 14:19 22:9,18 29:23 performed 22:16 34:1 **period** 11:13 36:13 57:8,9,19 66:5 80:18 **person** 40:1 personal 28:22 35:13 personally 54:2 78:24 perspective 68:17 perspectives 85:3 pertaining 3:25 pick 21:10 **piece** 79:5 **pilot** 6:3 21:11 31:19 35:24 42:12 51:11 51:12 56:10,15 57:11 59:1,2 60:7 62:1 63:13,20 64:1 66:5,24 67:5,5 70:23 pilots 23:8 34:18 35:1,9,11,12,13,15 35:17 40:11,19,20 55:25 56:4,6 57:7 58:15,20,25 59:11 59:15,18 60:2,3,20 60:21 61:1,1 62:10

62:11 63:4,5,12,12 63:15,21 64:17 65:18,18 place 20:8,11 25:1 25:11,20 27:3 28:1 28:16 46:24 48:15 48:21 **placed** 38:1 places 16:17 27:7 **plan** 5:3 6:20 16:9 17:15 19:14 22:22 31:23 32:21 33:10 33:23 34:14,23 40:12,21 41:4,15 41:24 43:22,25 46:21,21,25 47:4 48:22 49:10 50:8,9 51:7,13 62:16 64:23 66:1 68:8 74:25 75:1,3,5,8 75:16 planned 25:4 **planning** 15:7,18 16:3 17:4 18:24 21:24 22:12,21 23:15 24:4,6,7,8 26:6 30:2 32:9 37:4 38:23 39:11 39:12 43:9 47:23 59:21,22 60:11 61:3 62:12,14,19 63:6 65:8,20 67:8 68:7 75:10,12,25 playing 23:23 **plays** 41:4 please 11:9 31:10 62:8 73:19 point 10:21 12:3 16:14 18:10,21,22 25:22 26:7,19,20 26:22 27:12,20,25 28:2 36:12 39:8,24 40:12,23 41:17 42:25 45:12 47:16 52:1,8,16 53:24 69:11 78:12,18 84:16

pointed 25:8 28:16 pointing 45:9 points 8:1 position-based 50:13 possibilities 43:19 possible 32:7 43:3,4 65:6 85:18 **possibly** 36:18 37:8 **potential** 4:2 7:21 10:11,13 39:19 40:3 **pound** 53:15 **practice** 18:4 85:14 85:19 86:11 practices 51:18 praise 13:2 preconceived 10:7 18:18 **predictive** 20:4,10 preference 69:3,5 premature 7:24 premise 9:17 **prepare** 15:24 prepared 9:8 36:9 47:18 prerogative 17:20 **present** 7:10 9:13 31:6 presented 6:18 55:4 presents 24:20 45:19 preside 3:5 press 9:5 86:22 presumably 19:4 pretty 15:14 59:25 **prevent** 14:17 41:5 previous 31:20 64:20 67:1 80:23 **prior** 11:17 61:17,18 70:15 **priorities** 6:7 16:7 16:16 17:3 32:13 65:12 probably 20:23 51:23 problem 24:18 25:1

25:19,21 27:16,18 40:1 56:24 72:2 **problems** 15:9 20:9 20:10 24:14 25:4 25:25 26:15 28:19 procedurally 69:12 70:10 77:20 procedures 3:22 22:13,14,15 69:15 78:4,8,14 83:14 84:3 **proceed** 31:17 43:2 43:8,10 58:20,25 61:24 62:1 64:15 66:22 proceeding 3:23 41:21 43:10 proceedings 88:4,7 proceeds 59:3 process 4:8 7:15,18 8:5 10:2 12:21 13:8,9,11 14:13,15 14:21 16:3,10,13 17:11 21:21 23:16 26:2,6 29:4,22 31:18,25 32:9 33:8 33:16,19,24 36:23 37:21 38:6,23 41:13,17,24 42:16 42:24 43:5 44:19 47:8,19,23 49:24 51:6,25 52:3 55:2 56:16 57:9,19,23 58:5 59:21,22 60:11,17,22 61:3 61:25 62:12,14,19 63:6 64:2,16,17 65:1,9,21 66:23 67:8 68:6,7 69:25 70:4 71:6,16,22 75:11,12,25 76:6 81:7 85:4 processes 76:8 processing 29:9 produce 79:4 product 7:11,20

