

## ENCLOSURE 1

### ANALYSIS OF PUBLIC MEETING FEEDBACK FORMS FROM: OCTOBER 01, 2011 TO: SEPTEMBER 30, 2012

The Office of the Executive Director of Operations has analyzed 408 public meeting feedback forms sent in by the Offices and Regions, representing 64 meetings held from October 1, 2011 through September 30, 2012. There were actually over 1060 meetings held during this period (excluding Commission meetings and partially closed meetings), however, many of those attending these meetings did not complete the forms, either because of lack of interest or because the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC) staff did not introduce or distribute the forms at public meetings.

The feedback forms represent input from a variety of stakeholder groups. Many of the attendees (7%) were local residents, while a large segment of the others (44%) represented interested organizations including licensees, non-governmental organizations, licensee contractors, law firms, area newspapers, local and/or state governments, and community or citizens groups.

The following statistics were gleaned from the responses:

- The majority (64%) of respondents heard about the meeting from "other" sources such as co-workers, plant newsletters, or emails from a friend. 14% of the respondents heard from the NRC mailing list, 7% from the NRC web site, 12% from a local newspaper, and 3% learned of the meeting from local radio/television stations.
- When asked if the meeting achieved its stated purpose, 75% of respondents felt that it did. Only 9% felt the meeting did not. 15% felt it somewhat achieved its purpose.
- The meeting helped 79% of respondents understand the meeting topic better, 12% somewhat, and 10% not at all.
- 75% of the responses indicated that attendees who wanted to find supporting information prior to the meeting found it, while 13% could not find information. 12% were somewhat able to find information.
- 87% of the respondents felt they were given a sufficient opportunity to ask questions or express their views. 7% felt they were not. 6% felt that they had somewhat of an opportunity.
- 84% of the respondents felt that the meeting starting time, location, and duration were convenient 7% felt they were not, while 9% felt that they were somewhat convenient.
- 78% of the respondents were satisfied overall with the NRC personnel who participated in the meeting 9% were not satisfied with them, and 13% were somewhat satisfied.

Additionally, a sampling of specific comments are listed below:

I commend the NRC and company officials who were answering questions for their patience and explanations. Two suggestions:

1. When a question has been asked and answered, the moderator should not allow the same question again - refer the person to the previous answer.

2. Questions should only be allowed for the scope of meeting and question on previous history should be dealt with outside the meeting.

Due to travel and work the next day, had to leave early. Would like to have stayed to end. Starting time could be earlier. The meeting was scheduled to 9:30 pm which is the time I left. Due to questions meeting was to go longer.

Consider limiting topics that are not part of the selected topics. This challenges the participants ability to prepare and engage in a meaningful dialogue. Ensure registration information is readily available and obvious to all participants.

It would have been helpful for NRC to have had all documents discussed/referenced during the conference. It gives the appearance that not all supporting documentation was available/completed prior to issuance of the interim guidance and forums.

Even though I have serious misgivings about nuclear reactor technology, particularly regarding plants operating beyond the 40 year standard design life, I see that the NRC usually does its level best to fulfill its mission to keep the nation safe from reactor accidents. ("It's not easy being in the middle!")

I appreciate the NRC presenters taking a few minutes to explain the issues so the general public could understand and follow along with the dialog.

How about adding public debate?

You should take registration/RSVPs. Room did not accommodate number of attendees. If coffee cannot be provided, please pick a venue that has a coffee bar/shop available.

The NRC is not an organization to be trusted, so it doesn't matter how well you run your meetings.

NRC's rep's should be more candid and up frontly honest instead of being generally evasive while giving a "song and dance" show in order to show defense for NRC's good work.

Expertise seemed lacking among NRC staff. I say this because nothing they put forth clarified information already available to any great extent.

This is a public relations stunt! Not one of the NRC reps said anything contrary to the positions of the licensee. Who regulates the regulators? The energy monopolies! The NRC is a rubber stamp.

The room was too crowded and hot. It was difficult to circulate. Bottles of water would have been a nice touch. A few of the NRC staff were evasive to questions. I suppose they had no answer.

I felt the format was awkward + disorderly. NRC personnel crowded and bunched up toward the door, restricting the public's ability to get in and to get an overall picture of who the NRC personnel were or how private citizens were "supposed" to approach these people.

Suggest a more formal overview be given if possible - room too crowded and hard to get to right person; also - slightly chaotic had a disorganized feel to it.

Posters provided good, concise useful information regarding the current state of regulatory activities.

I can't believe the patience of the staff.

If possible, a more structured and controlled meeting would be more productive.

I compliment the NRC representatives for remaining professional and tactful when confronted with leading, emotional, and sometimes irrational questions. The facilitator did a good job keeping the meeting on-track to ensure the purpose of the question period was accomplished.

Copies of licensee slides would have been helpful. Overall, a very good meeting with lots of information.

Issue summaries were very valuable in preparing for the meeting, and should be a standard NRC practice. The detail was appropriate to frame the discussion and allow participants to prepare.

NRC building security - consider developing an approved visitor access list for frequent visitors who are "cleared."

Copies of the power point presentation that were supposed to be available for the public ran out. Not having the slides to take notes made it more difficult to follow.

I did not get answers to the questions I asked. I was told that they would get back to me, but no one asked for my name and number so that they could get back to me.

The initial NRC presentation was very vague though it did provide some useful information. Presented with questions from the audience, NRC staff often fumbled, gave vague answers, and needed to be reminded of questions they had left unanswered. I raised my hand several times but was not called on.

Please continue to make every effort to keep Q&A sessions for just that. It reflects poorly on the organization to allow individuals to control the microphone and use the meeting as their own demonstration/political platform. There was one specific instance where this could have been improved and would have allowed time for individuals with questions.

The presence of so many "experts" was confusing. If possible, you should limit the number of speakers, and ask each one to identify him or herself before offering answers to questions. You should also assure that those people designated to speak for the NRC use laymen's language and avoid acronyms whenever possible. I heard an alarming amount of jargon in your answers. You might also offer participants the chance to submit written questions, which you could answer by e-mail after the event. It would have been helpful to stress the nature of the meeting in advance-to tell people what you were prepared to tell them.

Well done. Thank you. Good job answering tough questions.

Lack of tables made it difficult to follow presentation in documents that I had brought along for use during the meeting. Also made it difficult to take notes on presentation. Suggest tables be provided at future meetings.

The meeting format was too rigid to facilitate the dialog. Presenters read slides v. providing information to foster understanding and engage guests. Rather than just presenters reading slides perhaps use a facilitator to initiate discussion and clarifying questions.

Finding a schedule and overview for this meeting beforehand was difficult. As a result, questions were prepared prior to this meeting and the topic was not discussed, so I was not provided a formal opportunity to ask.

This is a great use of technology-- you've supplied good information to interested parties with no inconvenience to them or need for them to travel to obtain that information. Thank you. I look forward to future webinars.

In order to fully comprehend content, it would be easier to have the slides before the webinar to follow along and make notes. There seems to be difficulty with the webinar/audio combination that you have chosen. Please consider alternatives.

Speakers should learn to speak in layman's term...Too stiff and overly technical. Please talk about the topics and don't just read the slides. Please make sure speakers know how to use the microphone...The popping and clicking from the speakers holding it too close or too far away is distracting.