13:1 14:1 19:6,10

[98]

professional 10:12
85:9 program 9:1 12:24
36:17,18 66:5
programs 31:19
57:11 61:14 62:1
63:13 66:24 67:5,6
prohibition 56:14
57:6 60:20
project 6:19,22
12:20 13:3 36:11
37:14,24 38:10,24
86:14 Proof 7:2
proper 27:18
proportional 14:9
proposal 4:25 7:24
8:20,25 11:1,3,15
11:21,21,23,24
12:1,7 16:21,23
20:18,25 21:8 24:3
29:15,19 30:20
31:2 42:25 45:23
48:7,9 50:7,12,18
51:10,15 57:14
59:8 63:9 70:13 72:16 73:1,10 74:8
74:10,13,15 77:20
78:1 83:5,11,12,24
84:18 85:12
proposals 44:20
47:14 77:24
propose 18:11 27:23
43:21 56:12 69:21
70:17
proposed 5:2 6:20
14:11 18:7 29:4 31:18,25 32:20
33:2,3,4 34:2
36:22 38:25 39:17
44:6 45:1 49:16,23
50:18 57:24 61:25
64:16,25 65:25
66:23 68:21 69:19
71:9 74:19,20
proposer 69:21
proposes 36:10

proposing 18:16
44:10 56:13 79:16
protection 16:20
proud 87:5
proven 48:14
provide 7:7 10:20
17:1 41:17,22
68:23 75:6 77:9
78:5 81:17,20
85:16,17
provided 7:3 14:23
32:10 49:18 65:10
69:4
providing 5:17 20:1
47:19
prudent 53:16
public 1:10 3:6,12
3:15,16,19,24 4:6
5:16 9:13,24 10:15
10:20,22 11:8,12
13:20 16:20 17:25
18:11,12,19 25:20
45:3 48:5 54:3,19
79:2 80:17 81:13
79:2 80:17 81:13 81:17,18,23 82:4
81:17,18,23 82:4 86:17
publication 8:23
published 10:23
19:11
pull 70:7
pun 19:22
_
purpose 22:1 purposes 18:8 22:12
purposes 18.8 22.12 pursuant 3:19 4:1
pursuing 6:3
pursuing 6:3 push 55:23 62:6
72:17
pushed 9:23
put 8:21 11:3 19:13
19:21 20:7 31:5
46:20,24 48:11,21
50:11 54:3 57:8
68:4,9
•
putting 26:25 51:9,9 57:18 70:2
37.18 70.2
0

Quade 2:20 88:3,17 quality 5:15 32:10 37:4 65:9 68:11 quarterly 29:25 question 17:21 18:13,14 31:7 34:17 38:20 40:8,9 40:10 54:1 55:1,22 56:1 73:17 81:3,5 81:10 82:21 83:4 questions 34:11 36:3 53:25 quick 32:23 49:15 83:25 quite 15:14,17 45:2 79:14 quorum 3:11
quote 6:23
R
R 2:1 3:1
raise 52:6 84:17
raised 34:4,8 53:25
raises 57:25
ranking 32:7 37:3
37:25 65:6
rankings 13:20
rational 73:12
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8 reactors 18:2
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8 reactors 18:2 read 9:5 16:23 37:6
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8 reactors 18:2 read 9:5 16:23 37:6 39:9 47:17 52:23
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8 reactors 18:2 read 9:5 16:23 37:6 39:9 47:17 52:23 54:10,14 62:8 64:6
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8 reactors 18:2 read 9:5 16:23 37:6 39:9 47:17 52:23 54:10,14 62:8 64:6 66:15 67:14
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8 reactors 18:2 read 9:5 16:23 37:6 39:9 47:17 52:23 54:10,14 62:8 64:6 66:15 67:14 reading 45:25 52:24
rational 73:12 re-evaluate 71:19 reach 78:25 82:20 reactor 13:8 35:8 reactors 18:2 read 9:5 16:23 37:6 39:9 47:17 52:23 54:10,14 62:8 64:6 66:15 67:14 reading 45:25 52:24 80:23

reasoning 69:23 reasons 76:14 recall 15:6 receive 83:16 **Recognition** 86:18 **recognize** 4:6 73:3 86:16 recognized 5:16 recognizing 47:5 55:23 recommend 29:12 59:19 recommendation 16:24 58:16 63:6 recommendations 5:18 60:5 62:15,18 62:23 65:20 67:7 recommending 16:23 recommends 59:18 record 40:10,10 80:16 81:10,22 82:3 86:16 87:9,12 recorded 88:4 recording 3:22 redirect 36:20 reduced 88:5 redundant 77:25 reemphasize 19:17 **referred** 24:9 63:13 **refine** 79:14 **refined** 12:19 38:3 reflect 40:21 70:5 reformatting 5:11 regard 20:24 38:19 **regarding** 4:3 7:19 62:17 75:8 85:12 regardless 17:18 34:16 87:3 regards 26:11 Register 3:17 regular 83:6 regularly 51:4 regulations 3:20 regulator 20:5 regulators 19:18

reasonable 14:16

Regulatory 13:8 related 16:19 31:18 57:10 84:17 88:6 relative 13:20 41:10 56:9 88:8 relatively 9:2 relevant 11:6 68:5 reliable 6:25 relies 49:24 rely 53:8 relying 30:2 remain 6:9 remainder 58:4 remarks 4:5,16 6:16 8:11,16 10:19 33:3 36:9 47:18 86:6 remembering 86:23 remiss 86:15 remove 35:2 69:22 70:8 removed 24:18 repeal 44:7 repeat 8:17 56:8 74:11 repeated 41:19 replace 12:18 38:2,6 38:11 44:7 48:9 replaced 77:21 replaces 31:20 64:20 66:25 70:11 70:12 REPORTED 2:19 Reporter 2:20 88:1 reporting 30:5 representing 9:13 request 5:3 6:21 7:8 7:25 15:1 31:15 38:1 71:5 requested 35:14 requests 14:16 23:7 23:9 30:6 55:24 56:7 require 33:5 60:20 64:16 required 7:5 59:14 requirement 48:21

requirements 30:6

really 20:9 27:22

68:11 72:8

79:10 87:5

29:19 30:2 36:14

50:3 59:20 66:4

reason 5:20 44:10

46:24 68:18 79:1

[99]

	4: 70.4		77.11.00.1.2.01.0	60.14.72.10.76.19
requires 48:4 56:15	retire 79:4	role 19:17 20:5	77:11 80:1,2 81:8	69:14 73:19 76:18
58:13	revert 78:3 79:16	41:12 49:19	82:5,6 83:22,23	79:21 82:1
requiring 60:25	review 4:1 6:5 11:15	roles 7:21 9:7	84:6,10,14 85:6,7	Secretary's 24:24
reread 82:25	20:12 33:9,23	roll 73:19 76:18	Santos' 51:14 76:13	see 5:12 13:9,18
reroute 8:9	41:14 60:6 70:10	79:22 82:1	77:21	15:16 18:25 20:13
resident 22:5	75:4	room 21:3,7	satisfy 32:4 37:8	26:14 29:1,16
resolve 39:24	reviews 17:13 23:1	root 27:2	49:4 65:3 76:22	35:24 40:3 45:18
resource 5:7 6:9	RFBA 31:16,19,21	ROP 29:22	saw 24:3	48:3,5 51:12,19
13:21 32:13 37:23	32:19 64:20,21	rubber 49:2	saying 18:3 19:2	53:24 54:2,5,6,13
37:25 63:18 65:12	65:24 66:25 67:2	run 24:24	30:19 42:6,17,19	58:10 60:13 66:16
72:24 73:1	68:21 69:4 71:8	S	42:22 44:17 45:25	68:5,6 79:1
resource-intensive	72:7	$\frac{5}{$2:1\ 3:1}$	46:14,14 48:23,25	seeing 11:11 31:4
50:19	RFBAs 42:14	safety 1:7 2:3 3:5	49:4 52:24 69:9	41:3 67:13 69:20
resources 5:13,22	right 3:7 11:11	4:3,8 6:7,17 9:14	says 25:12 39:9,10	seen 9:16 43:24 53:4
8:4 9:21 10:16	18:17,22 22:17	12:16 13:17,20	40:17 45:7 61:23	selection 14:18
13:15 14:3,7,10	43:11 44:7 46:6	12.10 13.17,20	71:10,20	self-explanatory
19:22 22:25 29:18	50:13 57:20 58:8	25:10 27:5 28:4,6	scarce 10:16	33:4
42:9,17 51:3 56:20	59:10,12 60:13	28:8,12 29:3 31:15	scenario 27:21	senior 7:11 49:20,20
59:14 60:3 61:2	61:4 63:23 64:4	32:6,7,12 36:15	45:18	50:2,2
62:11 63:5,25	66:13 69:11 72:16	37:2,10,11,17,21	scope 7:20 10:9	sense 15:13 51:17
65:19 67:6 73:3,5	72:20 76:17 78:7	38:5 65:5,7,12	12:22 35:10 36:11	54:18 59:22 63:23
73:7	83:22 84:7,13 87:4	73:6	58:14 59:6,7 60:25	sentence 57:19 58:5
respect 5:4 24:4	87:5	sake 18:1	62:9 63:3 65:17	58:5 66:8,25 68:1
47:22 53:3 85:3	right-sized 23:15		67:4 71:11 72:16	68:1 74:12,15
respected 6:6	risk 25:20 32:7 37:3	Sally 2:20 88:3,17 sanction 21:12	scorecard 4:2,24 5:2	76:21
respectfully 69:8	65:6		6:17,24 7:1 8:23	sentiment 70:22
respond 15:24 27:11	road 15:21 34:21	sanctioning 21:1	10:14 11:15 12:16	separate 6:21
30:18 38:15	41:5	sand 53:15	13:16,18 19:3 29:1	September 32:21,24
responded 42:5	Roberson 2:6 3:8	Santos 2:7 3:9 6:14	31:18,25 33:15	32:25 66:1
responding 42:5	4:18,19 20:19,22		36:22 37:24 57:9	series 53:8
response 11:10 24:1	23:21,23 29:8 40:5	6:15 11:4 21:15,16	61:25 64:16,25	serve 3:14 86:19
25:12,15 31:3	40:7,22 41:11 42:3	29:20,21 30:25 31:5,8,14 32:22,23	66:23 68:5 70:4,6	Service 86:17
42:22 55:13 67:12	42:4 44:4 46:12		74:25 75:2,14	SES 49:20,25
73:16 76:16 81:24	48:17 50:5 54:25	33:1 34:12 35:6,16 35:20,25 38:14,17	scribbling 60:14	set 12:19 26:15 38:3
responsibilities 7:21	55:6,10,16,19,22	, ,	Sean 2:4 3:3	76:6
responsibility 26:18	56:13,21,24 57:6	38:20 39:4 40:6,24 41:11 42:20 43:18	second 58:9,11	shalt 41:1
26:20	57:12,16 58:10,22		60:24 61:6,10 64:7	shape 6:7 13:21
responsible 25:11	59:1,5,12,16,19	44:10 49:15 50:15	66:7,7 69:17 74:13	16:25 19:16
42:8	60:4,8,12 61:19	51:24 52:7 53:3	74:16,18,19 78:6,9	shared 26:10
result 5:11 7:1,23	62:2,20 63:8 66:2	55:4,23 56:3,19,23	78:11,13,13,20	sharing 32:5 37:2
15:18 58:15,16	67:16 70:22 72:11	57:3,8,13,17,21	79:18,19 80:21	65:5
59:20 61:1	73:24,25 76:25	58:2,6 61:17 62:3	81:2,8,10	shift 72:19
resulted 12:5	77:1,5 78:21 79:19	62:13 63:17,21	secretary 3:14 5:18	shiny 19:20
results 27:22 41:9	79:24,25 80:19,22	64:3 66:11 67:15	13:19 16:19 24:23	shoehorn 76:11
50:20 60:8,9 62:10	80:25 81:5 82:13	67:18,21 68:17	24:23,25 25:1 28:1	short 4:19 6:16
63:4 65:18 67:5	82:14,21,23 83:4	70:19 72:3 74:1,2	28:10 29:12 55:15	shortcomings 14:24
71:21	83:17 84:22,23	74:21,22 77:2,3,6	63:1 66:14,20	shout 26:23
	I	I	I	1

supposed 8:3 29:3

[100]

shown 47:24	60.10 22 6
significant 7:4 41:6	68:18,23 6 70:4 84:10
similar 13:9 28:2	specifically
41:12 47:17 49:16	24:21 33:9
53:4 71:9	specified 61
simply 27:13 30:18	specified 61 speculate 39
33:20 37:15 42:25	speculating
45:9	speculating spending 22
sir 29:8 40:22 55:10	spending 22 spent 23:4
83:17	sphere 18:12
site 9:14 26:5	spoken 24:2
site-specific 27:25	spot 54:3,18
sites 9:9,21 15:15	SSO 50:19 6
17:12 20:6 22:2,4	69:25
22:6,11 26:12,15	staff 4:2,11,2
26:16,21 27:1,5,6	7:12 9:2,16
sitting 26:24 40:16	13:3,7 14:3
87:4	15:1,23,24
six 13:12 18:15,22	16:22,23 1
23:4 54:8	18:7,16,23
size 9:2 10:9 22:6	19:16 21:6
23:19	22:7,10 23
slip 10:11	30:3,20,21
small 9:2 30:16 56:9	34:7,22,23
solution 26:15	36:16,21 3
solve 47:22	38:25 40:1
somebody 40:16	43:1,5 44:6
somewhat 20:4 50:4	44:16,18 4
soon 16:8	50:11 51:1
sorry 29:2 31:6,8	65:15 68:2
43:19 67:18	69:3 70:1,1
sort 15:17 24:16	71:15,20,2
27:24 28:24 68:23	72:12,15,2
sorts 71:9	74:17 76:7
sound 77:25	79:12 85:1
sounds 37:9,9 56:8	87:1
speak 10:3,22 11:5,9	staff's 5:2 14
11:19,20 20:18	16:24 50:1
23:22 24:21 40:3	staff-produc
40:23	staff-reques
speaking 20:18	12:18
special 6:19	staffing 5:21
specific 4:1 5:6,15	stakeholder
7:7 24:7 25:1,2	stakeholder
26:4,5 28:7,15,16	stamp 49:2
29:13 32:18 33:16	standardiza
45:15 48:8 65:23	32:6 65:6

69.19.22.60.25
68:18,23 69:25 70:4 84:10
70:4 84:10 specifically 17:21
24:21 33:9 58:13
specified 61:15
specified 61.13 speculate 39:7 43:20
speculating 43:3
spending 22:19,25
spending 22.17,23 spent 23:4
sphere 18:12
spoken 24:21
spot 54:3,18
SSO 50:19 68:12
69:25
staff 4:2,11,23 6:3
7:12 9:2,16 10:2
13:3,7 14:3,11,23
15:1,23,24 16:17
16:22,23 17:17,18
18:7,16,23 19:4,12
19:16 21:6,11,19
22:7,10 23:4 25:17
30:3,20,21 32:16
34:7,22,23 35:7,18
36:16,21 37:19
38:25 40:15 41:7
43:1,5 44:6,11,14
44:16,18 46:4,7,16
50:11 51:16,19
65:15 68:20,24
69:3 70:1,12,25
71:15,20,24,25
72:12,15,23 73:10
74:17 76:7 77:20
79:12 85:15 86:2
87:1
staff's 5:2 14:8
16:24 50:18
staff-produced 12:5
staff-requested
12:18
staffing 5:21
stakeholder 10:7
stakeholders 10:2
stamp 49:2
standardization
32:6 65:6
•

standing 42:10
standing 42.10
stanus 11.22 start 84:19
started 10:25 17:11
24:6 46:23 71:15
starting 69:23 76:22
starts 68:1
state 13:2,5
stated 61:11 76:14
statement 4:12,13
4:20 41:7
statements 11:20
21:17 85:21
states 7:4
status 56:3
stenotype 88:4
Steve 40:18 50:3
stick 46:15
Stokes 40:18,20
stop 38:4 71:19
stoplight 6:3
strategic 68:24
85:16
strike 56:14 60:20
76:21
striking 57:5,6 58:4
strip 74:12
strong 69:5
strongly 69:1
structure 14:2
structured 37:22
subject 7:8 75:4
subjective 14:8
37:23
subjugate 10:12
subsequently 3:17
subset 21:11
successful 13:25
25:5
successfully 50:16
Suffice 7:17
sufficient 13:7
suggest 63:11 66:7
suggested 52:12
69:16
suggesting 28:17
58:23
50.25

```
suggestions 7:14
Sullivan 2:4 3:3,4
 4:18 6:13 8:13
  10:18 11:11 12:8
  15:4 20:17,20
 21:15 23:21,25
 24:2 27:11 29:20
 30:18 31:1,4,11
 32:22 34:9,19 36:2
 36:5,8 38:14,18
 39:8 40:14,24 42:3
 42:21 44:2 45:5
 47:9 50:1,23 52:5
 52:8 53:11,19
 54:24 55:3,8,11,14
 55:18,21 57:14,20
 57:23 58:3,7,18,23
 59:2,10,13,17,23
 60:5,10,13 61:4,12
 61:21 62:4,25 63:7
 63:11,23 64:4,9,12
 66:6,13 67:9,13,17
 67:20,22 69:11
 70:9 72:10,21
 73:15,17,20,21
 74:7,14 76:12,17
 77:8,14,15,19 78:7
 78:23 79:17,20
 80:5,6,11,20,24
 81:1,9,21,25 82:9
 82:10,19 83:9,19
 84:2,7,13,15,22
 85:6 86:7 87:7
summarize 4:9
 37:19
summary 4:10 15:8
 33:20
Sunshine 3:20,21
supervision 88:5
support 7:1 15:2
  30:12 34:16 38:3
 38:13 47:4 56:1
 68:13,15 76:12,13
supported 6:21 7:10
 8:2 23:12
supportive 35:11
```

suppose 28:3

supposed 8:3 29:3
59:3,5
sure 9:23 19:19,25
20:3,4,12,14 40:8
42:6 50:10 51:2,3
52:2,5 57:22 60:14
79:14
surface 37:9
surprise 20:23
system 15:7 37:25
71:3,10 73:6
systematic 4:8 13:13
13:17 14:2,6,17
29:3 31:15 36:15
37:10,11,17 38:5
71:10
systemic 37:20
systemic 57.20
T
table 34:14 78:2,8
78:10,11,15,17
79:18,22,23 83:2,2
83:21
tabled 80:10,11
83:10
tabling 80:10
tailored 13:13
take 10:3 15:5,14
20:20 23:9 26:2,22
27:15 39:11 41:21
43:22 47:8,21 55:5
55:6 78:1 79:3,11
81:23 86:10,15
taken 13:21 28:15
32:18 48:18 65:23
takes 21:23 27:3
44:11,16
tale 20:7
talk 8:18,19 11:23
42:11 46:19 47:12
48:3
talked 52:9
talking 10:25 22:2
28:20 46:23 50:3,5
50:6,6 53:14 75:2 75:22

talks 48:1 68:3

41-7-670.05	4
task 7:6 70:25	tend 24:16,16
tasked 53:4	tendency 19:19 20:8
tasking 4:11 37:16	term 13:16 29:2
85:15	86:20
taxpayer 10:16	terms 15:21,22 16:5
team 26:23 86:12	16:22 34:13 48:10
87:1	56:20 70:25 72:25
tech 7:13 87:1	tested 14:21
technical 5:15,24	thank 4:21 6:12,13
6:8,20 7:3,10,12	6:15 8:11,13,15
9:2 12:14 14:8	10:17 12:12 15:3,4
31:16,23,23 32:2,3	18:13 20:22 21:16
32:8,8,14,15,17,20	23:24 27:11 29:5,8
33:10,12,20,22,23	29:21 30:17,25
34:4 36:21,24,25	32:23 33:1,1 34:8
37:3,5,8,16 38:8	38:13,14,17 40:22
38:21 39:13,14,16	41:11 44:1 49:25
40:17,17 41:2,14	52:7 55:10 58:2
41:16 42:10,23	67:15,16,21 69:9
43:5,21 44:11,25	74:7 77:11,19
45:7,24 46:14,15	83:18 84:22,23,24
46:16,19 47:2,11	85:5,6,7 86:5,6,8
47:20,25 48:11,16	86:10 87:6
48:19 49:2,8,19	thanks 17:9
50:5,8,9 51:19	thing 18:17 28:14
52:11,21 53:1,2,5	34:16 37:17 38:8
53:15,17,25 54:8,9	42:5 44:23 46:12
54:18,21 56:5	52:13 62:21 72:12
58:13,20,24 60:1,6	87:4
61:13,25 62:16,18	things 15:6 17:24
62:22 64:14,23,23	19:20 20:2,15,15
65:2,3,7,8,13,14	24:10,16 26:19
65:22,25 66:10,21	27:7,24 28:7 39:18
66:23 67:3 68:7	39:23,25 42:14
71:15,20,24 72:6	61:7 68:22 72:24
73:1 74:24 75:1,3	75:23 85:18 86:15
75:5,7,7,8,10,15	think 16:7,10 17:2,6
76:6	17:15,17 18:10,14
telegraph 45:22	18:17,23 19:4 21:4
tell 18:14 21:22 23:3	21:7,9 22:14 26:10
23:5,5 40:18 46:8	26:12 29:8,9,11,12
73:4	30:16 34:14 35:7,8
telling 24:23 71:2,3	35:10,12,20 41:6
tells 53:15	42:7,21,22 44:3,4
template 13:9	44:8 46:2,12,18
temps 86:19	47:10,16 48:14,19
ten 23:8 42:12,13	49:8 50:3,12,14
,	, ,

51:1,14,20,24
53:16,20,22 54:3
54:14,15,17,17
57:2 61:17 67:13
68:8 70:2 72:8,17
75:23 76:5,10 81:6
85:11,19
thinking 79:14
thinks 42:12,13
45:24 60:15
third 64:11 66:15
71:19
thou 41:1
thought 34:25 43:10
43:14 46:5 54:12
61:4 80:25 83:4
thoughtful 36:17
thoughts 10:4 53:18
three 32:9 62:5 65:9
74:5 77:16 78:4
80:9 83:7,15
thresholds 22:17
throw 11:18 51:20
throwing 44:14
thrown 37:12
time 4:7 7:19 10:19
11:12 14:25 15:12
15:14,18 16:1,2
18:1 23:14 28:15
34:23 40:11,21
52:4 56:17,20
57:17 58:17 60:23
64:18 79:5,11
82:16 83:5,7 84:1
86:21,23
timelines 83:14
timely 56:6
times 26:15
timing 32:10 53:7
65:9 68:11
today 4:25 7:23 8:19
11:2,7 12:17 15:2
17:19 22:21 26:24
30:19,24 34:20
41:20 43:24
today's 3:5
told 43:7,8 49:22
,

```
72:13,25
tool 13:10,21 17:4
 17:18 18:24 21:24
 22:21 35:5 37:25
tools 19:14 30:2
total 70:12 74:8
 77:21
trace 27:17
traced 28:20
track 23:1 58:11
tracking 25:5
trade 9:5
transcribed 88:8
transcript 3:23
transformational
 30:14
transmit 29:24
transparency's
 17:25
transparently 43:23
tremendous 30:14
 86:12
trends 26:14
trial 36:13
troublesome 30:12
truncate 8:16
trust 49:12
try 21:20 26:3 36:19
 39:12 42:2,13
 50:23 60:17 64:13
 76:10,11 84:17
 86:11
trying 15:8 16:5
 26:1 34:12 39:24
 43:16 44:4 45:6,16
 45:21 48:6 50:15
 53:23 54:5,6,7,16
 54:17 59:23,24
 70:6 71:3 73:10
Tuesdays 7:13
turn 4:14 31:2 40:15
turning 86:14
turns 71:16 72:1
two 15:22 20:25
 32:8 39:25 61:7
                      useful 9:19 13:10
 64:9 65:7 70:19
```

73:18 74:6 77:17

[101] 80:10,16 81:11,12 81:23 82:3 87:9 type 27:17 37:4,24 85:10 types 4:22 typewriting 88:5 **typical** 25:12 U ultimately 11:1 **Um-hmm** 57:12 60:4,8,12 unambiguous 13:2 unanimously 82:20 uncertainty 7:18,19 unchanged 6:10 undefined 48:10 underlying 8:2 understand 17:11 18:6 20:2 27:7 32:13 34:12 36:5 36:14 42:18,21 45:2 46:13 47:15

49:4 50:22 51:6,16 65:12 69:9 70:9 74:22 75:13 79:17 83:18 86:24 understanding 6:23 13:5 21:1 44:9 50:8 61:6 83:20 understands 21:13 understood 28:18 34:3 61:5 69:4 unfair 54:21 unilateral 39:21,21 unilaterally 39:15 unique 5:3 unreasonable 48:15 **unsung** 86:18 **uphold** 87:3 use 10:15 13:7,22 16:10 17:18 18:24 19:6,7 21:24 22:11 29:3 30:4 32:15

37:5 44:20 65:14

26:6 34:25 44:22

[102]

				[102]
50:21	40:23 43:13,20	weekly 7:12 13:11	77:7 85:21,23 86:1	18 16:10 51:13
usefulness 6:5 56:18	44:24 49:15 52:2	weigh 10:7	work-in-progress	180-degree 21:13
60:23 64:19	52:19,20,21 62:17	weighed 9:1 15:5	16:5	19th 3:16
utilization 42:9	62:18 73:5,7 74:23	welcome 75:16	worked 21:22 51:7	1701 5.10
utilizes 33:8	75:6 77:9 79:7	wercome 73.16 went 23:7 28:5,7	54:9	2
utilizes 33.0	80:22 84:24 85:7	43:16	workers 86:17	2 5:25 12:23 13:14
$\overline{\mathbf{V}}$	85:20	weren't 68:16	working 15:23 16:8	14:13 22:3 39:20
validity 60:9	wanted 17:25 40:13	whichever 54:12	19:12	45:20 71:12,13
valuable 14:1	40:23 41:25 51:1		workload 42:15	20004 1:18
value 5:13,17 16:4	83:17,24	whiplash 19:22 white 44:5	works 39:14 45:10	2016 7:13 12:13
varied 6:1	· ·		46:7	31:21 64:21 67:2
various 15:15	wanting 70:22	willfully 50:4		2017 1:14 3:16,18
vein 53:14	wants 11:18 18:23	willing 53:17	world 47:22,22	5:3 6:20 7:16
verbatim 3:23	41:16	WIPP 19:23	48:18,18	32:21,25 66:1
version 34:16	Washington 1:18	wish 11:5 72:18	wouldn't 34:25	2017-300-004 7:9
versus 41:2	wasn't 35:11 61:15	wishes 11:9,20	write 68:22 71:24	31:21 64:22 67:2
vice 2:5 3:7 73:22	way 8:8 9:14 13:13	78:16	writing 85:17	2017-300-061 31:14
76:23 80:7 82:11	15:19 21:9 24:3	wonder 55:25	written 62:5 77:10	2017-300-001 31.14 2018 31:23 32:20
84:19	26:25 27:14 28:14	word 30:20 58:5	wrong 20:16 29:16	40:12,21 64:23
view 5:22 18:15	28:21 30:10 33:6	words 11:23 34:19	47:21 69:14	65:25
21:12 44:6,17 72:5	36:14 37:18 38:9	57:9,9 58:7 61:22	X	24th 3:18
73:9	38:22 41:2,8 43:6	62:16 63:1,15,25		24 01 3.16
virtue 72:13	43:10,11,16 46:5,6	66:9	<u> </u>	3
visibility 22:24	49:5,6 52:23 54:12	work 5:3 6:8,20 7:2	Y-12 28:8,8	3 62:6,7,7 63:2 66:9
visit 15:15	54:14 59:9 64:9	7:18 8:6,6 9:3,15	yeah 29:8 36:4 40:6	68:10
voluntarily 29:24	85:23	12:6 15:7,18 16:3	59:19 62:13 63:21	30 32:21 66:1
voluntary 30:8	ways 29:18	16:9 17:3,15,20	84:10	30th 32:24,25
vote 11:25 12:1	we'll 11:22 20:20	18:23,24 19:14	year 7:16 15:15	35 5:21
44:19 55:5,6,8,15	27:15 52:13 55:6	21:5,13,23,24	16:11,12 17:10,13	
60:18 69:17 70:16	59:25 60:13	22:11,20 23:15	73:13	4
77:6,11 78:1,3,5	we're 10:25 11:24	24:4,6,7,8 26:6,24	years 24:6	4 62:7 75:9
78:15 79:12,15	16:7 17:13 19:22	28:10 30:1 31:23	Yellow 31:14	40 22:14
83:3,13,15 85:2	19:25 20:3 22:2	32:2,9,20 33:5,10	yes/no 48:8	45 79:2
voted 3:18 5:6 67:22	30:5 44:7 45:2	33:13,23 34:14	yeses 82:15	
votes 74:5 77:16	46:18 49:6 52:16	36:24 37:3 38:23		5
80:9 82:17	52:25 55:21 59:24	39:11,12 40:12,21	Z	5-0 85:2
voting 11:24 77:8	64:9 70:5 72:25	41:4,15,17,24 42:2		50 35:20,21
78:3 79:16 83:7	73:14 75:24 80:21	43:9,22,25 46:20	0	
10.5 17.10 05.1	83:23 84:8 86:19	46:21,25 47:4,22		6
$\overline{\mathbf{W}}$	we've 16:7 17:5,5	48:12,20,22,23	1	61 5:25 22:2,4,6,11
wait 40:5 66:13 81:7	19:15 24:5,8 25:5	49:10,17 50:8,9,24	1 39:20 45:19	23:10 72:13
waiting 64:6	47:24 48:14 70:24	51:7,13 57:7 59:8	11 1:14 31:21 64:21	625 1:17
walk 72:18	70:24 72:2 76:8,8	59:21,21 60:10,20	67:1	
want 8:18,19 10:7	77:25 78:8 83:13	61:3 62:3,12,14,16	11:57 87:13	
18:6,19 19:13,18	website 3:16 10:22	62:18 63:6 64:23	118 5:20	
20:17 23:21 26:9	79:8 80:18 81:14	65:2,8,20,25 67:8	130 5:19	
34:23 35:9,23 40:5	81:18 Week 86:18	68:7 74:24 75:1,3 75:5.8.10.12.15.25	15 7:13 22:10 75:21	
,	L VVICEN OU. LA	1	1 1 7 7 7 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	1

75:5,8,10,12,15,25

17 22:10

Week 86:18